

DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-2-63-69

Zenfira R. Khabibullina

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

FROM CONTRADICTIONS OF THE ECONOMY TO THE OPPORTUNITIES OF NOONOMY: A CONCEPTUAL RETHINKING

Abstract: The concept of the modern world economy systemic crisis as a derivative of the neo-classical economic theory systemic crisis has been articulated. The economic mainstream with its theoretical foundation full of structural internal contradictions and development constraints is experiencing increasing difficulty in its systemic projection of the ways and forms the brand new economic model of social interaction will arise. It is proved that the new type of material production should be modeled on the – criteria of the movement from the narrow and unperfect parameters of market self-organization that significantly transform traditional capitalist relations to the solidarism principles that socialize the social and economic structure. In this process, the key role must be given to the comprehensive progress of human creativity based on the highest criteria of human intelligence and culture.

Keywords: human, creative process, technological transformation, noonomy, economics, new global challenges, new conditions of economic activity, self-motivation, solidarity.

For citation: Khabibullina Z.R. (2022). From Contradictions of the Economy to the Opportunities of Noonomy: a Conceptual Rethinking. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 63–69. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-2-63-69

Received June 01, 2022

哈比布林娜Z. R.

新兴工业发展研究所(俄罗斯圣彼得堡)

从经济矛盾到智力经济的作用—对概念的重新认识

摘要: 本文提出了现代世界经济的系统性危机是新古典主义经济理论系统性危机的结果的概念。理论基础不乏内部结构性矛盾和发展限制的经济理论主流, 越来越难以对社会主要新经济模式的产生方式和形式进行系统预想。事实证明, 物质生产的新形式应该以改造传统资本主义关系准则为基础, 从狭隘的、远非完美的市场自我组织的特点转为以社会和经济体系的统一社会化为原则。在这一过程中, 应根据人类思想和文化的最高标准, 对人的创造潜力的全面进步给予高度重视。

关键词: 人、创造过程、技术改造、智力经济、经济、全球新挑战、新经济条件、自我激励、统一。

引文注释: 哈比布林娜Z. R.(2022). 从经济矛盾到智力经济的作用—对概念的重新认识 //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. 63-69. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-2-63-69

文章收到日期: 2022年6月1日。

Introduction. Towards a problem statement

Let us note the core idea of this publication, around which the logic of our research will be developed. It is rooted in the fact that the paradigm of neoclassical economic theory, which advocates and dogmatizes an exclusively rational behaviour of economic agents (in the sense of economic science – economic actors) who, under conditions of market equilibrium, the primacy of private property and free competition, seek to maximise their own economic utility (profit) for a number of objective reasons, can no longer adequately reflect the nature of the global upheavals taking place in the world.

Frankly, the world economic crisis of 2008-2009, which triggered the general crisis of neo-liberal globalisation, was a complete surprise to this very popular but, as it turned out, not very useful theory in practise. The apologists of market fundamentalism have managed, as they say, to overlook the great crisis of modern capitalism and only in retrospect have they tried to attribute its consequences and causes to "market failures". The theoretical potential of neoclassicism is also incapable of credibly interpreting a phenomenon such as the "economic miracle" of a number of socialist countries that are now developing successfully (China, Vietnam, India, etc.). Neoliberal ideology was also powerless in the face of the new coronavirus pandemic COVID -19 which, as practise has shown, could not be fought within the narrow limits of market fundamentalism without the active involvement of the state.

This leads to the conclusion that *it is risky to rely on the methodological and categorical apparatus of a scientific school that is unable to promptly reflect (and often distorts) the development patterns of real economic processes and events, prefers not to notice the obvious signs of degeneration (self-denial) of capital, allows the situation of extreme global insecurity and high risks, provokes major social conflicts and unrest up to direct military confrontations, and (above all) is unable to develop a system.* Consequently, the new picture of the world that is emerging before our eyes is prompting the scientific and expert community to search for a new paradigm of theoretical knowledge that, by expanding the limits of previously accumulated experience, will offer humanity a unique historical opportunity to model a qualitatively different (mostly non-economic) way of regulating economic practise and social life.

Human purpose at the turn of the century

In times of transition, people are particularly driven to re-evaluate themselves and the world around them. It does not matter whether we are talking about a researcher who is professionally and daily engaged in the scientific study of the prospects of societal development and the factors that accelerate or impede this process, or an ordinary person who has decided at a certain point in time to radically rethink his attitude and outlook on life. In either case, both (and let us say in parentheses, the first globally and the second locally; although there may be exceptions) will seek to find answers to very important but difficult questions of humanity – what is the meaning of life; what is the true destiny of human beings in the world? Raising such global questions requires a critical rethinking of a whole range of attitudes – a reassessment of human values and beliefs, interests, motives and needs, the justification of new meanings and strategic priorities of development, etc. And rightly so.

