

DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-2-77-82

Sergey D. Bodrunov

S.Y. Witte Institute for New Industrial Development (Saint Petersburg, Russia)

**FROM “SURVEILLANCE CAPITALISM” TO THE NOOPARADIGM
OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT. AFTERWORD TO THE BOOK
THE WORLD SITUATION AND THE CHINESE ECONOMY
IN THE NEW ERA BY CHENG ENFU**

For citation: Bodrunov S. D. (2023). From “Surveillance Capitalism” to the Nooparadigm of Social Development. Afterword to the Book *The World Situation and the Chinese Economy in the New Era* by Cheng Enfu. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 77–82. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-2-77-82

博德鲁诺夫S. D.

维捷新兴工业发展研究所(俄罗斯, 圣彼得堡)

**从“监督资本主义”到社会发展的智慧范式。程恩富
《新时代的世界形势与中国经济》一书后记。**

引用注释:博德鲁诺夫S. D. (2003)从“监督资本主义”到社会发展的智慧范式。程恩富《新时代的世界形势与中国经济》一书后记。vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 77–82. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-2-77-82

In recent years, the struggle between two paradigms of development has been intensifying in the world: 1) strengthening of the unipolar (and in many respects - forceful, based on “rules” and the requirement of widespread obedience to them) order established by the centers of financial capital by any means (information pressure, economic coercion, pseudo-democratic procedures of “democratic” “international” institutions controlled by these centers, value-psychological processing of public opinion, political manipulation, etc.); 2) transition to multipolarity within the framework of preservation and development of international law, consensus mechanism of decision-making, equality of participants of the world economic process on the basis of respect and real consideration of their interests, needs and values.

In this regard, a new book by the well-known Chinese scholar Cheng Enfu, Academician of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Director of the Research Centre for Socio-Economic Development of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, and Chairman of the World Political Economy Association, is very interesting. For many years Professor Cheng Enfu has been consistently and actively studying the processes of economic development in different countries, including Russia (he is, incidentally, a member of the International Committee of the Free Economic Society of Russia). This allows him, a person with a broad outlook and deep understand-

ing of economic processes, to make important generalizations and put forward thoughtful and well-reasoned ideas.

Academician Cheng Enfu's work is well known in Russia. He has a long-standing scientific co-operation with the S.Y. Witte Institute for New Industrial Development (INID) (St. Petersburg) and the Free Economic Society of Russia. He participates in various scientific forums organized by the Voluntary Economic Society, the Moscow Academic Economic Forum, the S. Y. Witte INID, as well as in the development of general scientific issues. Professor Cheng Enfu took part in the international collection "A(O)nthology of Noonomy", recently published in Russia and the USA; in his article Cheng Enfu points out the affinity between the concept of intellectual economy developed by his scientific school and the theory of Noonomy, emphasizing that intellectualization of economy is an advanced stage in the evolution of economic society, the further development of which inevitably leads to the destruction of the economic social structure and the transition to Noosociety.

Enfu's new book "The World Environment and the Chinese Economy in a New Era" presents the reader with the results of the study of topical problems of the development of the Chinese and world economy from the standpoint of "Chineseised" Marxism, of which the author is a prominent representative.

Readers familiar with the official line of Soviet Marxism, which is largely oriented towards dogmatic reproduction and commentary on Party guidelines overloaded with Marxist terminology (for the sake of scientificity), sometimes transfer their previous impressions to Chinese Marxism. But such perceptions are far from the truth (partly in relation to Soviet Marxism as well). Of course, Cheng Enfu speaks as a supporter of the leadership line of the Chinese Communist Party. At the same time, he does not limit himself to referring to official Party decisions, but conducts a scientific search for solutions to the difficult problems facing the Chinese economy domestically and internationally during the period of aggravation of the contradictions of world development, not hiding their acuteness and seeking to develop recommendations for their resolution.

