

DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-4-59-74

Evgeniy V. Sitnikov

D. Mendeleev University of Chemical Technology of Russia (Moscow, Russia)

Tatyana N. Shushunova

D. Mendeleev University of Chemical Technology of Russia (Moscow, Russia)

POSSIBILITIES AND POTENTIAL OF MARXIST STUDIES FOR ASSESSING THE PROSPECTS OF THE EXISTING MODEL OF THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM AND THE FORMATION OF A NEW ECONOMY IN RUSSIA

Abstract: using Marxist methodology and its main tools, which have proved their worth in the analysis of capitalism in practise, modern economic models are considered: the liberal market economy of Russia, post-industrial society in the industrialised countries, the Soviet experience of socialist planned society applied in several countries, the “mixed economy” in Russia, socialism with Chinese characteristics, as well as theoretical developments in the field (NIS.2 and noonomy). It is shown that the existing model of market economy in Russia needs to be replaced as it is not able to ensure high growth rates, eliminate or smooth out social inequalities and avoid crises. The recommended directions of further development in Russia are the “mixed economy” as a transitional stage to a newly emerging system, and NIS.2 and noonomy, making partial use of Soviet experience and certain provisions of the Chinese model of the new civilisation.

Keywords: marxist methodology, neoliberal economic model, “mixed economy”, post-industrial society, contradictions of capitalism, new industrial society of the second generation, noonomy, Soviet and Chinese economic experience.

For citation: Sitnikov E.V., Shushunova T.N. (2022). Possibilities and potential of marxist studies for assessing the prospects of the existing model of the economic system and the formation of a new economy in Russia. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 59–74. 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-4-59-74.

西特尼科夫 E.V.

俄罗斯门捷列夫化工大学 (俄罗斯, 莫斯科)

舒姝诺娃 T.N.

俄罗斯门捷列夫化工大学 (俄罗斯, 莫斯科)

马克思主义研究在评价俄罗斯当前经济模式 发展前景和新经济模式形成方面的意义和作用

摘要: 文章运用马克思主义方法论及在研究资本主义过程中得到实践证明的其重要工具, 讨论了多种现代经济模式, 包括俄罗斯的自由市场经济、发达国家的后工业社会、被多国采用的苏联社会主义计划经济社会、俄罗斯的混合经济、有中国特色的社会主义, 以及这个领域的理论模型 (新型工业社会-2和智慧型经济) 等模式。文章阐述了俄罗斯当前市场经济模式转型的必要性。其原因是这种模式

不能保证经济的高速增长,不能铲除或减轻社会不公,不能避免社会危机。作者建议的俄罗斯经济发展方向是混合型经济(向正在形成的新体制过度)、新型工业社会-2和智慧型经济,并运用苏联时期的部分经验和采用中国的新文明模式的部分原则。

关键词: 马克思主义方法论、新自由主义经济模式、混合型经济、后工业社会、资本主义自身矛盾、第二代新型工业社会、智慧型经济、苏联和中国的经济经验。

引文注释: 西特尼科夫 E. V.、舒姝诺娃 T.N. (2022). 马克思主义研究在评价俄罗斯当前经济模式发展前景和新经济模式形成方面的意义和作用//智慧经济与智慧社会。维捷新兴工业发展研究所论文集. vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 59–74. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-4-59-74

Introduction

The peculiarities of the modern phase of world development, accompanied by economic slow-down, crises, high inflation, growing unemployment, the possible completion of the globalisation process and the transition from a unipolar to a multipolar world, urgently require the use of reliable research methods on socio-economic processes, problems and their solutions in justifying the formation of a new economic system (ES) of Russia. In our opinion, among these methods is the dialectical materialism of K. Marx. Based on the study of the works of his predecessors, he developed the dialectical method of studying the capitalist system, identifying its origins and main features, its characteristics, condition and prospects of development with a reasonable anticipation of future socio-economic transformations, using the example of Western Europe (mainly England and France) and the East Coast of the United States. Subsequently, the Marxist dialectic remained the starting point for understanding socio-economic processes in the world. It explained both the economic advances made under capitalism and the serious problems it generated. They were difficult for the researcher of socio-economic processes to grasp when he created a comprehensive economic theory of capitalism based on an analysis of the development of only two or four countries that were the first to begin building the new capitalist system, in a short time since its creation and without practical confirmation of the main conclusions of this theoretical scientific research. Marx's many opponents have repeatedly accused him of a series of assumptions, errors and, in their opinion, unreliable scientific forecasts. However, the importance of Marx's research lies in the fact that despite the fact that some postulates and events could not be confirmed in the future due to the complexity, contradictions and dynamics of the unevenly proceeding socio-economic processes, a number of his conclusions are convincingly confirmed at the present time. This is stated not only by domestic economists, but also by a number of foreign researchers. Therefore, in order to approach the task of shaping the new economic system that will replace capitalism in Russia, it is appropriate to use K. Marx's methodological approach. Marx, which allows us to identify and analyse the latest trends and patterns of development ES, taking into account the conditions for the development and resolution of the emerging contradictions.