The progress of science and technology is constantly changing and complicating the reality around us. The world does not stand still. It is always in a state of continuous change and dynamic development. New knowledge and skills, advanced technological solutions and new methods of

reproduction emerge almost daily, complementing and sometimes radically reshaping the usual models of economic and life management.

Along with these processes, man, his system of cultural and value orientations, his everyday life and habits, the content and motivation of work activity, etc., also change. Undoubtedly, in this process the comprehensive progress of human creative qualities, based on the highest criteria of human reason and culture, plays the fundamental role. A new type of man, aware of and overcoming the limitations of the neoliberal economic model, must formulate in the public consciousness a persistent demand for a new quality of life, in order to reorient the existing system of production relations from the outdated criteria of economic rationality – which dehumanize man – to the development and strengthening of the principles of social justice – which elevate man. This leads to the following conclusion: the search for a new paradigm of theoretical scientific knowledge about forms of management and economic management must go hand in hand with the search for *a new paradigm of human development*.

On the changing content of human activity: a comparative historical and economic description

Historically, the degree and role of human participation in the labour process has always changed as a society moves from one stage of economic existence to another. In economics, this approach is traditionally revealed through the problem of analysing the typology of economic systems – an objective process in which the change in the content of human activity is traditionally studied through the prism of society's formative transition from the subsistence economy (pre-market) to the productive economy (market), followed by the transformation of the latter under the increasing role of knowledge and competence into the so-called creative channel (post-market).

In classical Marxist political economy, this pattern is explained by the terminological sequence “personal dependence – personal independence based on eternal dependence – free individuality”.

In fact, from the very beginning, everything that man had and could rely on to satisfy his needs in life was entirely dependent on his own diligence and skill and on the efforts of the members of his family (community). There was no other alternative at that time.

The pre-market mode of production inherent in the subsistence economy presupposed a mode of production in which all consumer goods necessary for subsistence and the continuation of the race were produced and consumed by the individual, with the few exceptions of exchange (such as patronage, donations, sacrifices). It can thus be said that before the market economy, the economy was organically embedded in a logic of unity between the production process and the consumption process.

Over time, the process of food production began to change, as did the relationships between people. The once completely isolated cycle of production was dissolved by the social division of labour. The product of labour was no longer intended to directly satisfy the life needs of the person who produced it, but to be sold. This is how commodity production, market relations and the exchange of goods came into being, which are illustrated by the well-known formulas for the movement of goods (G-M-G) and the self-growth of capital (M-G-M).

Handicraft as the original form of human activity was systematically displaced by manufactory and then completely by the (at first primitive, later increasingly perfect) machine mode of

production. This last circumstance radically changed the place, role and content of human labour in the system of industrial relations. While at the beginning of his development man entered the production process as a self-sufficient labour unit, dependent only on himself and his needs (corresponding to the first phase of man's involvement in the production process – personal dependence), the specialisation of labour and the industrial mode of production marked the transition to the phase of man's personal independence with his eternal dependence on capital. In particular, classical scientific literary economics explores this problem in terms of the formal/real subordination of labour to capital.

Thus, if the formal subordination of labour to capital is characterised by the fact that the worker's dependence on the means of production is relatively low (if desired, man is able to terminate the relations of production with the owner of material capital relatively easily and without serious consequences for himself, organise the labour process independently and market the commodity product), then the real subordination is already the dependence of man as a factor of production in the production process itself (the worker is separated from the means of production, alienated from ownership [Khabibullina, 2021a, 2021b]).

It should be noted that the characteristic of the real subordination of labour to capital is the relationship of economic power and economic dependence, with all the negative consequences that result from this phenomenon. In this form of interaction, the factor of labour is in a rigid system of economic relations.

From a historical perspective, such a state of affairs cannot bode well for human beings. The endless accumulation of money and power inherent in the free market, the priority of satisfying private economic interests over those of the general public, and many other attributes of the Western civilisational structure were supposed to close humanity off once and for all from an alternative vector of social evolution.