Our Chinese colleague is characterized by a critical view of the modern capitalist economy, and this is not just by pointing out the contradictions of capitalism from a Marxist perspective. In his book (and this is its great cognitive value) we see a thorough analysis of the historical development of these contradictions, an understanding of their specificity due to the influence of the latest economic and technological trends, and a serious argumentation of the ideas and proposals put forward.

Cheng Enfu pays special attention to the methods of monopolistic control of the United States (as the center of financial capitalism and the "leader" of the corresponding development paradigm in the world economy) through the struggle to maintain the monopoly of the dollar and the monopoly of intellectual property, which is an essential part of the latest technological developments. Hence, the author draws a conclusion with which it is difficult to disagree: the most urgent task is the co-operation of countries wishing to get rid of US hegemony and its monopolistic dictate.

Cheng Enfu's view on the formation of so-called supervisory capitalism in Western countries is extremely interesting. The powerful digital platforms that have emerged in the West, occupying a monopoly position, use it to collect and appropriate users' personal data, using this information (in particular, through big data processing systems) to manipulate their consumer behavior and,

in fact, all aspects of their behavior and to control their private life and, further, their public life. The simulation of democracy is taking place, which is accompanied by the growth of social inequality with the departure from the policy of social reformism.

But in our opinion, the most interesting for the Russian reader is the book's study of the nature of "socialism with Chinese specifics". Cheng Enfu makes an important political economy emphasis on the fact that economic relations in the system of Chinese socialism are brought in line with the level of productive forces, so the main economic regulator of resource distribution is the market. To be more precise, in this (!) case it can be an effective regulator and in fact it becomes one. However, socialism would not be socialism if it were reduced to the market. The author is alien to the superstitious adoration of the market (inherent in rather limited representatives of the economic mainstream of the beginning of the century, including our compatriots (even after its fetishization was abandoned by many Western "inventors")); he shows the contradictions, problems and limitations inherent in the system of market self-regulation, especially in the modern era. The author convincingly argues that the modern market mechanism cannot function effectively without state regulation, which is not deified, but also has its own limitations and contradictions. The author believes (and in this he is very convincing) that only an organic (and we would add – competent, meritocratic in the specific Chinese sense) combination of these two regulators can form an efficient economic system.

Many colleagues have the right to ask a "simple" question: even under capitalism, state regulation is widely used, so how does Chinese socialism differ from capitalism?

While these economic systems seem to be similar in appearance, a deeper analysis reveals a completely different "internal content". Both the market and state regulation are just tools for implementing economic policy. But in favor of whom?

Cheng Enfu points out two fundamental differences. Firstly, under capitalism the property of private capitalist monopolies dominates, while under socialism it is public property. And it is precisely the property relations that determine the goals of social production. Hence, secondly, on the basis of public ownership, the fundamental question of who and in whose interests carries out state regulation of the market is solved differently than under capitalism. That is why, according to Cheng Enfu, the market system can function much more effectively under socialism than under capitalism. And practice as a whole confirms the author's conjecture (rather, a shrewd scientific vision!) about the reasons for the more intensive growth of the Chinese economy with the beginning of the application of market methods than in countries with higher starting positions that "gave birth to and nurtured" these methods.

We would advise you to pay attention to the way Cheng Enfu looks at the problem of achieving the goals of socialist development in the People's Republic of China, the key word here being "development". We have repeatedly opposed the indiscriminate application of the concept of "economic growth", pointing out that it can be simulative, disproportionate, destructive to social development, etc. We have insisted on prioritizing economic growth over development. We insisted on prioritizing the understanding of economic activity as economic development - with goals determined by positive values within a noocriteria framework. Cheng Enfu, looking at the problem of development, does not treat China's current socialist system as something frozen, canonized, once and for all given. For him, it is important to see the prospect of Chinese socialism moving to new frontiers, the prospect of solving the problems that Chinese society faces today.