1. The scientific validity and practical relevance of Marxist theory in the Modern Age

The truth of any theory, as we know, is confirmed by practise. And the fundamental conclusions of Marx's analysis of capitalism as a system have been convincingly confirmed:

– *the fundamental regularities of the development of material production are determined by consumption (changes in demand) and the subsequent supply.* In the first phase, the development

of commodity production proceeds according to the scheme $T - D - T'$. Later, there is fierce competition for markets and the role of money increases according to the scheme $D - T - D'$. Financial capital can not only develop the economy but also enslave it, and financial speculation can cause and deepen economic crises;

– *capitalism inevitably leads to a concentration of production, capital and various forms of monopolies* which, if unchecked, can have a devastating effect on further development. The theory of social reproduction and cyclical and structural economic crises is developed on this basis;

– *competition between capitalists for surplus value (profit) is the driving force of development*. The main points of the Marxist theory of surplus value, when adapted to modern conditions, are still recognised today for the change and transformation of the world;

– *simple process of labour is transformed into a scientific process and an experimental science* that uses the forces of nature and society to satisfy human needs. At the same time, there are shifts in the content and organisation of labour that change the place and role of the human being in the production process;

– *materialist approach to social relations in the production process, including production itself and the exchange, distribution and consumption of products and services*. Economic progress, with the increasing role of science and technology, is accompanied by serious contradictions and problems related to the detachment of man from the results of his labour, various forms of exploitation of workers and the polarisation of incomes, ultimately leading either to class struggles or to a temporary and partial improvement in the living and working conditions of workers;

– *industrial and finance capital, taking advantage of the division of labour, the deepening of specialisation and the improvement of the means of production in the interests of enrichment, leads to a greater interconnection of national economies, brings together national markets into a single world market and, having eliminated national borders and the sovereignty of individual countries, enters the phase of globalisation*.

The development of capitalism, the emergence of its new modifications in the future with corresponding theoretical justifications by prominent foreign scholars (D. Keynes, his successors: D. Hicks, P. Samuelson, E. Hanson, E. Domar, R. Harrod; the neoconservatives – representatives of the monetarists and supply theory; J.K. Galbraith, D. Bell and other theorists of the new and post-industrial society) has shown for two hundred years only the further development of capitalism with the implementation of various approaches to its reform in order to ensure higher growth rates and maximise profits, reduce the negative effects and limit such shortcomings as crises, the deepening of social inequalities, in order to preserve the basic foundations of the system of production and distribution of goods produced in society.

The Marxist approach can be applied not only to analyse and evaluate the tactics and strategies of economic actors in society, but also to identify and understand the main trends in the development of ES, to evaluate their potentials, to determine the conditions, possibilities and the need for transformation of the systems.

As is well known, in modern economics there are two main approaches to the study of economic systems: the formative and the civilisational. This article uses the original provisions of the formative approach and considers the modern world as consisting of ES different types. In our opinion, this approach is largely in line with Marxist dialectics. It is very important for modern researchers to understand what qualitative changes and what elements can lead to the formation of a new system that eliminates the shortcomings of the old system and gives a new impetus to

the development of the productive forces and relations of production. Both old and new systems can coexist. According to Marxist dialectics, a new system does not emerge immediately, but only with a certain transition from quantitative to qualitative changes, which leads to a transformation of the existing system. Particular attention is paid to the mode of production of material goods as the basis of ES, which is determined by the totality of the labour force, means of labour and objects of labour and characterises a certain level and character of the development of the productive forces and the social relations of production corresponding to them. The change of ES, called socio-economic formations by K. Marx, is based on the contradictions between the level of development of the productive forces and the relations of production, the social character of production and the private capitalist character of appropriation of its results, the solution of which leads to the change of the mode of production. These changes should be sought within the existing systems, since revolutionary changes leading to the formation of a new system always arise and exist in the form of rudiments in the outdated system.

In considering the possibilities and potential of Marxist research for the formation of a new economy in Russia, our aim is not to present an analysis of all the elements of the existing ES, but only to examine the existing technologies and the features of the division of labour, as well as the main cause-effect relationships in the relations between people veiled by the material form. Particular attention is paid to the oligarchic-type capitalist system established in Russia, the “mixed economy” as a transitional stage to the new economy of the country, consideration of other existing ES in the world, and theoretical approaches to the question of the formation of new types of ES. Starting from the framework of the article, the main factors and contradictions in economic societies are considered and analysed from the perspective of socio-economic Marxist theory.

2. Assessment of the prospects of the current model of the economic system in Russia

In the Russian Federation, economic activity was carried out under a number of systems: administrative-command until the 1990s, as well as transition and modern market economy for the last 30 years. For each of these systems, due to the prevailing ideological and political attitudes, the level of economic development, social and national conditions, and specifics of development in different periods of time, the Soviet and Russian models were used respectively. Each had its positive and negative sides. Since the 1990s, there has been a transition from an administrative apparatus to a modern one ES, modelled on liberal Western advisers:

- privatisation of a large part of the largely efficient national property in the interest of a small circle of entrepreneurs, abolition of directive economic planning and transition to a market economy. The implementation of the liberal strategy through privatisation and the introduction of a market mechanism, which limited the role and control of the state, ensured the well-being of the Russian financial and economic elite alone and eliminated Russia as a competitor of the West;

- developing the economy in accordance with Western recommendations on the division of labour and specialisation, which was in the interests of Western competitors and led to the creation of a resource-based economic model that resulted in the abandonment of technologically sophisticated industries and left the country at the beginning of the value chain of low-margin goods;

- pursuing an economic policy based on the recommendations of the World Bank and the IMF that left no chance for rapid industrial development due to the lack of cheap credit for industry because of capital flight to speculative markets and the creation of reserve funds that do not work

for the domestic economy, while at the same time declaring the transition from a market economy of free competition to an industrial economic model.

