



ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ В УСЛОВИЯХ ПАНДЕМИИ PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN PANDEMIC

DOI: 10.22363/2312-8313-2021-8-2-115-127

Научная статья / Research article

Extremely High Environmental Turbulence as a Challenge to 21st Century System Management

Marina A. Ignatskaya, Daniyil R. Malykhin

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University)
Miklukho-Maklaya str., 6, Moscow, Russian Federation, 117198

Abstract. The article actualizes the challenges of developing the theoretical and methodological basis for managing environmental turbulence in the 21st century under the unprecedented changes that have taken place both in the interpretation of the category of turbulence itself and the ability to manage it between the end of 2019 and the present in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. The results of the analysis of the category of turbulence of the new type are presented, as well as its nature and content are determined. Conceptual approaches to the criteria for the effectiveness of turbulence management have been developed. The vector of the direction of the evolution of national systems of government in the era of total turbulence at the level of public policy has been defined. The experience of the best management practices at the beginning of 2021 is noted, which, however, shows that without the use of an arsenal of “hard” technologies it is not yet possible to curb the challenges of extremely high environmental turbulence. Based on the study, the authors made the conclusion about the key role of general civil consent and cooperation in the implementation of “manual management” regime under the conditions of extremely high environmental turbulence of the early twenties of the 21st century. The peculiarities of forming the international socio-economic context of the period of extremely high turbulence, its problems and contradictions are highlighted. The main features of this context of the newest period include the ongoing systemic crisis of the world economy, permanent structural financial and economic crises, as well as the characteristics of globalization and deglobalization processes as major long-term trends. The trend towards general deglobalization, expressed in the strengthening of national protectionism and manifested in the economic policy of nation-states, has become the most pronounced at the current stage. New international platforms have been sought to implement regulatory management actions in the face of new type of turbulence.

Keywords: environmental turbulence, criteria for the effectiveness of turbulence management, “social ecology of the population”, general civil consent & cooperation, systemic crisis of the world economy, structural financial and economic crises, deglobalization

Conflicts of interest: The authors declared no conflicts of interest.

Article history:

The article was submitted on 05.12.2020. The article was accepted on 15.01.2021.

© Ignatskaya M.A., Malykhin D.R., 2021



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

For citation:

Ignatskaya M.A., Malykhin D.R. Extremely High Environmental Turbulence as a Challenge to 21st Century System Management. *RUDN Journal of Public Administration*. 2021; 8 (2): 115–127. DOI: 10.22363/2312-8313-2021-8-2-115-127

Definition of the turbulence category-2020

In the general introduction to the stated problems of the article, the authors consider it expedient to first of all update the understanding and interpretation of the category of environmental turbulence in the conditions of the XXI century, in general, and the COVID-19 pandemic, in particular. We are talking about the emergence of unprecedented new realities in social management, which represent the main challenge to the entire system management as a whole, namely, the category of extremely high total (universal) turbulence of the environment and ways to effectively counter it (at least at the national level).

To determine the essence and content of the turbulence category-2020, it is proposed to turn to the sources of its study, laid down in the works of Igor Ansoff [1; 2; 3], as well as Richard L. Daft [4. P. 100–101]. The category of turbulence was interpreted as a complex systemic phenomenon, however, amenable to effective managerial influence with these qualities, including through the use of planning and forecasting methods, as well as timely institutional imitation [5. P. 119–120]. Among other management tools applicable in the new reality for monitoring the external environment, political regulation and professional associations can be noted. At the same time, in general, turbulence was understood as the highest possible degree of uncertainty of the environment and had a fairly effective tool for managing it [6. P. 165–174]. With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, there was an unprecedented change in both the essence (nature) and the content of the category under discussion. Since 2020, the environment at all levels (both national and global) has acquired unique and unprecedented new characteristics, namely, it has moved to a new quality and turned into a total, extremely high and almost unpredictable reality, which has become the main challenge to system management at the beginning of the third decade of the XXI century. At the same time, the uniqueness of the situation lies in the fact that almost all the advanced tools of turbulence management developed in international practice, including methods of planning and forecasting, as well as political regulation [6. P. 165–174], were unable to have a positive controlling effect on the course of the spread of the pandemic, that is, they became unsuitable for use under force majeure circumstances. It is well known that modern software can calculate almost any predictive scenarios of the development of events in the environment in a continuum of optimistic – pessimistic – weighted averages. But neither a modern machine nor a person

