

DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-2-60-66

Zenfira R. Khabibullina

S.Y. Witte Institute for New Industrial Development (INID) (St. Petersburg, Russian Federation)

FROM A CREATIVE WORKER TO A NOONOMY HUMAN¹

Abstract: the main provisions of the theory of noonomy and the new industrial society of the second generation (NIS.2) are presented in the paper. It is emphasized that the contours of a new technological space (noonomy in S.D. Bodrunov's terminology) will be achievable only in the course of progressive development of human creative qualities, where the human will be simultaneously personified as the starting point and the end result of global civilizational transformations. "Noonomy" and "the third industrial revolution" (J. Rifkin), and "the fourth industrial revolution" (K. Schwab) are compared in the form of a system of steps on the way of theoretical knowledge. It is substantiated that the qualitative changes occurring between the creative worker and the owner of capital in the modern production process can become a transitional stage to the formation of nooproduction in the future, and the intellectual creative function can be a guide to the construction of a qualitatively new model of social development.

Keywords: human, creative worker, knowledge, economic evolution, goal setting, nooproduction, technological transformation, socioeconomic system, noonomy, third industrial revolution, fourth industrial revolution.

For citation: Khabibullina Z.R. (2023). From a Creative Worker to a Noonomy Human. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 60–66. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-2-60-66

哈比布林娜 Z. R.

维捷新兴工业发展研究所(俄罗斯, 圣彼得堡)

从创新工作者到智慧型经济人

摘要: 本文介绍了智慧经济学理论和第二代新型工业社会(NIS.2)理论的基本原则。文章强调,新的技术社会(博德鲁诺夫S. D.称之为«智慧经济学»)的轮廓只有在人类创造性素质快速发展的过程中才能实现,同时,人本身将体现为世界文明转型的起点和最终结果。文中把智慧经济学与«第三次工业革命»(杰里米·里夫金)和«第四次工业革命»(克劳思·施瓦布)进行了比较,将这些阶段视为理论认知过程的系统化步骤。作者论证了,在现代生产过程中,创新工作者与资本所有者之间发生的质变可能会成为过度到未来智慧型生产的过渡阶段,而智力的创造功能则是构建本质上新的社会发展模式的推动力量。

¹ This paper was previously published in the Bulletin of the Institute of Economics of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Khabibullina Z.R. From a creative worker to a noonomy human // Bulletin of the Institute of Economics of the Russian Academy of Sciences 2021 No. 2, pp. 97-106.). The purpose of the repeated publication is to familiarize the broader readership with the ideas contained in the paper.

关键词:人、创新工作者、知识、经济演变、目标设定、智慧型生产、技术转型、社会经济体系、智慧经济学、第三次工业革命、第四次工业革命。

引用注释: 哈比布林娜 Z. R. (2023) 从创新工作者到智慧型经济人//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. 2, pp. 60–66. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2023-2-2-60-66

The contemporary society and the world economic system are changing incessantly. These changes are so fleeting that when intruding in practically all sectors of public life, they qualitatively transform many phenomena and processes. The constantly increasing importance of knowledge (the so-called technological application of science in the production process) should be mentioned as one of the most noticeable and discussed changes of the recent decades. The systems of artificial intelligence, the Internet of Things, e-cottage, Industry 4.0, smart factories and other breakthrough solutions and projects are implemented under its impacts. Most definitely, the “chief culprit” of such changes – a human, to be more exact a human-creator – will not be able to stand aside and avoid the transforming fate.

The human, being a carrier of a highly intelligent creative component, starts reviewing not only the field of one’s being but, which is much more important, considerably modifying oneself, determining one’s new place, role and functions on the threshold of transition to a new milestone of the technological progress. To put it differently, the creative humans thanks to their intrinsic incentive launch the required and, one wants to believe, irreversible process of formation of new forms of inter-relations and their participation, the natural result of which should be the principally new version of social structure based on the principles of cooperation.

Such kind of transformation will require answers to numerous and rather difficult questions, to which the authoritative academic community still can’t give unambiguous answers for a number of objective reasons. This is understandable because to forecast the future, the horizons of which are far from unambiguous both in the immediate and far-off future, and fairly misty, and the area of research controversial, means to risk when starting to think about the issues of further civilization development, the prerequisites of which are only originating now.

One of such researchers who seriously engages in theoretical and methodical substantiation of a qualitatively new model of material production that should develop beyond the laws of economic activities, is the President of the Free Economic Society of Russia, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences S.D. Bodrunov.