But things begin to change, more or less, when the “technological application of science in production” takes place – an objectively evolving process in which the knowledge and skills that people put into work become of paramount importance to the owner of capital. This moment can be seen as the beginning of a development towards the construction of almost equal social and labour relations between participants in production – the starting point for the formation and development of qualitatively new approaches to social and economic life.

In the new system of economic management, the change in the basic tools and methods for managing social and labour relations thus formally elevates the importance of human creativity [Buzgalin, 2022]. A worker in whose activity the share of the intellectual component of labour far exceeds the share of routine operations begins to occupy a privileged position in the system of reproduction.

The creative activity of such a person becomes predominantly free and functions under conditions that depend little on the means of production. For example, it is very difficult to control and direct the highly intellectual activity of an innovator. It is difficult to subject the work process of such a person to any form of external regulation. In the activity of such an employee, not only is the boundary between leisure and work removed, but the form of initiative itself changes fundamentally, transforming from a state of external necessity to an internal need – self-motivation, self-realisation, self-development and self-goal. As a result, the moment of birth of the new knowledge so desired by the owner of capital becomes an almost imperceptible phenomenon.

We can thus speak of the elimination of the so-called “initial contradiction” between the participants in the production process – the meeting of the once different interests of labour and capital. All this, albeit within very narrow limits, creates the conditions for weakening the real subordination of labour to capital and facilitates man's entry into the next (ascending) stage of social and economic interaction – the stage of free individuality (in the post-market space).

We should not forget, however, that the distinctive feature of the market economy is the adaptability and self-renewal capacity of the capitalist system, which adapts virtually every change in the world to its private entrepreneurial interests and motives. A prime example of this is the attempt to value (directly or indirectly) seemingly non-commercial areas of human activity. We refer to Professor A.A. Porokhovskiy who states that “as ... the role of creativity in the work of hired labour increases and the scope of hired labour goes beyond material production (commodity production), it became advantageous for capital to treat all kinds of resources (human, natural, scientific, social) as a kind of capital” [Porokhovskiy, 2021, p. 42].

Looking at the present time, we can note the emergence of different types of capital – human, social, cultural, intellectual, natural, service, spatial and even the so-called economy of happiness, through which global capital seeks to influence the content, forms and direction of technological and social development. In this context, it would be naïve to believe that the transition to conditional non-capitalism (whether it takes place in the near or distant future) will be an easy task for humanity. Precisely for this reason, we would not want the qualitative changes that have taken place and continue to take place before our eyes to dissolve back into the space of capital and the market and, obeying its laws, to be transformed into even more irrational forms of manipulation, exploitation and inequality.

World in search of a new strategic model for social and economic life

Again, modern neoliberal economics and the theoretical mainstream that develops it need to reform the fundamental principles by which Western civilisation develops and which neo-classicism continues to position to the world as the benchmark. This is primarily due to the deep structural contradictions of the market capitalist system. The conceptual error of economics seems to be to place the subjective interest of the individual economic subject above the public interest.

In fact, however, such an “exemplary” model of social order not only occasionally drives the world economy into a global economic and social crisis, but also causes the geopolitical and economic interests of the collective West (to the point of unleashing military and political conflicts in various parts of the world as effective business projects) to collide with the national interests and sovereignty of other states. The most recent example is Russia's opposition to the NATO bloc, which has intensified against the backdrop of recent events in Ukraine. Consequently, it is necessary to question the absence of an alternative economic logic of economic management in order to dispel the myth of the infallibility of the global market and capital, which are firmly “fused with the bureaucracy of the “super” states (USA, EU, etc.)” [Buzgalin, Kolganov, 2021, p. 163], pursue the supranational economic interests of the owners of transnational corporations. Obviously, it is time to seriously think about the transition of society to a qualitatively new level of development, because “the market itself does not pursue or set social values” [Voeykov, 2022, p. 131].

One of the scenarios for effective development of the coming social and economic system in the interests of the social majority (and not the national exclusivity of some communities

over others) is the concept of Noonomy through the new industrial society of the second generation (NIS.2), most consistently developed and elaborated by Professor S.D. Bodrunov [Bodrunov, 2018a, 2018b, 2020].

The Russian scientist sees the horizons for the development of socially oriented forms of social interaction beyond the limits of human economic participation in material production – in the “removal of the shell of production relations from social relations”. [Bodrunov, 2021, p. 145]. One relies on the comprehensive progress of human potential, on solidarity, on a harmonious interaction of basic/applied science, advanced industry, socially responsible state, knowledge-intensive industrial material production [Bodrunov, 2018a,], to accelerated socio-economic and advanced technological development, to the displacement of market simulative needs [Bodrunov, 2021b] by higher order needs, to the blurring of the institution of property rights [Bodrunov, 2021a], to the transition to the elements of co-ownership, co-use and co-busyness, conservation of nature and its resources [Bodrunov, 2021b], etc.

