

DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-2-70-77

Viktor V. Tuzov

Saint-Petersburg Electrotechnical University (LETI) (St. Petersburg, Russia)

PHILOSOPHICAL GROUNDS ILLUSTRATING THE NEED FOR NOONOMY

Abstract: The necessity of replacing the “invisible hand of the market” as a system of self-organization based on the irrational principle in people’s behavior and thinking with the organization of all aspects of people’s life, primarily the economy, and the introduction of a rational principle in behavior and thinking as an alternative to irrational. Such a replacement is due to the laws that determine the development of the historical process.

Keywords: noonomy, self-organization, organization, irrational, rational, social system, regularity.

For citation: Tuzov V.V. (2022). Philosophical Grounds Illustrating the Need for Noonomy. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 70–77. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-2-70-77

Received July 01, 2022

杜佐夫 V. V.

圣彼得堡电工技术大学 (圣彼得堡, 俄罗斯)

智力经济必然性的哲学基础

摘要: 文章阐述了“隐形的市场之手”，即自我组织系统，其基础是人们的行为和思想中的非理性因素。“隐形的市场之手”必将被有序组织人们的各方面活动的系统所取代，以实施行为和思想中的理性因素，即理性取代非理性。这种取代现象受到决定历史发展进程的规律所制约。

关键词: 智力经济、自我组织、组织、非理性、理性、社会制度、规律性。

引文注释: 杜佐夫 V. V. (2022). 智力经济必然性的哲学基础//智力经济和智力社会. 新兴工业发展研究所论文选, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 70–77. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-2-70-77

文章收到日期: 2022年7月1日

Introduction

Modern civilisation is at a critical stage of development or, as the synergists say, at a branching point where different scenarios are possible. Humanity is moving away from the exhausted possibility of developing a form of organisation of living together and is trying to find guidelines for a new form of organisation. Since society is a system, all areas of society should be transformed, including the economic subsystem that determines all other areas. The question is what should be changed and how it should be changed.

At critical moments in history, people have usually relied on trial and error because there were no recipes for new forms of organisation. Successful forms were retained, unsuccessful ones died out, sometimes along with those who introduced them. Today, this approach is extremely expensive and dangerous in every respect. Trial and error in economics are called the market. Karl Marx showed that capitalism took its final form in the 19th century. But this did not mean that capitalism would disappear tomorrow. In this sense, V. I. Ulyanov was in a hurry to build socialism and the world socialist revolution.

K. Marx warned that: “No social formation perishes until all the productive forces to which it gives ample scope have developed, and new higher relations of production never appear until the material conditions for their existence have ripened in the depths of the old society itself” [Marx, 1955, p. 8].

Today a stage has arrived in the development of civilisation which corresponds to the second part of the sentence quoted above: “Mankind, therefore, always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve, for on closer examination it always turns out that the task itself only comes into existence when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the process of being created” [Marx, 1955, p. 8].

The need for new economic relations, not within a single country or region, but on a global scale, for all countries, is now obvious.

The question remains as to what these relations should be and by what mechanism they come about. The capitalists believe that they correspond to human nature and that there could be nothing better. They believe that the crisis will pass and that everything will be fine again. There is no substitute for competition as a means of improving production. This view is partly in line with reality.

It is true that capitalist relations correspond to human nature, but the question is what nature is. A man is a biosocial being and his behaviour is determined by various programmes. Capitalism results from the biotic basis of human behaviour as a means of organising human life together. But there is another behavioural programme in man, which is not based on instincts but on rationality (in the terminology of Professor S.D. Bodrunov: the rationality that results from understanding the true consequences of economic decisions and the true value of the needs satisfied and is based on the human mind). Today there is an urgent need to introduce such a way of thinking in the organisation of people's common life.

But in order to create a future, we need to understand what we need to give up and thus justify the necessity and form of the new that is to be created. The proposal to create Noonomy as “a non-economic way of organising the economy to satisfy needs, carried out by people who have moved beyond material production” [Bodrunov, 2018, p. 171], fits into the patterns of development of the historical process that we have been able to discover by analysing the process of social development through the development of man himself on the basis of modern methodology.