Russia is currently at the stage of an industrial society, and before the pandemic COVID -19 the possibility of initiating a gradual transition to a post-industrial economic system with a predominant development of the service sector along the lines of developed countries was considered.

The main focus of the fiscal and monetary policy pursued by the government and the Central Bank for a long time has not been on a policy of economic growth, but on a tight monetary policy with inflation targeting, control of the money supply and money supply to maintain macroeconomic stability. In this way, the central bank has managed inflation and nominal money supply growth, which has ultimately been responsible for the country's low GDP growth, especially in recent years, compared to other rapidly developing countries. Despite some success in rebuilding defence capacity and a number of selected sectors, there are significant weaknesses in socio-economic development. In addition to low GDP growth (at market exchange rates against the dollar and measured in terms of purchasing power parity), stagnant conditions with intermittent recessionary trends, these include a decline in real income and consumption levels, increasing social inequality, a mortality rate higher than the birth rate, a steadily increasing capital outflow, a low level of fixed investment leading to a longer life of machinery and equipment, and a loss of competitiveness. The imperfect structure of the economy, dominated by the production and export of fuel and energy resources, as well as the small share of innovative industries and the technological gap with developed countries should also be noted. This is due to the lack of funding for this sector, but also for education and science, health and culture. The country's financial and banking system does not work for material production as recommended by the World Bank and the IMF. This, in turn, leads to internal conflicts in the system of production relations, which limit rather than promote the development of social productive forces, even though there are some technical achievements that lead to a growth of profits, which are appropriated by the oligarchic circles and exported abroad. The current economic model in the Russian Federation, while maintaining the macroeconomic stability of the country and inflation in some years, does not allow to solve many acute social problems, which affects the implementation of a number of constitutional rights of Russian citizens. In fact, it has reached its limit of effectiveness and exhausted its full potential. This raises the question of an urgent change of course and the existing economic model.

3. Approaches to reforming the existing system and developing a new one

The neoliberal Russian market economy model and its modifications cannot be regarded as a universally valid approach to future development. Under these conditions, Russia, with its policy of macroeconomic stability and free-floating rouble exchange rate, has become a supplier of raw materials to the industrialised countries and a provider of finance to the USA and to global and domestic speculators. The continuation of such a policy becomes counterproductive in the face of fierce competition, protectionism, sanctions and the building of a new world order, which leads to the need to reform the current one and create a new ES.

3.1. The transition model of a mixed economy

Many developing countries are actively seeking alternative models for their development or adapting some existing models to modern political, economic and socio-cultural trends. China,

India and Vietnam, for example, are implementing an integrated (mixed) economic model that successfully combines elements of the Soviet model of a planned economy with elements of market regulation and combines the profit motive with the interests of society. In improving the current model and forming a new national model, it is important to change the quantitative development paradigm based not only on GDP and/or national income growth, although these are important, but also on qualitative indicators that characterise the standard, quality and security of life and the features of the living environment. The new model should also reflect: Changes in the national system of economic governance, strengthening and development of the real sector of the economy, promotion of innovation and investment, formation of a new technological and world economic order, change and strengthening of the role of the financial system in promoting economic growth while maintaining an optimal level of macroeconomic stability, and pursuit of a targeted social policy. The formation of a new model as a formalised description of various processes and phenomena, as well as a constant set of stable characteristics and indicators that exhaustively describe the functioning of the country's economy, requires the development of common strategic goals and a coordinated joint policy of the government, the economy and society for their implementation. Of course, it is difficult to achieve complete agreement, but in essence there should be unity. First and foremost, in the formulation of the principles, functions, nature and content of the national strategic management system and in the definition of a consistent set of sustainable characteristics and indicators to describe economic processes. Let us now look at the main activities that enable the transition to the new model.

Strategic planning and its implementing bodies. It is necessary to make maximum use of the existing planning documents with the necessary adjustments, especially the already adopted and temporarily postponed due to the postponement of the development of the basic documents Federal Law of 28 June 2014 No. 172-FZ "On Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation"¹, which should be further developed and considered as the basis of the new national economic management system. The main body for implementing this document should be an analogue of the State plan, based on the restructuring of the Ministry of Economic Development and, in part, the Ministry of Industry and Trade, with their functions changed so that key industries, including defence companies and public-private partnerships, working on defence contracts, implementation of policy plans and projects, guaranteed financing and sales of products, maximum technological sovereignty and other private sector planning, financial and control agencies should coordinate economic activities and ensure that the activities of all enterprises are in the public interest. The Central Bank, because of its changed functions, must create the conditions to work within the framework of the transformation of the economy and the financial resources provided by the budget. Under the current circumstances, the country's financial and banking elite can no longer organise the inflow of foreign investment into Russia and ensure the development of investment without harming their own interests. Therefore, a new national economic and financial system should be built, with a possible transition to a dual monetary circulation system.

Transformation of social policy. The main goals of Russian policy as a socially oriented state are to ensure economic growth as the basis of prosperity and to raise living standards and the quality of life in accordance with the Constitution and the Strategy for Social and Economic Develop-

¹ On Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation (2014). Federal Law No. 172-FZ. URL: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_164841/

ment. Achieving these goals requires a strong economy and a changed approach to social policy that takes into account, to a greater extent than before, expenditure on social assistance and the protection of citizens' social and economic rights, as well as the creation of conditions for the comprehensive development of individuals.