What does he see as these new frontiers?

The first is the deepening of the social character of property, which is associated with our (in the theory of Noonomy) understanding of the process of transformation of the institution of property as “diffusion of property” [Bodrunov, 2021, p. 5-14]. Cheng Enfu notes that in the decisions of the Communist Party of China it is formulated as follows: “...to rely on the people in development and share the fruits of development with the people, and to create more effective institutional mechanisms so that the entire population of the country can feel the achievements in joint participation in enterprise activities and joint development”. Cheng Enfu considers one practical way to tackle this task to realize his proposal: distributing a portion of dividends from state-owned assets to the entire population through an individual social insurance card. Another way - development of mechanisms of joint use and ownership of enterprises. It should be noted that China is a world leader in the “sharing economy”, which is developing rapidly in the world. Another measure that should smooth out the emerging growth of social stratification in China, which is inevitable (it is important for us to be aware of this - our home-grown apologists of the “mainstream”, advocating the “free” market, thus advocate the strengthening of social inequality and stratification of society) when using market and capitalist methods of development: the use of progressive taxation of income while limiting tax rates on labour income.

And we have something to learn here - instead of the populist “Sharikov’s” proposal to “take more from the rich” by introducing a progressive scale of taxation on any income, the approach proposed by a Chinese colleague seems to be more rational: to give priority to high taxes on non-labour income: “rentier” income, winnings, stock exchange gains, etc., rather than labour income: investment, savings, etc.... So far, Russia has done exactly the opposite - it has recently introduced an income tax on savings income (there was a moratorium on it during the pandemic, but from 2023 it has been cancelled), and citizens who have earned their money and kept it on not at all “fancy” deposits in Russian banks (where else should they keep it?), which do not even cover inflation, have to shell out money in favor of those who did not save (and not always - could not). Chinese eco-economists consider this approach wrong both from the point of view of strengthening in the public consciousness a positive attitude to labour and justice, which is very important in the Chinese value system. In the author’s opinion, all this should lead to the realization of the principle of joint capacity building and the prosperity of the Chinese people.

Another aspect of strengthening the national character of ownership is overcoming the monopolism of Chinese Internet companies. This problem (common to any technologically advanced society) is proposed to be solved in the version of socialism with Chinese specifics through various forms of joint access to the benefits provided by digital platforms. The development of forms of collective production and ownership is also proposed as a way of progressive development of the agricultural sector. Here Cheng Enfu consistently adheres to the principle of forming co-operative farms on the basis of their economic interest in joint activities, with such associations being completely voluntary.

Cheng Enfu advocates a rebalancing of the balance between external and internal resource circulation in favor of a gradual shift towards the domestic market. This should stimulate a more complete satisfaction of the needs of the Chinese population, the development of own research and development, overcoming the continuing technological dependence on Western countries in many areas, while maintaining a sufficiently high level of own technologies.

In the field of international economic relations, the theoretical developments of Cheng Enfu, who critically analyses the approaches of Wallerstein's school of world-system analysis [Wallerstein, 1990; 2006] and S. Amin [Amin, Arrighi, Frank, Wallerstein, 1982; Amin, 2007; 2017], dividing the world economic system into the "center" and "periphery" with a layer of "semi-peripheral" states. Cheng Enfu believes that such a division was valid for a certain historical period, but at present it is impossible to place the PRC under any of these three categories. In this respect, the author agrees with the ideas expressed in our recently published monograph *Regularities of the Noonomy Foundations Formation as Future Social Order: To Know and Operate* [Bodrunov, Glaziev, 2023], which gives a detailed analysis of the formation of new centers of world development in the framework of the transition to the integral world economic mode - the material basis of the new industrial society of the second generation as a transitional stage from economy to noonomy and from economic society to noo-social order. Without denying the achievements of the "world-systemists", we have significantly expanded our understanding of the modern fragmentation of the world economy and categorization of local economies in the last decade, which makes it inevitable to search for a new understanding of globalization and the role of various "strata" of economic space in it (as well as in its destruction), etc.