What does Professor S.D. Bodrunov write about in his work? In his polemic with the opponents of interference in economic processes, the author of Noonomy states: “In an economy based on ‘spontaneous, self-determined processes’, the possibilities of conscious intervention are indeed very limited. But not because of the weakness of human reason, as Hayek claims, but because the existing economic reality consists of many uncontrollable and unpredictable individual actions that can challenge any consciously pursued goal” [Bodrunov, 2018, p. 249]. Further, the Russian scholar writes quite correctly that “they, the ‘generals’ and ‘strategists’ of the market, do not understand that the market is a relic of a dying past, of a ‘former’ economy, of a “past war”, and

the observed (increasing!) tendencies of such “irrationality” are only “sensors” registering the increasing change of human consumption preferences and – the reduction of the importance of “market-rational” behaviour for it, and – the market itself...

In a market economy, rationality is understood only as maximising money income. In general, this is largely (though not completely!) true for a capitalist market economy. However, changes in the social conditions of production entail changes in the criteria of rationality of human behaviour” [Bodrunov, 2018, pp. 257-258].

There is no need to quote the whole paper, especially since the article has a slightly different task than analysing the work in question. Let us try to show those real foundations in society which, firstly, show the specificity of the current stage of social development, secondly, give an insight into the essence of the emerging stage of development and the basic principles which determine the nature of relations and, thirdly, require the changes discussed in *Noonomy*.

Research methodology

Philosophical reflection, dialectics as a theory of development and its categorical apparatus are used as a methodology to study the development of a social system in its history. Since the system undergoes a qualitative change at the stage of “antithesis” according to the law of double negation, synergetics as a concept of self-organisation has been used to understand and describe it. Both the laws of self-organisation and the conceptual apparatus of synergetics have a methodological function. The regularities and driving forces of the stage of “antithesis” in which the social system currently finds itself cannot be understood without incorporating knowledge of the regularities of the behaviour of living beings, which ethology is concerned with studying, as well as psychology's knowledge of the nature of human beings and the regularities of their behaviour.

Main results and discussion

In order to justify the transition from an economy formed on the basis of self-organisation to one based on human reason and scientific knowledge, we must digress somewhat from the immediate task and point out the process of development of the social system which determines its evolution in general and the regularities which govern the functioning of its various stages of existence. It should be noted that these are different regularities. In addition, it is necessary to note the causes that determine the forms of people's connection to society.

K. Marx, in defining the nature of social structure (socio-economic formations), assumed that it depends on the nature of economic relations. The capitalist relations in the economy form the capitalist socio-economic formation. This is correct from the point of view of the economic approach to the analysis of society. If we look deeper, we can see the real cause of this or that relationship. And this will not only be the development of the productive forces, although these are also very important, but the development of man himself, not only as a labour force, but as a human being in the broadest sense of the word.

Let us start with the beginning. Since man is the creator of history, understanding the determinants of his behaviour will reveal the secret of the forms of organisation of coexistence that have taken place in history and that are possible. The contradictory nature of social development reflects the contradictory nature of man himself. Human behaviour is determined by two programmes: One is genetically anchored in the body and aims to ensure human survival and reproduction. The second programme arises with the emergence of human society and is the antithesis

of the first. The purpose of the second programme is to counteract the biotic programme, which is detrimental to society and its unity. One programme is linked to instincts, the most important of which is the instinct of “dominance-subordination”; the second programme is linked to culture, to moral norms. Culture is based on universal moral values. The biotic programme is based on primitive behaviours oriented towards survival and reproduction.

Society as an open system develops according to certain laws. From these laws arises the logic of the historical process as a whole. This logic is described by the dialectical law of the negation of negation. The comparison of its content with the reality of the historical process shows their correspondence in that part of history which has already taken place. Marx relied on this law when he predicted the post-capitalist phase of historical development.

Hegel expressed the specificity of the dialectical law in the formula “Thesis-Antithesis-Synthesis”. Since Hegel is concerned with the development of the absolute idea, which expresses the unconditional completeness of all things and is at the same time the only really real thing, the formula is described by logical categories. Since Hegel is concerned with the development of the absolute idea as idea, the formula is described by logical categories.