The priority tasks are:

- support and social protection for the poorest. Programmes must be developed to subsidise the expenditure of low-income people in order to reduce the number of poor people and their share in the population, both through redistribution and the introduction of a progressive income tax scale, and through economic growth and development;
- regulation of employment with guarantees for the right to work;
- social security for certain professional groups of citizens;
- development of basic social infrastructure (health, education, culture, social security, housing and utilities, etc.);
- strengthening the role of trade unions, as well as the role of the opposition in parliament, who are able to advocate for social protection measures and monitor their implementation;
- improving the methodology of statistical calculations, the effectiveness of social policies and removing Rosstat as the body responsible for evaluating their effectiveness from the status of government.

Changes in ownership, partial withdrawal of exporters' revenues and combating capital flight could also help address social justice issues.

Better organisation, management and financing of scientific and technological development. In the face of growing global challenges, increasing geopolitical tensions, the transition to the sixth technological mode and the events of the fourth industrial revolution, a transformation of science and industry policy in Russia is needed. First and foremost, it is a matter of improving the management and organisation of basic science and the scientific and technological complex by increasing funding and responsibility for the implementation of national programmes and projects. These measures must be complemented by changes to simultaneously meet the challenges of accelerated development, national security and technological sovereignty in a changing economy:

- Russia's goal should not be macroeconomic stabilisation, but economic growth, modernisation of production and import substitution;
- functions of the government's Coordinating Council RF for the needs of the armed forces should in many respects be similar to those of the State Defence Committee USSR, with all agencies subordinated to it unconditionally, a new regulatory framework for administration created and bureaucratic procedures minimised;
- central bank should provide targeted credit at the lowest possible interest rate to meet production orders, strengthen the fight against speculation in the monetary and financial spheres, and establish socially oriented budgets;
- stabilising the rouble exchange rate and using national currencies (and Commonwealth currencies) in international trade.

The transition to a mixed-economy model will make it possible to use indicative planning for the main sectors of the economy in addition to indicative planning, mobilise industry to implement more rigorous plans, redistribute property, form a system of public-private partnerships, use part of exporters' revenues for development and strengthen the defence sector.

3.2. Post-industrial society

The theory of post-industrial society was developed in 1960-1970 by D. Bell, E. Toffler, J. Furastier, R. Heilbroner, D. Drucker and other authors. A notable contribution to this theory was made by M. Castells and representatives of the school of “autonomous Marxism” (N. Dyer-Wiesford, A. Negri, M. Hard, S. Lerner).

The authors of the post-industrial society see future development not in material production, industry, but in service production. Their views are based on the structural changes in industrialised countries in recent years, when the role of material production declined dramatically and the service sector dominated, dominated by “information production and processing” based on the improvement of computer technology and communication systems. Later, according to D. Bell and M. Castells, the concept of “information” was complemented by a significant part of “intellectual production” (knowledge and science, especially fundamentals). It should be noted that Russia, like most countries of the world, does not belong to the developed countries and has a low share of services in the production structure, giving preference to the industrial sector, which is the basis for the growth of living standards and quality of life. The developed countries of the West, realising the principles of globalism, locate facilities with a low technological mode in peripheral countries and leave the production of high value-added knowledge-intensive products in their own country, ensuring a lower share of material production and a higher share of knowledge-intensive production in their country, as well as a predatory colonial approach to cooperation and division of labour.

The views of post-industrial and Marxist theorists on the processes at hand differ considerably, despite some overlap. In Marxism, the productive forces act as the engine of history and are replaced by a new system of property relations and modes of production when the relations of production constrain them. That is, for Marxism, the technological process is always conditioned by society and at the same time a condition for society. In the theory of post-industrialism, the productive forces are reduced to technology as an autonomous process, independent of society. Thus, the success or failure of technological development depends more, if not entirely, on the individual with certain moral and intellectual qualities than on changes in the individual parameters of society as a totality of people. Therefore, society should direct its main efforts towards the formation of these qualities in the individual, and the latter should make every effort to perceive and expand social knowledge and experience. In other words, the development of the individual should be the main aim of the individual. While the Marxist theory of personality does not deny the necessity of the development of individual personalities and their contribution to the development of the world, its emphasis is on the interaction between personality and society, the dependence of personality traits on social, economic and objective activities and the specifics of their socialisation. Therefore, modern sociology, which uncovers the social content of the individual, shows the individual as a social, societal and historically developing being.

Its theorists emphasise knowledge and information as the most important element of post-industrial society. They are at the same time the most important resource, a kind of raw material and an end product of the new society, i.e. the derivatives of educational and scientific activity. Unlike material products and commodities, they do not disappear in consumption and are not disposed of in exchange. Before the classics of post-industrialism, K. Marx foresaw the growth and importance of knowledge in the future and the possibility of its application in material produc-

tion to further satisfy human needs. Material production will change with the use of knowledge in scientific and technological progress, but it remains the basis of even the minimal, normative or natural human needs of people in post-industrial society, without which there is no knowledge or information. Even a robot or an artificial intelligence needs a material basis.