Professor S.D. Bodrunov covers a wide range of issues in his works, each of which requires careful and detailed analysis. Such issues as the following are in the field of the scientist’s view: qualitative change of the character of production relations in the environment of growth of the knowledge importance and rapid development of innovative technologies; large-scale shifts in the structure of employment, naturally leading to gradual worker’s withdrawal from direct participation in material production; production’s transfer from the industrial via new industrial to noindustrial method of management; withering away of hired labor and the property institution in future; philosophy of rational consumption and as a consequence forcing out simulative wants of the society by the high ones – noowants; priority of human creative potential development, etc.

This far from the full list of the researched by him issues (one can get acquainted with works by S.D. Bodrunov in more detail reading [Bodrunov, 2016; Bodrunov, 2018; Bodrunov, 2019; Bod-

runov, 2019, pp. 4-8; Bodrunov, 2020; Bodrunov, 2019], and the fairly recently published book *Noonomy. The Trajectory of Global Transformation* [Bodrunov, 2020] will become a real find for those who having no economic and social-philosophic background, would like to master the basic principles of the noonomic thought during a fairly short period of time) allows to say that the Russian economist continuously researches the model of a new type of the society with the Human in the center of it as a free creative individual.

Other public figures are also speaking about the necessity of critical reinterpretation of the established system of management of the economy. Thus, recently, the issue of inadequate reflection of the national wellbeing level by purely cost (market) evaluation has been widely discussed. It is the issue of GDP as a fairly “specific” (if we can call it that) macroeconomic indicator that fixes only the speed of economic growth but does not reflect the main thing – the level of social development. The “Achilles heel” of GDP is that it is in essence a solely quantitative (expressed in currency terms) index, not adjusted to calculating the qualitative parameters of the society’s wellbeing (the total of social, ecological, humanitarian parameters of life activities).

Nowadays, the use of the GDP indicator is objectively criticized in many reports by the UN, WEF, OECD and others as well as in academic works. In particular, the Nobel Prize winners J. Stiglitz and A. Sen jointly with J.-P. Fitoussi point at the fact that in the contemporary environment, GDP is an inadequate indicator as a measure of wellbeing in time, especially its economic, social and environmental aspects [Stiglitz, Sen, Fitoussi, 2016, p. 46]. They are for transferring the attention from the system of indicators focused on production to the system with the wellbeing of the present and future generations in the center, i.e., wider measurement of the social progress [Stiglitz, Sen, Fitoussi, 2016, pp. 50-51], as achievement of the standard of a high quality of life. As it is not difficult to guess, the views of the Western experts coincide with the developed by S.D. Bodrunov provisions as to the main aspects.

It should be acknowledged that such a course of thought is timely and necessary. The gradual transfer of the society to the new, higher stage of technological development requires from humans a more conscious attitude to themselves, their activities, the environment, perception of the world. Such a trend in its turn naturally restructures not only the established character of economic activities and forms of management but will also require searching for new ways of achieving and weighing the really important things for the harmonious development of the society, making non-market (non-material) assessment criteria for social processes more important than market (material) criteria.

Jeremy Rifkin, the President of the Foundation on Economic Trends, theoretician of post-capitalism, sees the lines of the new model of social structure in building a new model of interaction, in which “survival is less about competition than cooperation, and less about the search for autonomy than the quest for embeddedness” [Rifkin, 2014, p. 268].

The scientist advocated the idea of the inevitable socialization of the economic system because of the increased importance of creativization of labor [Rifkin, 2014; Rifkin, 1996], which will surely require revision of many phenomena and processes. He is sure that entrepreneurship and cooperation will not be considered as opposing each other but will be reviewed as a directive for restructuring the economic, social and political life in the 21st century [Rifkin, 2014, p. 179].

The economist sees the concept of the future social structure in the definite change of the very model of market capitalism: human striving for continuous maximization of personal profits

should be replaced by the wish to work jointly to achieve socially important goals, wellbeing for all. In essence, he is speaking about formation of the principally new forms of social and labor relations and ties, in the result of which hired workers will leave the classical capitalist company and after that unite in self-managing cooperatives based on solidarity, co-participation and public control. Thus, the economic power and dependence should be replaced by the equality of opportunities, just distribution and ethics of debt.

The founder and the chairman of the World Economic Forum in Davos Klaus Schwab adheres to a similar position noting that the contemporary economic world “stands on the brink of a technological revolution that will fundamentally alter the way we live, work and relate to one another” [Schwab, 2016, p. 8]. The scientist is right to pay attention to a whole number of changes the contours of which are becoming more and more evident on the today’s labor market [Schwab, 2016; Schwab, 2018], to wit: in the period of digital technologies and advanced science development, the highest demand is for highly educated and intelligent individuals, with the creative component being to a considerable extent predominant in their activities.