is able to accurately indicate a scenario that will actually be implemented in practice. It can be stated that in the current conditions, the fundamental traditional managerial function of planning and the function of forecasting future activities have already ceased to function effectively, leaving only its primary basis in the form of goal setting. That is, there has already been a cancellation of probabilistic forecasting, foresight and situational calculation, which in general is extremely dangerous for a person. A long-term situation in which we are unable to predict the further course of events leads to increasing mass social frustration, generating multiple economic and cultural shocks (as it already happened in the most developed world democracies in 2020). In addition, it is also necessary to clarify such a category within the framework of the theory of management organization as “structural insufficiency” [4. P. 209–210], since now management decisions, including the highest state level, are outdated at the development stage, not reaching the implementation stage.

The category of turbulence itself has transformed and acquired the properties of almost absolute, almost complete (or at least partial) unpredictability of the development of both the external and internal environment. Thus, a new challenge was thrown to system management, which is based on extreme multitasking with absolute turbulence remaining [7].

Development of criteria for the effectiveness of management of a new type turbulence

Since any new phenomenon of the era of social transformations of the twenties of the XXI century, which should be put under managerial control and establish effective managing subject-object interactions, objectively requires the establishment of clear performance criteria, to the extent that we put the issue of developing criteria for managing turbulence of a new type at the forefront here.

Optimality, in our opinion, based on the current status quo, can lie in the plane of such a basic conceptual approach as the criterion of “social ecology of the population”.

Among other well-known and historically applied criteria (such as, for example, purely economic and /or financial-economic, as well as social and environmental) at the current stage, when effective means of countering turbulence are still only in the development and testing stage, it is “social ecology” that is able to realize the maximum of the current extreme multitasking on the basis of the only possible reasonable approach, namely, saving the maximum possible number of human lives by all currently available means (in other words, the approach of, which ensures the minimization of mortality while maximizing the number of recovered

people). In the future, as the arsenal of managerial means of influencing turbulence of a new type increases, it is realistic to expect a transition from this narrow interpretation of social performance criteria to a broader basis – the criterion of socio-economic efficiency. That is, it is objectively natural to expect that as the pandemic and its consequences are overcome, as effective management tools are developed, it is also natural to expand the social criterion of efficiency when it is combined with the economic one. However, such a transition is not yet possible for objective reasons.

From the arsenal of already existing conceptual approaches developed and proven in practice within the framework of the modern theory of management organization to the formation of criteria for socio-economic efficiency, the most promising approach looks from the point of view of taking into account the entire range of interests of the so-called “electoral districts” (in other words, taking into account the full range of interests of the widest possible range of “voters”) [6. P. 83–86].

Thus, it should be recognized that only a deep understanding of the nature of the ongoing social transformations in the global context can provide a situationally adequate response to a new challenge to system management. A special role here is played by the characteristics and parameters of the transforming environment for the implementation of the global world context – economic, socio-political, socio-cultural, etc., the understanding of which can lead researchers to an effective management tool for countering turbulence-2020 with new properties.