There are differences between the subjects of labour and decision-making in capitalist and post-industrial society. In the first case, it is a hierarchical system of decision-making; in the second, it is the self-organisation of multifunctional teams of workers in which each team member contributes to the continuous development of production, or a network principle of organisation. This is due to the specificity of information technology production with increasing mental and decreasing physical labour, access to all electronic sources of information and a new quality of personnel, which in turn is determined by the needs of society. This determination can be applied to variants of mental labour as one of the modern forms of labour, but not to universal material labour. The theorists of post-industrialism, having discovered trends in a small sector of the economy, albeit a very important one for the future, have extended them to the whole of society, disregarding other underlying factors such as material production, as well as mentality and culture, which are also linked to the functioning of the material sphere.

The emergence and development of post-industrial society, according to the founders of this direction, is related to the fact that creative individuals themselves assess the need for one or another type of economic interaction as well as virtually all social relations. This should lead to a change in the market nature of economic relations, the value of goods and services, private property and human exploitation.

Some foreign researchers, especially I. Schumpeter and J.K. Galbraith, consider technological and innovative development and recognise their influence as the main factors for renewal of production, creation of competitive advantages and successful economic development, but at the same time point out the need to overcome many serious contradictions and solve some acute social problems in the post-industrial system and post-economic society.

Thus, in post-economic society, the conflict between individuals and social groups is constantly reproduced because of their claims to a limited number of material goods. The division of society into a creative class engaged in creativity and the precariat – the service workers and consumers – requires the creation of a fundamentally new social system. But even if such a system is created, there is a great risk in the concentration of power in the hands of the creative class, which can use potentially dangerous technologies uncontrollably for its own benefit. The inequality in this case arises from fundamental differences in basic values and inequality in intellectual abilities between members of society, which are genetically and socially predetermined. The elimination of these contradictions, which are partly due to the genetic nature of human beings, requires either a long evolutionary development or a revolutionary intervention in the genetic structure. This is the first very remarkable difference between the new social conflict and all its predecessors. According to the theorists of this society, the social contradictions in society do not arise from the ownership of the means of production, but from the unequal distribution of human opportunities. The post-industrial society of the Western type is oriented in its development not to material production but to the sphere of services, which is unacceptable for Russia because it will maintain its dependence on the developed countries.

3.3. The new industrial society of the second generation as the first stage of a new economic order

A concept of forming a new industrial society of the second generation – NIS.2 – and its components and elements has been developed [Bodrunov, 2017], based on the Marxist principles and ideas of K. Marx on the future growth of knowledge, its productive application, the impact of scientific and technological progress on the economic structure and economic development of society, the close relationship between production relations and productive forces. The Marxist concept finds its development in the phase of new industrialisation and not in the processes of deindustrialisation, financialisation (i.e. the change in the relationship between the real and financial sectors of the economy in favour of the financial sector), which are currently developing in Russia, and not in the transition predominantly to services, as is happening in post-industrial society. Such a policy has the effect of primitivising industries even for the United States, which is a technological leader in the world economy, and leads to stagnation, crisis and other negative consequences.

So how will NIS.2 differ from first generation industrialisation in the field of material production? First of all, it is a change in economic resources and a higher level of development through the use of new technologies (biotechnology, energy production and storage, advanced materials, information, digital technologies, NBIC technologies), which play a crucial role in the socio-economic development of the country and in ensuring its national security. This requires a dramatic leap in the acquisition/production and application of new knowledge and technologies to approach world leadership in this field. Increasingly complex manufacturing, which requires the development and implementation of highly efficient, competitive technologies, higher quality personnel, safe technological processes and strict compliance with environmental regulations, will inevitably lead not only to higher capital investment, but also to an absolute and relative increase in the share of spending on intellectual resources.

The use of more advanced and powerful computer and communication systems, production and information centres, computer programmes and artificial intelligence algorithms will gradually displace humans, first from the field of management and then from the field of material production itself. But the role of man as the subject of social life is also changing, because it is necessary to eliminate contradictions not only between people in access to education, science, accumulated knowledge and experience, but also between man and the technology used, which would inevitably lead to changes in the nature and system of economic relations and the formation of a new social structure. This is a serious problem that will take time and money to solve.

The new second-generation industrial society in which information, including education, knowledge and basic science, becomes the raw material, the object and the product of the post-industrial society that is emerging in the West is something quite different, for it is a limited computer/information/technology society in which humans are becoming more important and a new relationship with nature is emerging, but in which services rather than material production predominate. This is unacceptable for developing countries, as they lag behind advanced industrialised countries in adopting this system. Moreover, industrial production is only partly a material basis for knowledge and information professions, but serves other sectors and areas of society, the whole human environment. Moreover, the theorists of post-industrial society deliberately ignore property relations and the traditional principles of nation-state sovereignty, which are undermined by the maintenance and development of globalisation.

The implementation of NIS.2 will lead to the confirmation of K. Marx's scientific forecasts of the long-term trends in the development of material production with the gradual removal of man from the direct process of material production and the creation of conditions for his full creative activity, and will show the supporters of industrial society that the economic value of the application of knowledge and information lies primarily in industrial production. The use of NIS.2 will bridge the technological gap with the developed world.