According to the law of negation of negation, the system goes through three phases of development. The first phase is the emergence of the system on its own basis. The second is the transition to a completely different basis and essence. In the third phase, the system returns to its original essence, which has taken on a newly developed form.

Science has documented the existence and characteristics of two phases of social development: the classless phase and the class-based phase. The first phase is based on rationality and the *organisation* of common activities based on cultural norms. In the second phase, irrationality takes over and leads to a process of *self-organisation*. The need for this arose from the increasing complexity of the social system and the inability of the rational element to solve the emerging organisational problems because it is underdeveloped.

Noonomy was present in the life of primitive society even in its infancy. This was because the relationships inherent in the pre-human herd, based on the instinct of “domination – submission”, did not promote the development of the productive forces, as K. Marx would say. The advent of man-made tools led to an increase in labour productivity. There was more food, but it was distributed according to the laws of the biotic community. Most of it went to the dominant top male, the females and the offspring who were unable to obtain food for themselves. Those who made the tools were financed on the basis of scraps, as they are today. As their intellect was more advanced than that of the majority of the community, they did not like it very much. As there was enough food, the community grew and after a certain number of individuals, it became necessary to divide the community. Part of the community would split off and form a new community. Most likely, a group of “intellectuals” and sympathetic young men and women separated from the main core.

For reasons unknown to history, a new kind of relationship emerged in this community. The relationship of “dominance-subordination”, which was the basis for supremacy and order in the community, was replaced by one of cooperation and mutual help. Food was distributed equally, for which a suitable form of distribution was invented – circular food distribution. These communities with a new kind of relationship survived, and those of which the people who were able to make tools died. All social life in the primitive community was organised on the basis of rationality, including the economy. Culture became the basis of life.

Instinctive behaviour within the community became taboo. The open social system proved to be very stable. Tradition and culture gave it this stability. However, this stability was due to the naivety of primitive man and his underdeveloped consciousness.

With the complication of all aspects of life and the development of labour productivity, people's consciousness changed. The first to undergo this change were the people in the field of governance. The change is expressed in the fact that these people have acquired a self-awareness. They have changed from a self-awareness based on the model of a "we-being" to a self-awareness based on the model of an "I-being". Primitive man began at this time to perceive himself as a separate being, separate from the collective. He became aware that his needs belonged to himself and not to another member of the community. In other words, he became aware of his "I". From that moment, the transition to a new relationship began. Rational relationships of equality and mutual help were gradually replaced by relationships of inequality and exploitation.

J.J. Rousseau wrote: "The first man who fenced in a piece of land and said: This is mine, and he found people simple-minded enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society. How many crimes, wars, murders, how many misfortunes and horrors would humanity have been spared if he had called out to his fellows as they dug stakes and filled the ditch: Beware of listening to this impostor, you will die if you forget that food belongs to all and the land to no one" [Rousseau, 1907, p. 68].

But J.J. Rousseau was wrong. Private property, exploitation and inequality did not come into being because someone thought and decided to fence in his property. On the contrary, all this has arisen because instead of rationality based on human reason, on the principles of "noo" in the organisation of the common existence of human beings, the irrationality of human behaviour has entered the historical arena. Animals "fence in" their plots and leave individual smells; people fence in graves in cemeteries and vegetable gardens (plots). This irrational element is instinct – the instinct of dominance and submission. You can see it everywhere; just look at the news broadcasts on TV.

Self-organisation arose in response to the inability of the undeveloped rational basis in society to organise the common life activity of people at a certain stage of social development [Tuzov, 2011, pp. 158-187].

The rational beginning, which was the reason for the emergence of human society, gave way to the irrational beginning associated with the current stage of development. Self-organisation occurs automatically. For this to happen, a source of self-organisation, which is hardly controlled by consciousness, must operate in the activities and behaviour of human beings. In my view, this source is something in the human psyche that can be conditionally called the instinct of "domination-subordination". The term refers to the specificity of the definition of instinct in psychology.