Determination of the direction vector of the evolution of national management systems in the era of total turbulence

The importance of determining the vector of evolution at the current stage in application to national GMU systems and, in general, to the entire public administration is determined by the acute problems of early adaptation to the pandemic situation at the current stage, finding and testing effective tools for countering turbulence-2020. That is, we are talking about unprecedented new conditions for the implementation of controlling subject-object influences, in which the latest shifts are already being noted. In particular, we are talking about such new realities that have already generated a massive transition to the “manual mode” of management of national GMU systems by the national state, significantly strengthening and breathing new life into the implementation of its traditional regulatory, regulatory and managerial functions. Such a current vector of evolution is objectively justified, since the conditions of the pandemic have brought to life the category of economic autarky, albeit partial, that was long forgotten in the era of globalism. Of course, these new realities have become a kind of

effective test of the strength of any national GMU systems and have produced intermediate results that are still waiting for their researchers. We will note here as a fact that so far the “manual control” regime has come best to the category of turbulence-2020, which is characteristic of “market democracies” that have not developed systematically and have not formed structurally, that is, countries that still do not have signs of “development” based on the rule of law, civil society, the working principle of separation of powers and “economic democracy”.

The noted mass transition to the “manual mode” of state administration on the part of national states gave rise to a kind of resurrection “of the most traditional category of national state”, which turned out to be in maximum demand in a situation when all other mechanisms for managing the functioning of the global economic system turned out to be unviable.

The national GMU systems of such countries as China, Vietnam, South Korea, Japan, New Zealand, and Australia were “tested for strength” at the turn of 2020–2021. The USA, Italy, Germany, France, Spain, Portugal and many others did not pass it. As for the “special way” of Sweden, regarding this option of responding at the state level to the challenges of a new type of turbulence, it is appropriate to note that according to official statements, it is due to the need to take into account Swedish specifics. The latter is based on the “lagom philosophy” and the desire to preserve the socio-psychological health of the nation, as well as to maintain a fragile socio-political balance and the overall balance of forces in Swedish society, which would not withstand the challenges of a pandemic with a tough version of a full-scale package of restrictive measures.

At the same time, as the IMF experts rightly note [8], Europe was less prepared for the lifting of restrictions than Asia, which was the first to take the brunt of the pandemic. They emphasize that so far, each country has its own strategy for countering coronavirus infection, under which, for example, European countries came out of quarantine at an earlier stage of the epidemiological cycle than Asian ones. However, despite the possibility of full-scale testing, in terms of contact tracking and, most importantly, productive isolation of infection foci, Europe is still inferior to its Asian counterparts. There is a certain paradox: in the countries of the Old World and the United States, in the context of the fight against the pandemic-2020, the economic criterion of efficiency came to the fore, and in Asia (for example, in Vietnam or China) – the social one, taken on the basis of the “social ecology of the population”.

A WHO study published in early 2021 [9] noted that European countries failed to prevent the second wave of coronavirus after the first one was brought under control, due to the fact that the reaction was incomplete and the opportunity to build the necessary infrastructure in the summer months of 2020 was missed. If the infrastructure is not built during the second

wave, then it is realistic to wait for a new wave in early 2021. The main task remains to put the virus under control without lockdowns.

As for the countries of East Asia, according to the cited study, the situation with the virus is much better here because of clear communication between the authorities and the population. After the number of cases of infection was significantly reduced due to the strong reaction of people, the measures were not weakened, because first we need to wait until the indicators become low and remain so [9]. That is, it is obvious that we are talking about nothing else but universal civil consent and cooperation, which is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for effectively countering turbulence-2020. It was provided within the framework of the best world practices for today. In addition, we note that the Asian specifics in the countries that demonstrate the greatest achievements in effective turbulence management-2020 are:

- 1) Ensuring the high quality of government decisions, working to “pre-empt” the crisis;
- 2) A purposeful bet on the historical and socio-cultural features of national development, as well as on the existing mentality (which guaranteed discipline, unconditional submission to the decisions of the authorities and high confidence in the authorities);
- 3) Absolutization of the professional and official authority of the head of the highest level of the state level;
- 4) The maximum degree of trust in the authorities and the enforcement based on it in relation to the decisions of the authorities (the “correctness” of the behavior model);
- 5) The rules (including strict restrictive measures) are considered the same for everyone, and violations act as a taboo and thus, the violator is inevitably subjected to general ostracism.