3.4. A new form of social organisation of Noonomy

The improvement of the "mixed economy" and the construction of the NIS.2 contribute to the development of our country and counter the threats and challenges in a rapidly changing world of confrontation and competition. These are realities of the present, but not of the future, which objective researchers cannot ignore and propose new forms of social organisation. Therefore, research on Noonomy as a natural extension of the concept of NIS.2 is particularly important and relevant to theoretical and practical approaches to the formation of a new society, and these issues are also considered from a Marxist perspective. The concept of a new society "Noonomy" to replace the liberal model of Russia's capitalist economy was first presented by S.D. Bodrunov at the St. Petersburg Economic Congress 2018. By "Noonomy", the scientist means such a non-economic way of organising the economy to satisfy needs, carried out by a human being who has transcended material production. In other words, *Noonomy* is an economic system that differs from economics by the absence of relations between people in the process of material production [Bodrunov, 2018]. In the following, we will consider the main provisions of this concept.

The use of scientific knowledge in material production and other areas of economic activity. A key component of Noonomy research is the previously outlined vision of the contours of a new second-generation industrial society – Noonomy, like NIS.2, is based on K. Marx's theoretical determinations about the development of productive forces and relations of production, their further transformation with changes in society. The development of knowledge in NIS.2 and Noonomy does not consist in replacing material production, but in the increasing role of knowledge as its most important element [Bodrunov, 2019, pp. 249-254; Glaziev, 2022]. The new technologies of the fourth industrial revolution make it possible to shape a new world economy, not just the information and computer sphere, as post-industrial theorists would have us believe. It should also be taken into account that knowledge and information do not create value, but only the conditions for its creation and subsequent appropriation. In post-industrial society, the creation of value through knowledge and information is linked to its conversion through human labour into material value, and this is not just a matter of working with a computer. In addition, marketing services do not create a real product, but only the idea of it; value is not created in real production, but in brand promotion. The focus is not on the quality of the product, but on its attractive image.

The change of human needs in the new environment and the possibilities to satisfy them. The concept defines needs in a noonomy society: they are needs determined by the criteria of human reason and cultural imperatives, based on a rational level of vital (evolving life) needs and the increasing role of higher order needs. From dialectical positions, the author of the concept convincingly exposes the categories of simulative (rational) and non-simulative (non-rational) human needs. The former can in principle be satisfied with the development of knowledge and society, but at the same time their transition to non-simulative needs, i.e. irrational and unsatisfiable from society's point of view, is possible. Conversely, non-simulative needs can be transformed

into simulative needs with a higher level of development and social progress. It is known that the normal physiological level of consumption develops according to the latest level of knowledge. Due to limited resources, the need for knowledge will displace non-simulative needs [Bodrunov, 2019, pp. 200-210]. This will also require a system for educating people and scientifically based planning of consumption and distribution, taking into account universal values. In the future, knowledge needs will replace simulative needs.

Replacing the system of inequality of property with a system of inequality of skills and talents. The theory of Noonomy with NIS.2 focuses in the first phase on the sphere of material production to satisfy rational (simulative) needs and replaces the system of inequality of property with the system of inequality of skills and talents, which may lead to a fundamentally new type of social contradictions. Competition between people will increase on the basis of innate and acquired creative abilities. As far as innate abilities are concerned, it is a competition on a biological basis (influence of the genetic factor). Acquired creative abilities depend not only on the individual, but also on the society one is in and how social problems are solved in it. In the future society, these inequalities will not disappear, but they will not be found in the unequal opportunities to satisfy rational needs, but in the unequal opportunities to increase one's abilities while ensuring that there are no social barriers to doing so. Unfortunately, this is only possible in the distant future. Inequalities in the near future will persist due to differences in individual abilities, including genetic factors, as well as the availability of opportunities to acquire new abilities. The need to overcome these forms of inequality is therefore driven by current challenges.

The transition from natural resource consumption to geo-biocoenosis reproduction. A negative feature of the modern industrial economy is its destructive impact on the natural environment. The noocommunity economic system combined with the use of new knowledge instead of traditional material resources to create a fundamentally new class of technology can help solve this problem [Bodrunov, 2022, pp. 24-26].

Changing the meaning of property, value and money. A change in ownership in a number of fields of activity in NIS.2 and Noonomy is accomplished through the transition from private to personal ownership of one's own labour power and the acquired means of production into personal property, i.e. in much the same way as described in "Post-industrial society". However, since surplus value is created not only by the living labour of the producer, but also by the past labour of all workers, private ownership of the means of production must not be destroyed, since it is the engine of scientific and technological progress, while surplus value becomes public property and is distributed, if necessary, not through the market mechanism, but in a more equitable way, as envisaged by updated Marxist theory. The extinction of private property leads to changes in market relations in a number of areas. The classical market was focused on increasing profits as a measure of efficiency and was indifferent to social factors. In today's conditions, however, it is not profit but social utility and the quality of life that aligns the interests of the individual with the goals of social development that are increasingly in demand as indicators of the efficiency and purpose of production.

The concept of "value" in economics evolves with the nature of economic processes and changes its meaning. At the beginning of the industrial age, Riccardo-Marx's definition applied when value was created in the process of reproducing a pattern. Then, with the development of the market, came the definition of value as marginal utility, which according to Say and Boehm-Bawerk is determined by a process of bargaining. In the transition to financial capitalism, according to

M. Friedman's monetarist theory of money, value emerged in the process of financial speculation. According to post-industrial theorists, value is determined in the process of advertising an object (PR) as a symbol of utility and the consumer preference attributed to that object¹. Marx's labour theory of value states, "A use-value or commodity has value only because human labour is abstractly objectified or materialised in it, and the quantum of labour itself is measured by its duration, the socially necessary labour-time." [Marx, 1983, p. 47]. Consequently, the question of measuring value boils down to estimating the expenditure of time and energy, and changing needs and conditions will continue to dictate the methodology of such estimations as value relations transform.

