

DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-1-44-47

Ruslan N. Pavlov

Central Economics and Mathematics Institute (Moscow, Russia)

THE ROLE OF IDEOLOGY OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE PROCESS OF GLOBAL TECHNOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATIONS

Abstract: the paper considers some peculiarities of genesis of social entrepreneurship as a new form of organizing entrepreneurial activity aimed not at maximizing the owners' profits, but at realizing social tasks within a context of deriving the ideological fundamentals of its development. As it is shown in the paper, in most part the ideology of social entrepreneurship depends on the balance between its social and economic missions. In terms of the formation approach, it is shown that the ideology of social entrepreneurship is formed at the stage of the transition from the stage of socialism-precursor to the new multilevel democratic level of mature socialism. Also it is mentioned that in terms of dividing social entrepreneurship into two sides, – namely the superstructure and the basis, the essence of social entrepreneurship as the socialistic democratic model can be rather well laid within a new basis, which conflicts with a new paradigm of economic relations of modern capitalism.

Keywords: social entrepreneurship, political economy, mainstream, production relations, ideology.

For citation: Pavlov R.N. (2023). The role of ideology of social entrepreneurship in the process of global technological and economic transformations. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 44–47. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-1-44-47

巴夫洛夫 R. N.

俄罗斯科学院数理经济学研究所 (俄罗斯, 莫斯科)

全球技术经济转型过程中社会型企业经营思想的作用

摘要: 文章论述了作为企业经营活动新组织形式的社会型企业经营活动的一些特点, 这种社会型企业经营活动的目的不是以企业所有者利益最大化为目标, 而是以实现社会目标为目标。作者希望以此揭示其发展的思想基础。文章指出, 社会型企业经营思想在很大程度上取决于其自身的社会目标和经济目标二者的平衡。从社会形态发展规律角度看, 社会型企业经营思想在从“预备期社会主义”向新的多层次的民主模式的“成熟社会主义”过度阶段形成。作者指出, 如果把社会型企业经营划分为上层建筑和经济基础, 那么作为社会主义民主模式的社会型企业经营的实质在于其新的经济基础, 这种新的经济基础与现代资本主义经济关系范式相矛盾。

关键词: 社会型企业经营、政治经济、主流、生产关系、思想

引用注释:巴夫洛夫 R. N. (2023). 全球技术经济转型过程中社会型企业经营思想的作用//智慧经济与智慧社会. 维捷新兴工业发展研究所论文选. vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 44–47. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-1-44-47

Over the past few decades, trends have been observed in the development of capitalism that could be characterized as processes of capitalism socialization. This is largely due to the fact that new entities emerge in the area of entrepreneurial activity, which are called social enterprises, that is, enterprises that operate not for profit, but for the purpose of achieving a certain social effect. In terms of their activities, these enterprises are in conflict with conventional commercial enterprises, since in terms of surplus value here, if generated, then it is reinvested in further social projects, and not appropriated by top managers or owners of the enterprise. In addition, these enterprises enjoy active government support, and are not abandoned at the whim of market forces, as is the case with conventional commercial enterprises. The fact that these enterprises actually differ from conventional commercial ones in the nature of their activities cannot be concealed even by representatives of the neoliberal group from the National Research University Higher School of Economics (NRU HSE), when they try to portray these enterprises as self-sustaining, functioning at the expense of sustainable commercial effect, the best guarantee of which is income generation mainly from the sale of goods and services, and not grants and charity, which, however, are not excluded as additional financial resources [Social ..., 2011]

All this allows us to say that social enterprises have their own ideology which determines their behavior, long-term development strategy and creates those foundations for the social mission of these enterprises that distinguish them from conventional commercial enterprises operating on the principles of profit maximization and appropriating surplus value by the bourgeois class. It is for this reason that the well-known foreign researcher Charles Leadbeater called social entrepreneurship “the mainstream of dissenters” [Leadbeater, 2007], because it does not fit into any of the frameworks that representatives of the neoliberal groups in economic science propose for it.

Currently, some researchers who have tried to analyze the ideological roots of social entrepreneurship believe that in fact any social enterprise is based on the implementation of two missions: social and economic. The social mission of social enterprises refers to the creation of value for “public good”, while their economic mission refers to the creation of value for “private benefit”. While commercial enterprises are focused only on their economic mission, the hallmark of social enterprises is their social mission in addition to the economic one, and it is the balance between social and economic missions that ultimately determines the strategy of a social enterprise and its potential to exercise social functions. According to R. Stevens, N. Moray and J. Bruneel [Stevens, Moray, Bruneel, 2015], these two phenomena may be limited in time, since the relative balance between social and economic missions may differ over time due to institutional pressure, and here, apparently, we are talking about political pressure, since in Russia at present the leading role in the study and real-world implementation of social entrepreneurship legislation is attributed to the National Research University Higher School of Economics, which traditionally adheres to neoliberal values and its researchers usually put the economic values of development (that is, the economic mission) before social ones. In this regard, in other countries, social enterprises are in a better position, especially in those countries where social mission is put before the economic one, such as the UK, the USA, Germany and China. [China..., 2012]

According to R. Stevens, N. Moray and J. Bruneel [Stevens, Moray, Bruneel, 2015], social enterprises are driven by individuals with a pro-social value position who are not guided by private benefits. These social entrepreneurs are altruistic in their activities and put social values ahead of profitability.