To briefly update the various national development scenarios (both Western and Eastern) as a response to the challenges of turbulence-2020, the experience of the best management practices at the beginning of 2021 shows that it is practically impossible to curb the challenges of the pandemic and cope with the management of extremely high environmental turbulence without using the arsenal of “hard” technologies. In other words, so far the maximum results are demonstrated by those countries that have learned to “live according to the rules” in conditions of turbulence on the basis of the “vertical of power” built up at all levels in conditions of the highest possible turbulence.

Features of the formation and the role of the international socio-economic context of the period of extremely high turbulence

The main features of the implementation environment (international socio-economic context) of the recent period include: the ongoing systemic

crisis of the world economy, permanent structural financial and economic crises, as well as the characteristics of the processes of globalization and deglobalization (as the main long-term trends).

The processes of global changes have long been associated with the situation of systemic and structural crises of the world economy. The global nature of the latter, the depth and severity are determined by the basic mechanisms of functioning, and first of all, by the significant increase in the instability of the world financial markets at the turn of the XX–XXI centuries, with continuing qualitative shifts in the balance of power between the US and the EU, on the one hand, and the PRC and Japan, on the other. There was a progressive separation of exchange rate formation from world commodity flows, first in the conditions of absolute dominance of the US dollar, and in the last decade-increased competition from the euro, yuan and yen. Since the beginning of the XXI century, the process of liberalizing the movement of capital has accelerated in the context of the introduction of new information technologies, as well as the separation of exchange rates from commodity prices. In other words, the volatility of the international monetary and financial system has increased, with the qualitative state and contradictions of which any modern structural crisis begins. In conditions when the virtual economy has repeatedly bypassed the real one, the market capitalization of companies is artificially inflated, and the massive inflating of "soap bubbles" by speculative play on the currency and financial exchanges becomes a pattern of globalization processes. The economic crises of the last two decades confirm that globalization, the formation of a global capital and currency market, the possibility of making transactions using electronic means of communication almost anywhere in the world in real time make significant adjustments to the traditionally established patterns of exchange rate formation, increase the general instability and unpredictability of the modern monetary and financial system. The separation of the monetary and financial sphere from the real economy also contributes to increasing uncertainty, to the point that the IMF is increasingly unable to cope with the statutory role of a stabilizer of international monetary and financial relations, and the element in international economic relations is objectively fraught with new dangerous cataclysms on a global scale. Hence, the need to develop international mechanisms for coordinating the policies of states and regional associations in the interests of sustainable development objectively follows [10. P. 23–30; 11. P. 39–45].

Thus, it is necessary to state that the global world economy has approached the period of extremely high turbulence with serious and deep contradictions complicating its state. De facto, the Jamaican (Kingston) monetary and financial system, which still exists de jure, has completely ceased to perform its regulatory functions, but without the appearance of any

new regulatory mechanisms that can revive it. In other words, the mechanisms of functioning of the world economy and the system of international economic relations by 2020 they have become ineffective: the ideas of “market fundamentalism” and the corresponding mechanisms of national and supranational management of the global economy as the ideological basis of the management paradigm for regulating socio-economic processes during the period of globalization have proved their complete failure (and in Europe, the collapse of the ideas of multiculturalism has also been added to them).

Under these conditions, it is not surprising that international experts talk about the crisis of the century, and forecasts are made within the pessimistic spectrum of development [8]. Moreover, for the first time in history, the IMF forecasts become outdated faster than they can be issued and presented to the public. This is another manifestation of the challenges to system management from the side of extremely high turbulence. Suffice it to say that the damage estimates of the three largest world economies, which provide more than 50% of global output and consumption, were estimated in 2020 as the most serious falls in modern history. The pandemic interrupted the recovery of the world economy after the previous crisis of 2008–2009, and the scale of that crisis is now estimated as ridiculous compared to what will happen after the current depression, already called the “Great Quarantine”. If in 2008–2009 the world got off mainly by easing monetary policy, now the problem is not a lack of capital, but the costs and restrictions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. That is, future generations will have to “pay the bills” (including through tax increases and inflation rates).