Professor S.D. Bodrunov argues convincingly that the Western model of organising economic processes, which commodifies human activity – identifies man with a thing, regards him as an object of economic manipulation and coercion – cannot be eternal. The Russian scientist advocates rational management of economic life, the development of “trust technologies”, the systematic dismantling of intermediary relations, the conscious and purposeful improvement of the institutional environment and social relations. This provides a conceptual view of the transition to a new quality of social structure.

There is no doubt that the concept of the market economy contradicts the concept of the free and full development of people's creative potential in the interest of the social majority. And it must be said that open-minded academics have observed this for a long time. The triumph of global capital is not aimed at world peace. The logic of the market process (where everything is bought and sold) is exclusively geared towards achieving the parameters of economic rationality and optimal choice. It is therefore not possible to reproduce a new model of a socially just society while remaining within the neoclassical paradigm. Consequently, it is necessary to distance oneself from its postulates.

Thus, in order to gain a reliable immunity “against the epidemic of profiteering and other numerous temptations of 'savage' capitalism” [Ryazanov, 2019, p. 33], humanity is doomed to “overcome” neoclassicism and, having overcome the flaws and quirks of this system, to begin building a socially oriented social structure based on the concept of Noonomy as a non-economic form of regulating economic processes, developed and theorised by Professor S.D. Bodrunov. So simple, and at the same time so complex...

References

- Bodrunov S.D. (2018). *Noonomy*. M.: Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya Publ. 432 p. (In Russ.)
- Bodrunov S.D. (2020). On the Way to Noonomy: Man, Technology, Society. *The World of Transformations*. No 2. Pp. 24-39. (In Russ.)
- Bodrunov S.D. (2021a). Genesis of Noonomy: Scientific and Technological Progress, Diffusion of Ownership, Socialization of Society, Solidarism. *Economic Revival of Russia*. No 1 (67). Pp. 5-14. DOI: 10.37930/1990-9780-2021-1-67-5-14. (In Russ.)
- Bodrunov S.D. (2021b). Noonomy as a Strategical Project. *Strategizing: Theory and Practiceoriya i Praktika*. No 1 (2). Pp. 136-150. DOI: 10.21603/2782-2435-2021-1-2-136-150. (In Russ.)

- Buzgalin A.V., Kolganov A.I. (2021). A Great Reset or A Half-Truth Dump: Will the Post-Pandemic World Become More Just? *Sociological Studies*. No 8. Pp. 161-167. DOI: 10.31857/S013216250015524-9. (In Russ.)
- Buzgalin A.V. (2022). Creative Person in the Economy of the Future. *Economic Revival of Russia*. No 1 (71). Pp. 48-57. DOI: 10.37930/1990-9780-2022-1-71-48-57. (In Russ.)
- Voeykov M.I. (2022). The Evolution of State Paternalism and Noonomy. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*. Vol. 1. No. 1. Pp. 129-135. DOI: 10.37930/2782-618X-2022-1-1-129-135. (In Russ.)
- Porokhovskiy A.A. (2022). Human and Robot: Technologization vs. Humanization of Noonomy. *Economic Revival of Russia*. No 1 (67). Pp. 39-47. DOI: 10.37930/1990-9780-2022-1-71-39-47. (In Russ.)
- Ryazanov V.T. (2019). *Modern Political Economy: Prospects of Neo-Marxist Synthesis*. SPb: Aleteyya Publ. 436 p. (In Russ.)
- Khabibullina Z.R. (2021a). From the Creative Worker – to the Homo Noonomics. *The Bulletin of the Institute of Economics of the Russian Academy of Sciences*. No 2. Pp. 97-106. DOI: 10.52180/2073-6487_2021_2_97_106. (In Russ.)
- Khabibullina Z.R. (2021b). Controversial Role of the Creative Worker in the Context of the Corporate Capital Dominance. *Philosophy of Economy*. No 5. Pp. 68-85. (In Russ.)

Information about the author

Zenfira R. Khabibullina

Senior Research Fellow of the S. Y. Witte Institute for New Industrial Development, Cand. of Ec. Sc. (16 Bolshaya Monetnaya Str., St. Petersburg, 197101)

E-mail: ruzen7@mail.ru