K. Schwab writes the following on the issue: “Shaping the fourth industrial revolution to ensure that it is empowering and *human-centered* [italics are added by Z. Khabibullina] rather than derisive and dehumanizing, is not a task for any single stakeholder or sector or any one region, industry or culture. The fundamental and global nature of this revolution means it will affect and be influenced by all countries, economics, sectors and people. It is, therefore, critical that we invest attention and energy in multistakeholder cooperation across academic, social, political, national and industry boundaries” [Schwab, 2016, pp. 9-10].

At the same time, one should note that K. Schwab (in contrast to J. Rifkin and S.D. Bodrunov) sees shaping of the new model of market relations predominantly in transformation of the economic system as such – in moving from classical “shareholder capitalism” to socially oriented “stakeholder capitalism”. According to K. Schwab, making labor creative should help to alter the content of capitalist production relations (let us note in brackets – not their disappearance!). In this connection, we’d like to understand, does “stakeholder capitalism” promoted by K. Schwab mean some intermediary stage with a possibility for the social structure to transfer into non-capitalism, or is it interpreted by the researcher as nothing more than another variety of the capitalism system? The answer to this question is important because the place allotted for the carrier of creative labor in the process of activities – a human – will depend on that.

There is no definite answer to the question being of interest to us in the developed by K. Schwab theory of the “fourth industrial revolution”. At least, we have not managed to find it in any definite form. It is evident that K. Schwab discusses possible variants of labor and capital interaction in a strictly economic format. In particular, he characterizes the objectively changing character of contemporary labor relations as “on-demand economy”, in which the creative worker’s potential (his competences, experience, goal setting) is actually taken into the global virtual space and starts functioning there. At the same time, the German economist warns that the effect of a creative worker’s participation in the so-called “human cloud” cuts both ways.

On the one hand, there is an illusion of “the ideal combination of a lot of freedom, less stress and greater job satisfaction” [Schwab, 2016, p. 41]. On the other hand, he gives a warning of “silent offshoring” [Schwab, 2016, p. 41] – the world of precariat leading to pitiless drive to the depth of unregulated virtual hard labor [Schwab, 2016, p. 41], with complete deprivation of labor rights, social guarantees and rights to inviolability of rest time.

S.D. Bodrunov offers a slightly different scenario of human civilization development. The Russian economist sees the horizons of the society's transfer to a qualitatively new stage of the technological progress – the space of noonomy – in the inevitability of human's withdrawal from the production process as such, to be more exact, in human's elevation above the production process, the production system. He writes on the issue that the human “will no longer stay ‘inside’ it. Because the property relations are “inside” it, and there are none in the *noosociety*. On the other hand, there is participation in the production process by labor ‘inside’ it (when labor is an element of the production process!). And there will be no such participation either! A human will stay *outside this system* [italics are added by Z. Khabibullina]. The society will control this system but will not stay inside it” [Bodrunov, 2019, p. 7].

Professor S.D. Bodrunov develops the promising theory of “noonomy” revealing its content as “the *noneconomic* way of economy's organization for satisfaction of the requirements, carried out by a human who has gone beyond material production. To put it differently, noonomy is an economic system differing from economy by the *lack of human relations in the process of material production*” [Bodrunov, 2018, p. 171]. He concludes from that: “The gist of the noostage of civilization development is in the fact that not individuals enter into relations with each other in the process of material production but two different sectors of civilization construction enter into relations with each other – production (nooproduction coming to technosphere) and the human society” [Bodrunov, 2018, p. 171], forming the basis for “the ‘elimination’ of economic relations between people in technological adjustments of the self-acting production” [Bodrunov, 2018, p. 273].

Are we witnessing the movement in the direction of such relations' development today? We think that we do – there is movement in this direction. Let's examine it in more detail. We can witness movement to establishment of production relations that considerably differ in their form from the traditional methods of interaction already today in some sectors of activities (especially highly intellectual). The success and competitiveness of a modern company more and more often start depending on a new-type worker's potential, the worker for whom the uncertain future is not a restrictive factor as such professionals are starting to acquire a special privileged status on the labor market. Their position no longer “fits” in the classical relations of hired labor and capital.

The new employment forms (freelancing is not the only example) question the form of hired labor in future. Today, the creative human component has already been practically withdrawn from direct participation in the production chain at the fully automated high-tech production facilities, the professional's activity is limited by performing as an outside observer and regulator of the reproduction process. In this environment, the owner of capital more and more often prefers the strategy of parity relations when dealing with a creative worker. Partner relations in their turn develop the “technology of trust”. However, though the relations between the participants are still regulated by market laws as before, purely economic regulating tools are beginning to be considerably supplemented (let's note in brackets – sometimes even being replaced) by noneconomic ones.