At a certain stage of civilisational development, money has played and continues to play an important role. It is an intermediary between producers and consumers of goods, has in the past replaced natural exchange, eliminated many of the contradictions that existed in the exchange process and enabled the simplification of economic transactions. But in Noonomy, no intermediaries are needed. Together with the market and capital, money will cease to be of decisive importance as confidence in it diminishes and the range of its possible uses also diminishes. It will cease to be a market commodity and will gradually disappear [Bodrunov, 2019, p. 286].

In building a new form of social organisation – Noonomy – the solution to the objective contradictions will, according to the Marxists, be through the creation of conditions most suited to human nature, eliminating all forms of social exclusion [Buzgalin, 2022, pp. 11-13, 26].

3.5. Using Soviet, Russian and Chinese experience to shape the new economic system

Soviet and Russian experience. At present there has been a dramatic decline in the attention paid to the writings of Soviet scholars on the prospects for socialist society in USSR and Russia, especially during the transition from a planned to a market economy. Despite Gorbachev's misguided attempts at acceleration and perestroika during this period, the earlier Soviet model of catch-up development, for all its faults, was generally effective and competitive in some areas. The country had unprecedented social, scientific and technological achievements, it had high dynamics in the 30-50s, the best results in the five-year Kosygin reforms (1966-1970), and even the period before the transition to the beginning of the real crisis was characterised only by a slowdown in growth rates [Popov, 2009]. The virtues of the Soviet economic model were its stability, social equality, free education and health care, employment guarantees and the provision of a minimum standard of living for all citizens.

The nature of the slowdown of the USSR's economy in the 1960s-80s and the stagnation in the following period is explained by domestic and foreign economists by various reasons, but it is not only the fall in oil prices that occurred in 1986. In our view, the main reasons that emerged in the 1980s and subsequent years are as follows:

- disproportionality of the national economy, manifested in the hypertrophic development of heavy industries, especially the military-industrial complex, and the weakness of industries linked to the consumer sector;
- inefficiency and lack of competitiveness of many enterprises, which require a restructuring of their activities in order to improve the quality of their products and satisfy real demand
- scarcity of various goods due to the dictatorship of the producer over the consumer, the lack of incentives for productive labour and the low standard of living of the population;

¹ The role of money in post-industrial civilisation, 2022.

– despite some achievements in science and technology, there were few scientific advances or designs that could be used in civilian industry that gave a good return on investment, necessitating the importation of technology, some equipment and almost all types of automation.

– shortcomings of the plan system – the basis of the country's economic mechanism – are detailed planning with an expanded range of products and severely limited funding of resources with small reserve funds, resulting in unbalanced plans and product shortages; the orientation of the main investments not towards retirement compensation and reconstruction with the replacement of obsolete equipment, but mainly towards new construction and expansion of fixed assets, etc.

Later, the negative situation in the economy was aggravated by subjective misjudgements of the country's leaders – M.S. Gorbachev (an insufficiently substantiated programme of economic reform communicated to all the republics and peoples of the USSR followed by transition to the market) and B.N. Yeltsin (acceleration of the collapse of the USSR despite the result of the referendum on its preservation, adoption of the worst of the privatisation options, transition to oligarchic capitalism), which essentially led to a crisis, a drop in the standard of living and a decline in life expectancy in the country.

After a series of attempts to soften relations with the United States and the developed capitalist countries, an attempt was made to build a new economy based on recommendations from Western advisors, the World Bank and the IMF. This resulted in the loss of much of the industrial potential, the competitiveness of many enterprises and the country as a whole, its raw material development and semi-colonial economic status within the world hegemon, and the inability to defend the country's national interests and technological and economic security. At present, attempts are being made to break away from neo-capitalism. The Soviet experience is useful in shaping Russia's new ES when it comes to mobilising all resources for the country's dynamic development and securing social achievements. In this case, the planning system used in the past must be improved, the imbalances in development must be eliminated and research and development must be intensified.

The Chinese approach to building a new economic order. The theory of building socialism with Chinese characteristics, adopted by the Chinese leadership, took into account the spirit of modern Western civilisation and the ability to adapt Western culture while retaining Chinese values and Marxist ideas. Thanks to the socialist system that laid the foundation for China's civilisational transformation, China has achieved remarkable results: in 2010, it surpassed Japan in terms of GDP volume and ranked second in the world; in terms of GDP in purchasing power parity (PPP), it still ranks second in the world and will rank first in the world by about 2025. The convergent model that has now emerged combines socialist ideology and state planning with market mechanisms and private entrepreneurship. China's traditional culture, its leaders and its people have neither embraced nor tolerated the Western ways of modernisation, capitalism and imperialism. The country has chosen the Marxist and socialist path of modernisation with Chinese characteristics to become a developed country. The future of Chinese society – communism. Marxism taught the Chinese people to find their own path and follow it. China is currently in the final stage of industrial civilisation, the so-called “eco-civilisation”.