An instinct is understood here as something that emerges from the depths of the psyche and provides an impetus for activity in a particular direction. This understanding of instinct is reminiscent of what Freud wrote about the unconscious: "Applied to the Self, the I-being is like a rider who has to restrain the superior strength of a horse, the only difference being that the rider tries to do it with his own strength, but the I-being with borrowed strength. This comparison could be continued.

Just as the rider, if he does not want to separate himself from the horse, often has only to lead it where it wants to go, so the I-being usually puts the will of the Self into action as if it were its

own will (Freud, 1990, p. 447.) Summarising Freud's thoughts on this subject, Robert Frager and James Fadiman write in *Personality and Personal Growth*, "The id may be compared to a blind king endowed with absolute power and authority, but whose trusted advisers, chiefly the ego, tell him how and where to use that power" [Freud, 1990, p. 44.] [Frager, Fadiman, 2002, p. 11].

In other words, this source of behaviour is the desire to be the first, the strongest, the happiest, the greatest. In living nature, Darwin discovered the law of natural selection based on competition. But the question arises: what is the basis of competition? We can say that the basis of competition is the struggle for survival. But that says nothing about what the source of competition is. If the psyche of a living being is the source of its behaviour and activity, the answer to the question about the nature of behaviour is related to the functioning mechanism of the psyche. The basis of a living being's behaviour is innate and acquired behavioural programmes, i.e., conditioned and unconditioned reflexes or instincts and programmes for their adaptation to environmental conditions.

The dominance-subordination instinct or the desire to be first triggers the process of competition. Competition in society fulfils the same function as in a community of living beings – it selects the most viable forms of human existence and chooses the people who create and live in these forms (relationships). Everything that ensures the survival of a community is selected. Self-organisation and selection take place at two levels: one level (micro-level) of self-organisation takes place within the state, the other (macro-level) takes place at the level of state interaction. Until recently, macro-level selection was a military interaction. Even in primitive society, where there were relationships of cooperation and mutual support within the community, the relationships between different tribes (at the macro level) were characterised by competition and selection. The entire history of humankind is a history of war. People were selected for their personal qualities that enabled them to fight and win. Economies were selected to ensure victory over rivals, cultures were selected to mould successful people in these relationships. Globalisation is the culmination of this process of self-organisation through selection.

Until recently, when the foundations of the theory of self-organisation were laid, one could only speculate about what was going on in society. Today, on the basis of the regularities discovered in this theory, it is possible not only to explain the nature of ongoing processes, but also to predict possible scenarios of historical events and to outline possible ways out of the current situation for the benefit of humanity.

Capitalist relations, in their pure form as "market relations", had already been exhausted by the 19th century. The emergence of J.M. Keynes' theory of state regulation of the economy and its implementation in practise delayed the transformation of capitalism by a considerable period of time. Today, however, even this resource for sustaining capitalism has been exhausted. How does self-organisation end in terms of synergy?

S.P. Kurdyumov at a seminar on synergetics at the Faculty of Philosophy of St. Petersburg State University showed the mechanism of self-organisation of the combustion process in a medium.

It was represented by three stages of self-organisation. In the first stage, the entire combustion medium was covered by combustion foci of varying intensity. In the second stage, strong combustion foci attracted neighbouring weak combustion foci. Their own combustion intensity decreased, but the intensity of the weak foci increased. The intensity of combustion is balanced by the redistribution of energy between the strong and weak hearths; on the other hand, the combustion area of the weak hearth increases. In the third stage, these, which had been dampened

and had "divided" the combustion medium between them, erupt with renewed vigour. However, no further unification into a single combustion chamber takes place.

Synergetics studies the self-organisation of open, unstable systems of different natures that are not in equilibrium. Since the social system falls into this category, it is also subject to these laws. Therefore, something similar can be observed in the social environment (by the social environment we mean the whole of modern civilisation). There are different economies depending on their economic development. Countries with strong economies act as attractors, as centres of gravity. Weak economies are drawn into the sphere of influence of a strong neighbour in one form or another. Eventually, economic alliances or, in other words, multiple political-economic centres of attraction form, partly cooperating and at the same time competing with each other.