Experts also expect further strengthening of trends towards deglobalization and emphasize that against the background of the pandemic and in 2021, the business community will continue to be “ruled” by the selfishness of political elites, distrust and “we are against everyone” games [12].

At the same time, national economies will continue to experience pressure from governments distributing subsidies and benefits. An economic breakthrough in such conditions becomes impossible.

The pandemic increases deglobalization and creates huge obstacles to future economic growth. Over the past 30 years, the world has become more and more interdependent and interconnected due to scientific and technological progress and economic globalization, manifested by trends everywhere – in politics, in the economy, and in corporate supply chains. Large-scale refusals from global supplies and the forced transition to autarky lead to a massive return of production from abroad and to the creation of new programs for localization of production. The idea of “national self-sufficiency” comes to the fore, and first, it applies to the production of

medical goods, food production, energy and high-tech. The realization of “national self-sufficiency” leads to an inevitable increase in the costs of local production and, ultimately, to an increase in prices for almost all goods and services. Thus, this trend is too expensive for consumers, national governments, and the labor market as a whole.

The current situation is hitting globalism as a policy of integrating the economic activities of countries and continents. Supply chain disruptions have already led to shutdowns of many enterprises in 2020, and also created difficulties in quickly establishing vital production facilities (for example, medical equipment-ventilators that are vital in the conditions of the COVID-19 pandemic) [13]. It turns out that the world economy has turned out to be defenseless before new challenges to global system management, which can be repeated anytime and anywhere. At the same time, as we noted above, even before the onset of the pandemic period, the world economic system was already seriously “sick” and was not able to solve many of the problems of its functioning at the root (the main evidence of this is the permanent global structural financial and economic crises and, in general, the systemic crisis of the world economy).

So, we have stated the cardinal changes that have occurred in the environment of the implementation of system management, which require further large-scale practice-oriented studies of the global context we have outlined here – economic, political and socio-cultural. The most pronounced trend at the current stage has become a general deglobalization, which finds its implementation in the strengthening of national protectionism and manifests itself in the economic policy of national states.

Search for new international platforms for the implementation of regulatory management actions in the conditions of turbulence-2020

The emerging international socio-economic context of the period of extremely high turbulence and the main patterns of its development urgently require an active search for new international platforms for the development and implementation of regulatory actions by the world community.

As practice shows, such activities are strategic in nature, objectively conditioned and require global platforms, one of which may be the G-20 platform. In particular, it was already tested at the summit in late November 2020, when Chinese President Xi Jinping made proposals for a new role for the G-20 in the international order and world order [14]. The configuration of the latter was set within the framework of the following fundamental conceptual approaches:

* Creating a global barrier to the pandemic through joint work on vaccines, providing assistance to developing countries;

- * Reducing barriers to the global economic recovery; exploring opportunities for liberalizing trade in basic medical goods;
- * Promoting healthy growth of the digital economy, jointly creating an environment for digital development and bridging the digital divide;
- * Implementation of development in a wider space;
- * Ensuring the growth of the G-20's role in global governance;
- * Strengthening the international system led by the UN;
- * Optimization of the management structure in the context of economic globalization;
- * Increasing the capacity to respond to global challenges.

All the above-mentioned areas of international regulatory activity are acutely relevant, but the last four points are of particular interest among them, in our opinion. They are connected with ensuring the growth of the role of the G-20 in global governance in the conditions of the largest crisis of humanity, and their significance is confirmed by numerous facts of the manifestation of the incapacity of the modern system of global governance. This leads to the conclusion that in the post-crisis era, it is the G-20 platform that is called upon to bear a greater responsibility for improving the international order and global governance. Strengthening the international system is necessary for a powerful global response to global threats and crises. Here, “three principles of protection” were proposed:

- 1) Protection of the international system led by the UN;
- 2) Protection of the international order, which is based on international law;
- 3) Protection of the key role of the UN in international affairs.

In other words, the PRC has made proposals to create specific mechanisms for achieving a global consensus, mobilizing global resources and coordinating global actions.