The following points can be highlighted from the report of the 20th CPC Congress (October 2022). The Chinese Communist Party has accepted the challenge of the global leader, the United States, by adopting a series of new solutions. The Chinese Communists want to take advantage

of the crisis of the unipolar world, based on the American rules, on the power of the dollar, on the undivided leadership of the US in the military, trade and financial, information areas, just as they had previously used the US globalization theory to grow the Chinese economy. They do not want to lose what they have achieved, which is seen by the US and its allies as a threat to their supremacy that must be eliminated at all costs.

The declared strategy of expanding domestic demand combined with the development of the “One Belt, One Road” initiative, i.e. the abandonment of the PRC’s export orientation to the markets of the “collective West”. This is a direct economic challenge to the US currency and the modern global markets that are designed and operated in the interests of the US, as well as strengthening its own position in world markets. But the PRC is also acting cautiously and in its own interest here. The programme of the Great Rebirth of the Chinese Nation contains for the first time a thesis about the creation of “a new model of development and a new form of human civilisation”. Such a vision has never been officially proclaimed before. The ultimate goal, in our view, is to continue China’s basic strategy of gradually increasing its achievements in all fields until the time when all competitors retreat because of the utter futility of confrontation with China and begin to seek compromises on emerging issues. The US understood this and wanted to weaken its rival by dealing with China’s internal opposition. However, due to their failure, they have now adopted a policy of containment through technological isolation and economic warfare in the region and beyond.

China aspires to global leadership in the creation, development and widespread application of advanced high technology. China has no major problems in a number of areas and is already a leader in a number of high technologies. Aware that an acute confrontation with the United States is inevitable, China is taking measures to strengthen its technological sovereignty, and on this basis is developing technological renewal in the military field, actively developing an import substitution programme, but has no intention of rushing things because of its strategy [Sun, 2019].

China’s experience is based on the connection and interdependence of culture, morals and values with the peculiarities of economic construction, combining socialism with Chinese peculiarities (civilisational governance), i.e. the civilisational approach is also taken into account in the design of the new ES. It takes into account such superstructure factors as spiritual-ideological, cultural, religious, philosophical and ethical, which determine the mentality of the population and have a noticeable influence on the development of the base. Part of the Chinese experience should be used creatively in the Russian context.

Conclusions

1. The article proves that the method of dialectical materialism can be used to study, analyse and transform contemporary ES by testing the method of dialectical materialism to select the most promising Russian ES.

2. The Marxist methodological approach, with dialectics as one of its main components, allows us to take into account not only the contradictions between labour and capital, but also the social confrontation in the distribution of the product as the basis of the conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production, which was the main starting point of classical political economy. Today, it remains an important research tool in the study and analysis of class erosion, new market phenomena, property systems, categories of social utility, state regulation, new values in the socialisation of society and the civilisation approach, which is becoming increasingly important in modern economic systems.

3. The urgent task for Russia is to make an early departure from the liberal ES and move to a “mixed economy” as a stage in the formation of a new system, allowing for more effective action in transforming the economy, further utilising the concepts of NIS.2, noonomics and applying some provisions of the Soviet experience and the Chinese new civilisation model.

References

- Bodrunov S.D. (2017). The Return of Industry – the return of Galbraith: from NIS.2 to noospheric civilization: Based on the materials of the report at the III St. Petersburg Economic Congress “Foresight “Russia”: a new industrial society. Reboot” (St. Petersburg, March 27, 2017). Economic Revival of Russia. No. 2 (52). Pp. 17-21. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S.D. (2018). Noonomy and Marx. Free Economy. Journal VEO of Russia. April. URL: <https://freeeconomy.ru/veo-rossii/noonomika-i-marks.html>. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S.D. (2019). *General Theory of Noonomy. Textbook*. Moscow: Culture revolution Publ.; St. Petersburg; London. 504 p. (In Russ.).
- Bodrunov S.D. (2022). Scientific and technological progress and transformation of society: Noonomy and noosociety. Part 1. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*. Vol. 1, No. 1, Pp. 24-42.
- Buzgalin A.V. (2022). In Search of Ways to the Future. Lessons of the NEP. Collection of Lenin’s NEP: Relevance, Role, Problems, International Experience. St. Petersburg: Polytechnic Service Publ. Pp. 7-26. (In Russ.).
- Glaziev S.Y. (2022). Noonomy as the pivot of the forming new technological and world economic ways. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*. Vol. 1, No. 1. Pp. 43-64. (In Russ.).
- Marx K. (1983). *Capital*. In 4 vol. Vol. 1. Moscow: Politizdat. VI, 905 p. (In Russ.).
- Popov V. (2009). The sunset of the planned economy. [Expert]. No. 1, spec. vol. Pp. 74-79. (In Russ.).
- Sun L. (2019). The Chinese Way – Modernization Transformation of Chinese Civilization. [Comparative Politics]. Vol. 10, No. 2. Pp. 20-36. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kitai-skii-put-modernizatsionnaya-transformatsiya-kitai-skoi-tsivilizatsii>. (In Russ.).

Information about the authors

Evgeniy V. Sitnikov

Associate Professor of Management and Marketing Department, D. Mendeleev University of Chemical Technology of Russia, Candidate of Economic Sciences (9 Miusskaya Pl., Moscow, 125047)
E-mail: e.sitn@yandex.ru

Tatiana N. Shushunova

Associate Professor of Management and Marketing Department, D. Mendeleev University of Chemical Technology of Russia, Candidate of Economic Sciences (9 Miusskaya Pl., Moscow, 125047)
E-mail: serg-1167@yandex.ru