Under these circumstances, the ambition of one attractor to bring all countries and their economies under its influence is opposed by other attractors because their interests conflict with those of that attractor and its satellites. If we assume that all countries and economies are united around a centre (which is what the globalists want), first of all market relations will cease to exist. There would be no one to compete with, no place to expand the market and no way to increase profits through expanded reproduction of capital. Secondly, synergetics argues that in such a system, simultaneously with its consolidation, the forces of dissipation, i.e., the destruction of the integrity and simplification of the system, begin to operate.

There are many examples of such processes in history. Every empire can illustrate these regularities. A strong personality who cemented the empire dies and the empire "tears" into pieces (Alexander the Great, Charlemagne and others). There was one Soviet Union, but now there are fifteen independent states.

The desire of Western countries to dominate and subjugate all the countries of the world contradicts the laws of self-organisation, including the laws of the market economy, whose development is based on competition and choice. Therefore, globalisation along the lines of the Western countries is impossible.

Modern society has an international division of labour, a global aggregate, competition and exploitation. On the one hand, the division of labour means that the participants in the global economic process objectively form a complete system. On the other hand, within this system there is a mechanism of competition, selection and exploitation. We are witnessing two opposing tendencies, the first based on the laws of the old economic system and the second based on the laws of the emerging system.

Conclusions

The stage of social development based on self-organisation, based on an irrational beginning (the instinct of "dominance-subordination"), is nearing its end. After the stage of antithesis, following the law of negation of negation, comes the stage of synthesis, in which the system returns to its original essence, but in a newly developed form made possible by the stage of antithesis.

The social system must return to its original essence from which it had departed due to the underdeveloped rationality of both the individual and the general, social (public) consciousness. The question arises as to what should characterise this new phase in the development of human society, what relations should replace the capitalist ones. In the phase of the emergence of the social system, there were relations of equality between the members of the community,

of cooperation and mutual help. This is a truly social relationship characteristic of human society. These relationships are based on culture, on the human spirit, on the common existence of people within the tribal organisation. After the social system had passed through a non-human stage of development, where relations were not social but biotic and based on domination, exploitation and inequality, i.e., the stage of self-organisation, it had to return to its original essence, human relations. The problem with this stage is that it is not possible to build new relationships automatically. Neither is trial and error. Neither economic, nor political, nor any other relationship or form of interaction can be built at the level of common sense.

Modern science and practise urgently need a new strategic model of socio-economic development. In a rapidly changing world, humanity simply cannot survive without the fundamental work of social philosophy, political economy and a number of related disciplines. The difficulty of this phase is that humanity does not have a theoretical model for a new economy or a new social system, nor does it know how to build a system of relationships based on qualitatively new principles of interaction. What we need are new goals, new orientations and new ways of doing things. The theory of Noonomy, successfully developed by Professor S.D. Bodrunov, can make an important contribution to this process.

References

- Bodrunov S.D. (2018). *Noonomy*. M.: Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya Publ. 432 p. (In. Russ.).
- Marx K., Engels F. (1955). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Introduction. Writings*. 2nd edition. Vol. 13. M: State Publishing House of Political Literature. (In. Russ.).
- Rousseau J-J. (1907). *Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men (Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes)* St. Petersburg: Svetoch. 166 p. (In. Russ.).
- Tuzov V.V. (2011). *The Historical Process in the Light of the Synergetic Paradigm (Substantial Approach)*. St. Petersburg: SPbGETU "LETI", 228 p. (In. Russ.).
- Freud S. (1990). *The Psychology of the Unconscious*. M.: Prosveshcheniye. URL: pedlib.ru/Books/5/0137/5_0137-447.shtml (Access date: 29.06.2022). (In. Russ.).
- Fragar R., Fadiman D. (2002). *Personality and Personal Growth*. URL: bookap.info/Oglavlennie/g111.shtm (Access date: 29.06.2022). (In. Russ.).

Information about the author

Viktor V. Tuzov

Professor of the Department of Philosophy of St. Petersburg Electrotechnical University, Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor (197022, St. Petersburg, Russia, Professor Popov str., 5)

E-mail: tuzov_1950@mail.ru