ZgSp2353-7426/31.05.2018/25.08.2018/30.09.2018/01

PhD. Svetlana Sokolova
National Academy of Science of Belarus in Minsk, Belarus

THE SECURITY IN MODERN SOCIETY: INNOVATION POLICY AND STATE REGULATION

Abstract

A low level of innovativeness in society perpetuates low innovation and investment needs of the economy, creates a direct threat to its security. Securities of all public life spheres (economic, political, social and spiritual) are interrelated and interact actively. Currently in Europe, innovation development process involves several essential points: a number of enterprises engaged in innovation activities is growing; consumer demand strengthens the cooperation between producers and consumers and the competitiveness of national and global markets is believed to stimulate innovation processes. The transformation of the traditional economy into the innovation economy will lead to science becoming a primary productive power, and education will transform into a system for reproduction of the main productive powers that will determine the future effectiveness of security.

Keywords: security management • innovation development • innovation management system • innovative development models • state innovation policy • innovation economy

BEZPIECZEŃSTWO W NOWOCZESNYM SPOŁECZEŃSTWIE: POLITYKA INNOWACYJNA I REGULACYJNA PAŃSTWA

Streszczenie

Niski poziom innowacyjności społeczeństwa utrwala niskie potrzeby inwestycyjne w gospodarce i stwarza bezpośrednie zagrożenie dla jej bezpieczeństwa. Bezpieczeństwo we wszystkich sferach życia publicznego (ekonomicznego, politycznego, społecznego i duchowego) jest ze sobą powiązane i aktywnie współdziała. Obecnie w Europie sposób rozwoju innowacji obejmuje kilka istotnych aspektów: rośnie odsetek przedsiębiorstw zaangażowanych w działalność innowacyjną, popyt konsumpcyjny wzmacnia współpracę między producentami i konsumentami, a konkurencyjność rynków krajowych i globalnych stymuluje proces innowacji. Przekształcenie tradycyjnej gospodarki w gospodarkę innowacyjną doprowadzi do tego, że nauka stanie się podstawową siłą produkcyjną, a edukacja przekształci się w system reprodukcji głównych mocy wytwórczych, który określi przyszłą skuteczność bezpieczeństwa.

Słowa kluczowe: zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem • rozwój innowacji • system zarządzania innowacjami • innowacyjne modele rozwoju • państwowa polityka innowacyjna • gospodarka innowacyjna

* * *

Exploring the conceptual approaches to security management, it is necessary to focus special attention on innovation policy as a form of state regulation of public life in general and the security sphere – in particular. At present, innovation grasps the social space and social relations more widely and deeply and apparently to a large extent determines them. The dynamic transformation of the relations itself creates uncertainty in the society, disrupts the mechanisms of self-regulation. In general, the qpresence of certain risks and uncertainties is always accompanied by social development and apparently is an immanent feature of the social innovation (as a rule without risks it turns out to be a «stagnation»). Meanwhile innovation can occur both spontaneously and organized, so it becomes increasingly difficult and often impossible for state and political system to distinguish not only the positive and negative social

innovation, but also to manage them [1, p. 16 – 17]. In the current international practice, the concept of «innovation» has expanded and now includes new organizational processes associated with the production and sale of products and services [2, p. 12].

National security of all public life spheres is interrelated and interacts actively (economic, political, social and spiritual). Let me note one more important peculiarity of social innovations. The fact is that, the state while searching for opportunities to carry out its activities more effectively can and should itself become a source (of course not the only one) of social innovations. The reason for this lies in the objective importance of political decisions for the innovatively transforming society [3, p. 121].

I think if the supreme authorities do not trigger innovations, it gives a social initiative to other socio-political actors. Just elite groups are able to comprehend the necessity of social and political importance of innovations (which, as a rule, are not always taken positively by the majority of community) [4, p. 15]. These are the best representatives of the political elite, who can and should, as professor O. Kryshtanovskaya notes, not only control the resources, but also offer alternatives of social development [5, p. 109 – 110]. I think the politicians, referring to the innovative development, yet keep in mind the change in mindset and actions of public authorities, the change of community in the direction away from the traditional to innovative. However, for community by itself the word «innovation» does not mean anything. So again, I emphasize that now we need positive political innovation on the top that is coming from the political system of society that can eliminate the possibility of radical changes and crises. As a rule, all other (non-political) innovations are put forward by other subjects: social, economic and authority should not impede their emergence, development and implementation, but do everything to facilitate and encourage them. Several points of view exist on this matter. For example, according to the researcher, A. D. Artamonov, state innovation policy is an integral part of the state

policy, guided with respect to the appropriate priorities established by state authorities.