We are speaking about building the system of relations where values and motives not directly related to monetary rewards come to the forefront in case of creative workers [Buzgalin, 2017; Buzgalin, 2020]. Such phenomena as mass collaboration, sharing economy, open source, collaborative consumption, copyleft, gig economy, crowdsourcing, etc. can serve as illustrative examples. Thanks to them, the change of the system of incentives may turn out to be the reason of transformation of numerous economic sectors, and not only labor but ownership, cost, consumer as well.

Unregulated creative work, self-organization of activities, opportunities for self-development and self-awareness, flexible forms of management, etc. are the priorities. In a nutshell, sustainable phenomena threatening to unconditionally replace the driving forces of socioeconomic development at a certain moment, are maturing in the depth of real events taking place now. Aren't they the harbingers of the new world order being conceived? Aren't they the ones undermining the fundamentals of the economic system?

Currently, we are speaking not just about certain opinions on the issue. There is no doubt that the new quality of labor refers to a qualitatively new level of the individual factor of production development. In this connection, one can't fail to acknowledge that in the nearest historical period many aspects of life activities should undergo a large-scale restructuring. At least, there are already outlined preconditions for this process. At the same time, it's not possible to write off the fact that the market self-regulating mechanism is a fairly "tenacious system" that constantly adapts to changes in the environment and tries to use the main sources of development in its own interests (the creative worker is not an exception either).

On the other hand, it is required to understand that the Western economic model is not adequate for the originating conditions of the new times. Such a system simply can't react to many challenges of the contemporary times (economic crises, social protests, unemployment, social exclusion, economic inequality, COVID-19 pandemic). Exactly because of that more and more Western researchers stand up for the critical revision of the system-forming principles of market fundamentalism, justly criticizing the economic course of development. And exactly because of that capitalism in the developed countries has become socialized to a large extent.

Finally, we'll quote S.D. Bodrunov, his words that in our opinion objectively reflect the real state of the contemporary socioeconomic space as well as the time when "the mankind stands on the threshold of one of the most important road forks in history: either to turn to Homo sapiens, or to the dead end, into the technetronic society" [Bodrunov, 2018, p. 118], with all the negative consequences proceeding from this process.

In order to choose the right trajectory for its further development, the mankind should stick to the logic of civilization development pictured as a system of verified steps in transition processes, basing on the theoretical noonomic research. The author of this paper thinks that it is very important to underline exactly this aspect. Only deep and comprehensive progress in the development of human creative potential will make possible the transfer from the economic world to the world of noonomy as the highest historical form of strategic social development.

References

- Bodrunov S.D. (2016). *The Coming New Industrial State: Reloaded*. St. Petersburg: S.Y. Witte INID. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S.D. (2018). *Noonomy*. M.: Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya Publ. 432 p. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S.D. (2019). *General Theory of Noonomy*. M.: Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya Publ. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S.D. (2019). On Noonomy. *Economic Revival of Russia*. No. 1. Pp. 4–8. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S. D. (2020). *Noonomy: The Trajectory of Global Transformation*. St. Petersburg: S.Y. Witte INID. (In Russ.).
- Buzgalin A.V. (2017). Creative Economy: Private Intellectual Property or Ownership by Everybody of Everything? *Sociological Studies*. No. 7. Pp. 43-53. (In Russ.).

- Buzgalin A.V. (2017). Creative Economy: Why and How Private Intellectual Property Can Be Limited. *Sociological Studies*. No. 8. Pp. 20-31. (In Russ.).
- Rifkin J. (2014). *The Third Industrial Revolution; How Lateral Power is Transforming Energy, the Economy, and the World*. M.: Alpina Non-Fiction Publ. (In Russ.).
- Stiglitz J. E., Sen A., Fitoussi J.-P. (2016). *Mismeasuring Our Lives: Why GDP Doesn't Add Up: The Report*. Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. M.: Gaidar Institute for Economic Policy Publ. (In Russ.).
- Schwab K. (2016). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. M.: Eksmo Publ. (In Russ.).
- Schwab K., Davis N. (2018). *Shaping the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. M.: BOMBORA Publ. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S.D. (2019). Prospects of Transitioning to a New Model for Socioeconomic System Organization (Noonomy). *Global Journal of Human-Social Science*. Vol. XIX. Is. XI. Vers. I. Pp. 1–9. [Electronic source]. URL: https://globaljournals.org/GJHSS_Volume19/1-Prospects-of-Transitioning-to-a-New.pdf. (Access date: 14. 07.2023).
- Rifkin J. (1996). *The End of Work: The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-Market Era*. NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Information about the author

Zenfira R. Khabibullina

Senior Research Fellow of the S.Y. Witte Institute for New Industrial Development, Ph.D. in Economics (16, Bolshaya Monetnaya street, St. Petersburg, 197101)
E-mail: ruzen7@mail.ru