

DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-4-86-95

Svyatoslav V. Shachin

Murmansk Arctic State University (Murmansk, Russia)

TO THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN THE ERA OF NOONOMY: THE EXPERIENCE OF SYNTHESIS OF THE POLITICAL ECONOMIC APPROACH OF S. BODRUNOV AND THE SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH OF A. HONNETH AND YU. HABERMAS¹

Abstract: this article attempts a creative extension of S. Bodrunov's concept of noonomy through drawing in the most important ideas of A. Honneth and J. Habermas, third and second-generation leaders respectively of the Frankfurt school. The purpose of this theoretical synthesis is to supplement Bodrunov's theory, which provides a detailed account of the changes to the productive system and which from them, deduces profound transformations in other areas of public life. The article sets out to do this through social and philosophical elaborations that primarily analyse changes in the normative and institutional setting (A. Honneth) and in the political field (J. Habermas). Although S. Bodrunov also recognises and analyses these changes, approaches that proceed from other bases in defining the future social structure are nevertheless able to complement this analysis.

Keywords: noonomy, socialization of society, moral self-restraint, mutual recognition, solidarity, freedom, democratic law.

For citation: Shachin S.V. (2022). To the problem of social structure in the era of noonomy: the experience of synthesis of the political economic approach of S. Bodrunov and the socio-philosophical approach of A. Honneth and Yu. Habermas. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 86–95. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-4-86-95

沙钦 S. V.

摩尔曼斯克国立北极大学 (俄罗斯, 摩尔曼斯克)

对智慧经济时代社会结构问题的看法——博德鲁诺夫 S. 政治经济学方法与霍内特 A. 和哈贝马斯 J. 社会哲学方法的结合

摘要: 本文试图通过引入法兰克福学派第三代代表人霍内特 A. 和第二代代表人哈贝马斯 J. 最重要的思想, 对博德鲁诺夫的智慧经济学概念进行创造性扩展。这一结合的目的在于补充博德鲁诺夫 S.D. 的理论, 该理论详细阐述了生产制度的变化, 并根据这些变化得出了社会生活其他领域必将发生深刻变革的结论。文章建议通过对社会哲学成果的研究来解决这一问题, 主要应利用规范制度 (霍内特 A.) 建设和政治领域 (哈贝马斯 J.) 变化方面的研究成果。博德鲁诺夫 S. D. 也认同并正在研究这些变化, 从前述思想中得出的方法能够补充对未来社会结构的社会哲学分析。

关键词: 智慧经济学、社会化、道德上的自我约束、相互承认、团结、自由、民主法治国家。

¹ Published in the journal Questions of Political Economy. No. 1 (29). Pp. 121-134. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6525577. This re-publication is intended to introduce the ideas contained in this article to a wider readership.

引文注释:沙钦 S. V. (2022). 对智慧经济时代社会结构问题的看法——博德鲁诺夫 S. 政治经济学方法与霍内特 A. 和哈贝马斯 J. 社会哲学方法的结合 //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. 86–95. DOI: 10.37930/2782-6465-2022-1-4-86-95

1. S.D. Bodrunov's concept of Noonomy

S.D. Bodrunov, a well-known Russian entrepreneur, scientist and public figure (head of the Free Economic Society and the Institute for New Industrial Development) developed in his books and articles a theory of the society of the future, which he called the term “Noonomy”. The complexity of Bodrunov's theory lies in the dialectical nature of the concept of Noonomy: having begun as an economic society, it removes economy in the Hegelian sense as it develops and transforms into an entirely new form of social structure. This dialectic of Noonomy will be explained in this section of the paper. The superficial level of understanding the content of this concept derives from its name and represents the idea of an economy based on reason, i.e. a rational economic order. If we specify what is meant by intelligent economy, we come to the understanding that it will be an economy of knowledge, in which the final product (created by various economic agents) will have such a high intellectual component that it will radically surpass the material (tangible) component in importance [Bodrunov, 2018, pp. 72, 129]. This is the first feature of Noonomy: the primacy of knowledge and intellectual creativity not only over natural materials and resources, but also over what is not creativity (activities in which performance, following rigid algorithms, etc. predominate) [Bodrunov, 2018, pp. 73, 82].