State innovation policy is implemented with the help of interrelated economic, regulatory and other mechanisms of state support of competitive enterprises [6, c. 30]. Perhaps, such definition is difficult for understanding and apparently it is fairly narrow because this policy is unlikely to be reduced to various supports of competitive enterprises.

In the work «Innovation priorities of the state», the authors define qualitative innovation policy as an effective protection of intellectual property rights, the sufficiency of tax credits, state subsidies for research and development in private sector, the effectiveness of state regulation among competitors [7, p. 34].

This definition is dominated by economic issues, but quite clearly shows the role of the state that is up to date for modern society. Researchers I.P. Denisova, L.R. Klinovenko, A.V. Shcherbina believe that state innovation policy is a goal of state in the field of science, engineering and technology, as reflected in national research, innovation programs, plans, as you can see, goal setting is the key point in this definition, and is realized in specific documents.

Participants of the round table «Problems of legal regulation of public policy on nanotechnology development» see that the main task of the state in innovation sphere consists in shaping of the perspective of home products' sales market, in creation of the state mechanism with the task of turning scientific research into a commercial marketable means, in creation of future guaranteed market sales of science-based home products [8, p. 59]. To my mind this definition is principally economic.

At the same time, important relationships between science (scientific researches) and its commercial customers (market) are recorded there. Apparently, development and implementation of these rules are the essence of the state innovation policy. The Russian Federation legislative and executive authorities are paying particular attention to improving of the methods and criteria for state regulation of innovation activity, scientific and technological progress accelerating and innovation development. Apparently, innovation development (innovation component of

security) truly involves a complex mix of scientific and technological progress, effective industrial policy and practical implementation of scientific and technical developments. However, some definitions of these terms have not been formulated and their correlation with each other has not been established. In this document the concept of «national innovation system» has not been expressed, as well as innovation activity management system has not been defined. Attention is drawn to the fact that in the scientific literature a lot of concepts that define the state regulation of innovation processes are used, but very little attention is paid to economic entities, which are involved in innovations. This is probably due to the fact that after a period of market reforms authorities still prefer to operate in the economy generally by means of state (as opposed to market) regulation. It should be noted that, in general there is the desire of the authorities to promote innovation processes, to support them financially and legally within the specific programs and in certain development areas. Generally, it's agreed as an erroneous decision, that market self-regulation should be based only on the innovation activity development in the country. However, current state participation in the innovation activities development carried out at the level of legal regulation (by the way, insufficiently) and in the form of new elements of state institutional structure generation.

After analyzing the basic innovation activity laws of the Russian Federation, it must be noted, that the following moments, that need to be improved, can be articulated: planned deliverables of innovations are not legally defined, that does not allow formulating aims and objectives of innovation properly, especially in the field of security; criteria of assessing of the realism of previously set innovation activity goals are not defined; the lack of formal performance criteria of innovation activity reduces the effectiveness of existing institutional system of innovation activity state support; parliament and the supreme executive authority haven't defined the criteria for evaluating of the budget expenditures effectiveness based on the specificity of innovation activity; criteria for assessing the quality of budget and socio-economic innovation activity management are also not

developed; creation of the effective strategic system of innovation activity management is not allocated at the legislative level as a focal issue of state management.

The conclusion is that, applications for the elimination of the administrative system of the state innovation management have not yet led to the creation of new effective innovation management system. Recognized all over the world main national science achievements were made in the past – in the context of rather tough state management of innovative activities and the planned economy. Of course, in the recent years there have been some changes in the Russian society, both in practical activity of various economic entities and in economic development strategies. Experts believe that the accelerated development of nonprofit sphere and nonprofit sphere of economic activity is becoming the hallmark of new innovation economy. This particular economic development is essentially innovative. Within scientific studies on economics innovations are far more frequently associated with the investments and / or technological innovations, rather than with the new information technologies. They noted that Russia needs a new way to train personnel for market economy and a low level of innovation development of Russian society perpetuates low innovation and investment needs of the economy, creates a direct threat to its national security [9, p. 13].

Defining the differences between business strategies and economic development of state Russian society, it should be emphasized that business, aiming for a quick and maximum profit, needs a system of constant innovation activity. Business takes a risk, constantly introduces innovations, focuses on performance, and learns from mistakes, highlighting the need for profitable achievements. This strategy is useful for many enterprises from state economic sector. However, state economy, declaring innovation policy, yet cannot avoid a routine activity, and usually is more focused on the activity itself rather than on the results. State economy operates the interests of the structure, avoids mistakes and punishes executors for errors appearance as a whole avoiding any risk. However, this situation is not quite the same among all countries. For example,

currently in Europe the way of innovation development involves several essential points. First, proportion of enterprises engaged in innovation activities is increasing.