Optimization of the management structure in the conditions of economic globalization, on the one hand, and a powerful trend towards deglobalization, on the other, was justified on the ways to protect the multilateral trading system based on international norms and characterized by transparency, non-discrimination, openness and inclusiveness. In other words, the proposed management structure rejects unilateral approaches and protectionism in order to effectively confront the challenges arising in the course of economic globalization, its balanced and mutually beneficial continuation.

In the same vein, an increase in the capacity to respond to global challenges should also act, among which the most urgent is the strengthening of the global public health system, the prevention and control of coronavirus infection, as well as other infectious diseases of humanity. At the same time,

international cooperation in the field of environmental protection should be intensified for the sake of preserving our common home.

Thus, in essence, at the end of 2020, the PRC has already put forward, if not a strategy, then at least a declaration of intent in the field of creating fundamentally new foundations for global system management in response to the challenges of extremely high environmental turbulence. The near future will show which way the reform of the modern morally outdated model of the world economy and the system of international economic relations will go, which are no longer able to respond to the challenges of the 20s of the XXI century and suffer from “structural insufficiency”. However, it is clear that radical changes are coming in the world economy.

We also conclude that the extremely high level of environmental turbulence in 2021 remains, and the accumulated experience of managing it, even within the framework of the best world practices today, still cannot be transferred to the rank of universal algorithms for managing subject-object impacts (not to mention the management tools at the level of state policy).

REFERENCES

- [1] Ansoff H.I. *Corporate Strategy*. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill; 1965.
- [2] Ansoff H.I. Concept of Strategic Management. *Journal of Business Policy*. 972. 2 (4).
- [3] Ansoff H.I. *Strategicheskoe upravlenie* [Strategic Management]. Moscow: Ehkonomika; 1989 (In Russ.).
- [4] Daft R.L. *Organization Theory and Design*. New York: West Publishing Company; 1994.
- [5] Daft R.L. *Menedzhment*. 6-e izd. [Management. 6th edition]. SPb.: Piter; 2006 (In Russ.).
- [6] Daft R.L. *Teoriya organizacii* [The Theory of Organization]. Moscow: Yuniti-Dana; 2016 (In Russ.).
- [7] *Upravlenie socialnymi innovatsiyami: opyt, problemy, perspektivy: sbornik statej VIII Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii* [The Management of Social Innovations: Experience, Problems, Prospects: conference proceedings]. Moscow, 19–20.11.2020. Moscow: RUDN University; 2020. 178 p. (In Russ.).
- [8] Mirovoj ehkonomie grozit krizis stoletiya – MVF [Global Economy Faces Crisis of the Century, IMF Warns]. *BBC News. Russian News Service*. 13.05.2020. URL: <https://news.mail.ru/economics/41754352/>. Accessed: 03.10.2020 (In Russ.).
- [9] VOZ predupredila ob ugroze tretej volny SOVID-19 v Evrope [WHO Warns of the Threat of a Third Wave of COVID-19 in Europe]. *RIA News*. 22.11.2020. URL: <https://news.mail.ru/society/44255345/?frommail=1>. Accessed: 25.11.2020 (In Russ.).
- [10] Dinkevich A.I. Mirovoj finansovo-ehkonomicheskij krizis (opyt strukturno-funkcionalnogo analiza) [World Financial and Economic Crisis (Experience of Structural and Functional Analysis)]. *Dengi i kredit*. 2010; 10: 23–30 (In Russ.).
- [11] *Sovremennaya ehkonomicheskaya teoriya i reformirovanie ehkonomiki Rossii* [Modern Economic Theory and Reformation of the Russian Economy] Moscow: ZAO “Izdatelstvo “Ehkonomika”; 2010: 39–45 (In Russ.).
- [12] Ehksperty ozhidayut usileniya deglobalizacii na fone pandemii [Experts Expect Increased Deglobalization against the Background of the Pandemic]. *Gazeta.ru*. 03.07.2020. URL: <https://news.mail.ru/economics/42425408/?frommail=1>. Accessed: 04.10.2020 (In Russ.).
- [13] Koronavirus menyaet mirovuyu ehkonomiku [Coronavirus Changes the World Economy]. *Lenta.ru*. 08.05.2020. URL: <https://news.mail.ru/economics/41694640/?frommail=1>. Accessed: 14.10.2020 (In Russ.).