Enfu defines China's position in the world economic system as "quasi-central". Why?

China has long ceased to be a periphery of the world economy, dependent on the countries of the center. But it has not moved to the center of the world capitalist economy, because it has not become a hegemonic power that uses its dominance to exploit the countries of the periphery, which is the main feature of the center in the system of "world-analysis". China offers all countries a different system of relations - relations of equal co-operation, based on the concept of moving towards the formation of a "community of common destiny of mankind". This is a fundamentally different view of the fate of humanity and a different approach to building relations between countries.

In conclusion, we would like to draw attention to possible difficulties in perceiving the text of Academician Cheng Enfu's book. It is not simple. And it is typical of the texts of our Chinese colleagues. It may seem that there is a lot of repetition in the book, when the same, at first glance, ideas are repeated several times with minor variations. However, one should take into account the traditional Chinese way of presenting ideas, where small nuances in the construction of phrases and the context in which they are placed make the idea presented play with new colors and meanings. One has to think about such texts, sometimes reading and reading, "digging" into their meaning. To some extent, this is caused by the influence of the Chinese hieroglyphic writing system, when the meaning of certain characters can change depending on what other characters they are surrounded by. The Russian translation is not able to fully convey these peculiarities. But still careful reading gives an opportunity to catch many nuances. And I am sure that readers who are able to tune in to the "Chinese" version of the material will gratefully absorb the ideas and thoughts of this outstanding scientist.

During the visit of a delegation of the Free Economic Society of Russia to Beijing in April 2023 as part of the three-day Russian-Chinese dialogue of scientists, where the problems of society development in the global context were discussed, a landmark meeting of Russian scientists with the director of the Renmin University of China, Professor Lin Shangli, took place. At this meeting, the Chinese colleague said that today the most important task of the Chinese social science circle of scholars is to develop a new concept of the development of Chinese society for decades

to come. He emphasized that this is an equally important task for Russian society and urged us to “learn to understand each other and work together on these tasks”. We can state that both the book and the ideas of Academician Enfu are a good help in developing our mutual understanding and, in general, in this great work.

References

- Bodrunov S. D. (2021). Genesis of Noonomy: Scientific and Technological Progress, Diffusion of Ownership, Solidarism. *Economic Revival of Russia*. No. 1 (67). Pp. 5–14. (In Russ.).
- Wallerstein I. (1990). World-Systems Analysis: The Second Phase. *Review*. Vol. 13. No. 3. Wallerstein I. (2006). *World-systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Translation by N. Tyukina. Moscow: Territoriya buduscshogo Publ. 248 p. (In Russ.).
- Amin S., Arrighi G., Frank A. G. and Wallerstein I. (1982). *Dynamics of Global Crisis*. New York: Monthly Review Press. 254 p.
- Amin S. (2007). *The Liberal Virus: Permanent War and the Americanization of the World*. Moscow: Evropa Publ. 168 p. (In Russ.).
- Amin S. (2017). *Russia and the Long Transition from Capitalism to Socialism*. St. Petersburg: INID Publ.; Moscow: Kulturnaya revolyutsiya Publ. 148 p. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S. D., Glaziev S. Y. (2023). *Regularities of the Noonomy Foundations Formation as Future Social Order: To Know and Operate*. St. Petersburg: S.Y. Witte INID Publ.; Moscow: Tsentrkatalog Publ. 340 p. (In Russ.).

Information about the author

Sergey D. Bodrunov

Dr. Sc. (Econ.), Professor, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the S.Y. Witte Institute for New Industrial Development (INID), President of the Commission of the Union of Economists, President of the Free Economic Society of Russia, (Bol'shaya Moneta Str. 16, St. Petersburg, 197101, Russia)

E-mail: inir@inir.ru