If we evaluate the position of social entrepreneurship with reference to modern transformations of socio-economic development, then we can use the periodization of recent history of economic relations proposed by well-known Marxist D. Laibman. According to this periodization, it turns out that social entrepreneurship should be attributed to the stage, which he called “socialism-precursor”, characterized, in particular, by the following feature: the capabilities and consciousness of the people’s forces are historically limited, since they are imbued with a proprietary-individualistic ideology and practices of society, from which they emerged, though mitigated by the experience of cooperation in the production process, collective efforts and solidarity – in part, but not completely [Laibman, 2013]. All these features can be found in many social enterprises. They also introduce elements of a new system for evaluating the enterprise efficiency into economic practice. It is known that the efficiency of social enterprises is measured in terms of creating social value, not economic value. In this respect, this system is the forerunner in the formation of such a mechanism as Multilevel Democratic Iterative Coordination (MDIC) which forms the basis of the core of a mature socialist society, according to the concept of D. Laibman, which, in accordance with his theory, is the stage following the period of “precursor socialism” [Laibman, 2013]. In addition to other important parts of coordination of socio-economic processes, this system, in particular, includes criteria that characterize the achievement of a number of social goals by enterprises: development of the employees themselves; overcoming the manifestations of gender or racial stratification and oppression inherited from the past; achievement of the set goals regarding environmental impact; development of relations with the local community, with other enterprises, etc. This entire list is exactly the area of influence of social entrepreneurship and, accordingly, is the subject of evaluation, as judged from some publications in this area [Young, 2006]. In this regard, referring to the period of “socialism-precursor”, social entrepreneurship also has attributes of genesis of the next stage – “mature socialism” and therefore, of course, contributes to its formation. Thus, it is most likely possible to define the mode of production represented by social entrepreneurship as transitional from the capitalist order to a new form of economic relations, where the values of solidarity and the welfare society already dominate, rather than individualistic and private ownership interests. Time will tell whether to call this stage “mature socialism” or in some other way. Today, only one thing can be stated: the current state of capitalist relations has already reached the stage when, in order to preserve this paradigm and eliminate all its contradictions, the state has to introduce a number of elements that are not characteristic of it – elements of planning, developing the social sector and reducing a significant level of social tensions caused by growing social inequality [Young, 2006]. However, over time, all these quantitative changes can develop into qualitative ones, and as for the role of social entrepreneurship ideology in the process of global technological and economic transformations, it consists in establishing the values of a new integral society based on the values of solidarity and cooperation in the public ideology, and a multi-level democratic system, which D. Laibman wrote about. If we apply his concept to social entrepreneurship as a transitional phenomenon, then we get the following picture: the basis, that is, the baseline, of social entrepreneurship is the socialist model which can be considered the forerunner of a multi-level democratic system being the core

of a mature socialist society. Its major elements are cooperation, collective efforts and solidarity. At the same time, the superstructure represents the forms and trends of the capitalist paradigm that are becoming history, namely: the proprietary-individualistic ideology and practices of society from which social entrepreneurship emerged, that is, business structures inherent in the capitalist paradigm, namely, positions such as CEO, CFO and other positions in the enterprise management structure, that are typical of a conventional commercial enterprise being the basis of the capitalist order.

References

- Laibman D. (2013). Mature Socialism: Design, Prerequisites, Transitions. *Alternatives*. No. 1. URL: <http://www.intelros.ru/readroom/alternativi/al-2013/19011-zrelyy-so-cializm-structurs-predposylki-perehodnye-periody.html> (Accessed: October 23, 2017). (In Russ.).
- Moskovskaya A.A. (ed.) (2011). *Social Entrepreneurship in Russia and in the World: Practice and Research* (2011). National Research University Higher School of Economics. Moscow, HSE Publishing House. P. 16. (In Russ.).
- Leadbeater C. (2007). Mainstreaming of the Mavericks. *The Observer*. March 25. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2007/mar/25/voluntarysector.business> (Accessed: January 24, 2023).
- Stevens R., Moray N., Bruneel J. (2015). The Social and Economic Mission of Social Enterprises: Dimensions, Measurement, Validation, and Relation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Vol. 39, Issue 5. P.1051-1082. DOI: 10.1111/etap.12091.
- Young R. (2006). For What It Is Worth: Social Value and the Future of Social Entrepreneurship. *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 56-73.
- China Social Enterprise Report (2012). *BSR*. URL: https://www.bsr.org/reports/FYSE_China_Social_Enterprise_Report_2012.PDF (Accessed: January 24, 2023).

Information about the author

Ruslan N. Pavlov

Candidate of Economics, Senior researcher of the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the RAS (117418, RF, Moscow, Nahimovsky pr., 47)

E-mail: pavlovru@mail.ru