Secondly, the study of consumer demand strengthens the cooperation between producers and consumers. Thirdly, it is believed that the competitive pressure of national and global markets stimulates innovation process [10, p. 41 – 42]. Earlier and now in European countries and in the USA business sector is the most important segment of the national innovation systems [11, p. 81]. If to extend the European way of innovation development to Russian conditions, private sector still remains obviously underdeveloped in Russia, the government often interferes the competition, intellectual property protection is not effectively organized. One of the problems of the Russian Federation is the problem of implementation, that is, the perception of market innovations, and not the organization and conduct of any certain scientific developments. It is believed, that monetary and departmental innovation nature, as well as declarative nature, short period cover, patchy character and isolation from the economic policy are the main features of innovation policy [12, p. 111].

Three types of scientific and innovative development models of industrialized countries are known for modern scientific idea [13, p. 22 – 23].

The first model is focused on leadership in science, the implementation of major targeted projects, and the national coverage of all stages of the scientific-industrial cycle.

The second model is focused on the spreading of innovations through the creation of fertile environment; streamlining the entire structure of the economy, (this model is common to Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland).

The third model assumes the stimulation of innovation through the development of innovation infrastructure, ensuring the susceptibility of the national economy to the achievements of world scientific and technological progress, various sectors coordination among in the field of science and technology. Despite that the definition of the model looks so easy, however, it turns out that different scholars have different points of view

both on its innovative potential and prospects of development, but it is unlikely, that the military-industrial or energy-producing systems created during the Soviet time can be the basis for the so-called innovation «leap». To sum up, I will add, that business in Russia can and should become a full member of the innovation economy, especially at the stage of innovation and state regulation of security. In this case, the primary role in the process of innovation policy formation and implementation should be reserved to the supreme authority and organs of the state. The transformation of traditional economy into innovation, including by privatization, will lead to the fact that science will become a primary productive power, and education will transform into a system for reproduction of the main productive powers, that will determine the future effectiveness of security [14].

Bibliography

1. Brega, A.V. Political risk in ensuring of military security. M., 2007. P. 5-6, 9-10, 16-17.
2. Nikolayev, A.V. Evaluation and efficiency mechanism of innovation use: Thesis. ... PhD in Economy. M., 2006. P. 12.
3. Runov, A. V. Peculiarities of the communicative environment in the models of information society. M., 2003. P. 116-121.
4. Innovation training of state service personnel / Under the general editorship of V.L. Romanov, L.A. Vasilenko. M., 2006. P. 15.
5. Kryshtanovskaya, O. The Russian elite anatomy. M., 2004. P. 109-110.
6. Artamonov, A.D. Innovation policy in Russia: the mechanism of implementation. St. Petersburg., 2005. P. 30.
7. State innovation priorities / Managing editors A.A. Dynkin, N.I. Ivanova. M., 2005. P. 34.
8. Round table proceedings «Problems of legal regulation of public policy on nanotechnology development of the Russian Federation» (Transcript). M., 2005. P. 59.
9. Tsirenschikov, V. S. Europe: trends of innovation development. M., 2004. P. 13.
10. State innovation priorities / Managing editors A.A. Dynkin, N.I. Ivanova. M., 2005. P. 41 – 42.

11. Ivanova, N.I. National innovation systems. M., 2002. – P. 81.
12. Innovation potential of Russia: problems of use activation / Ed. T.P. Nikolaeva, E.M. Korostyshevskaya, A.V. Butuhanova others., St. Petersburg, 2007. P. 111.
13. Artamonov, A. D. Innovation Policy in Russia: the mechanism of implementation. St. Petersburg., 2005. P. 22 – 23.
14. See: Sokolova, S. N. The ontology of security and humanistic modernization of contemporary society // Bulletin of the Polesskie state University. A series of public Humanities. 2017, № 1. P. 35 – 48; Sokolova, S. N. The spiritual security of the society and culture of the modern person // Bulletin of the Polesskie state University. Series of social Sciences and Humanities. 2017, № 1. P. 48 – 57; Sokolova, S.N. The safety culture of modern society and axiological personality matrix // Bulletin of the Polesskie state University. Series of social Sciences and Humanities. 2017, № 1. P. 66 – 73. http://lib.psunbrb.by/bitstream/112/7895/1/8.pdf.