- [14] Kitaj vydvynul predlozheniya po mirovomu ustrojstvu posle pandemii [China Has Put Forward Proposals for the World Order after the Pandemic]. *RIA News*. 22.11.2020. URL: <https://news.mail.ru/politics/44256922/?frommail=1>. Accessed: 25.11.2020 (In Russ.).

Экстремально-высокая турбулентность окружающей среды как вызов системному управлению XXI-го века

М.А. Игнацкая, Д.Р. Малыхин

Российский университет дружбы народов
Ул. Миклухо-Макляя, 6, Москва, Россия, 117198

Аннотация. Статья актуализирует проблемы разработки теоретических и методологических основ управления турбулентностью окружающей среды в XXI-м веке в свете беспрецедентных изменений, которые произошли как в трактовке самой категории турбулентности, так и возможностей управления ею в период с конца 2019-го года по настоящее время в условиях пандемии COVID-19. Представлены результаты анализа категории турбулентности нового типа, а также определена ее природа и контент. Разработаны концептуальные подходы к критериям эффективности управления турбулентностью. Определен вектор направленности эволюции национальных систем управления в эпоху тотальной турбулентности на уровне государственной политики. Отмечен опыт лучших на начало 2021 года практик управления, который, однако, свидетельствует, что без использования арсенала «жестких» технологий все еще не реально обуздать вызовы экстремально-высокой турбулентности окружающей среды. На основании проведенного исследования авторы пришли к заключению о ключевой роли механизмов обеспечения всеобщего гражданского согласия при реализации режима «ручного управления» в условиях экстремально-высокой турбулентности окружающей среды начала двадцатых годов XXI-го века. Выделены особенности формирования международного социально-экономического контекста периода экстремально-высокой турбулентности, его проблемы и противоречия. К основным особенностям среды реализации новейшего периода относятся продолжающийся системный кризис мирового хозяйства, перманентные структурные финансово-экономические кризисы, а также характеристики процессов глобализации и деглобализации как основные долгосрочные тренды. Наиболее выраженным на текущем этапе стал тренд ко всеобщей деглобализации, проявляющийся в усилении национальных протекционизмов и реализующийся в экономической политике национальных государств. Осуществлен поиск новых международных платформ для реализации регулирующих управленческих действий в условиях турбулентности нового типа.

Ключевые слова: турбулентность окружающей среды, критерии эффективности управления турбулентностью, «социальная экология населения», всеобщее гражданское согласие и сотрудничество, системный кризис мирового хозяйства, структурные финансово-экономические кризисы, деглобализация

Заявление о конфликте интересов: Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи:

Статья поступила в редакцию: 05.12.2020. Статья принята к публикации: 15.01.2021.

Для цитирования:

Игнацкая М.А., Малыхин Д.Р. Экстремально-высокая турбулентность окружающей среды как вызов системному управлению XXI-го века // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Государственное и муниципальное управление. 2021. Т. 8. № 2. С. 115–127. DOI: 10.22363/2312-8313-2021-8-2-115-127

Информация об авторах:

Игнацкая Марина Анатольевна – доктор экономических наук, доцент кафедры государственного и муниципального управления Российского университета дружбы народов (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7573-1404) (e-mail: ignatskaya_ma@pfur.ru).

Мальхин Даниил Рафаилович – студент кафедры политического анализа и управления Российского университета дружбы народов (e-mail: daniyil.malykhin@mail.ru).

Information about the authors:

Marina A. Ignatskaya – Doctor of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of State and Municipal Management, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University) (Russian Federation) (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7573-1404) (e-mail: ignatskaya_ma@pfur.ru).

Daniyil R. Malykhin – Student of the Department of Political Analysis and Management, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University) (Russian Federation) (e-mail: daniyil.malykhin@mail.ru).