But this is not enough: in order for people to become creators and intellectuals, the living conditions surrounding them must be favourable for the formation of the personality of a creator and a knowledge-seeking intellectual. But it is clear that for this to happen, basic human needs must be massively satisfied. It follows that under Noonomy a special mechanism comes to life, as the author himself puts it, “the mechanism for satisfying people's needs through a self-managed (under human control) system of production that does not depend on people's direct participation and that does not use labour as a factor of production.” [quoted in Bodrunov, 2020a, p. 58]. So the whole mind-based production system will work for humans in the sense that work for survival will be a thing of the past and humans will gain free time (which they can use to develop their skills) as a matter of course. And this signifies the second important feature of Noonomy: as a special mode of production, a way of organising economic life, this new social order will gradually dialectically abolish all economic features [Bodrunov, 2021, pp. 4, 16-18].

As a result, a special social order will emerge in which, as S. Bodrunov suggests, the socialisation of society will be accomplished. The author of the concept of Noonomy himself defines this as follows: “We can say that the ‘socialisation of society’ [our term – *author's note*] as a state is the currently achieved level of social organisation, culture, norms, etc., which is accepted by the majority of individuals. It is clear that this level is changing. The change of this level is the process of socialisation of society.” [Bodrunov, 2020b, p. 6]. S. Bodrunov also notes that he uses this concept as an alternative to the concept of “socialismisation”, i.e. the movement towards socialism [Bodrunov, 2020a, p. 58].

Socialisation of society is the meaning of Noonomy as a social order that has outgrown its economic framework. What are the specific features that constitute the content of this concept? To answer this question, we will refer to the text of S. Bodrunov's main book on our problem.

First of all, there will be a qualitative change in human needs: they will not just be put under the control of high culture, but the deviant actions that people take – both to satisfy their needs and in the process of production to satisfy their needs (destruction of the environment, distorted eating habits, tendency to demonstrative overconsumption, etc.) will be overcome. [Bodrunov, 2018, pp. 101-105]. Even more important is the ennoblement of man himself, because “sacred spiritual knowledge is instilled in him”, and this will smooth out other, deeper conflicts related to the unequal access of different people to real education [Bodrunov, 2018, p. 108]. Probably S. Bodrunov means that the state described by the Apostle Paul, in which “knowledge overshadows and love creates” will be overcome¹: Knowledge will cease to be a source of pride and will be united with love.

In this article we cannot describe Noonomy itself as a new social order, but we will deal with the transition period that Bodrunov calls “the new industrial society of the second generation (NIS.2)”. Its most important feature is, above all, the decreasing importance of material resources and the increasing importance of education and creativity in determining a person’s position in the social world [Bodrunov, 2018, pp. 105-108]. These processes result from the radical changes in material production described above, which, metaphorically speaking, lead to the dematerialisation of the final product. The same dematerialisation, “vaporisation” is experienced by the property relations of the means of production: the relations of their common use, the differentiation of property according to functions, the erosion of intellectual property, finally the alienation of property without adequate compensation from other property, which does not happen by force, but because there are the phenomena of the creatosphere described by A.V. Buzgalin, in which the principle of “ownership of everything by everyone” formulated by V. Mezhujev operates [Bodrunov, 2020, p. 57; Buzgalin, Kolganov, 2015, pp. 222-226, 333-334, 337-338].

There are texts in which Bodrunov, together with A.V. Buzgalin and A.I. Kolganov, analyses the relations of sharing – that is, the sharing of basic economic goods. This leads to astonishing results: “Not only the value of property increases “in parallel”, but also the openness of society, the transparency of the economy and of life as a whole. And then there will soon be no need for the protection of companies or of trade secrets. Which, by the way, are also forms of property management”².

And since the state in capitalist society is geared to the basic function of protecting and maintaining property rights, it will gradually change its function: “There will remain a certain analogue of this institution which regulates the relations of individuals – on the basis of their conscious and free acceptance of the regulatory ‘burden’ ... Not to administer, but – to regulate the relations of individuals other than their relations in the sphere of that very production, consumption, distribution, etc., economic and consequent relations... With a certain degree of convention, we can say that such a system of production becomes part of ‘nature’, of the ecosystem of the non-human. Society will live on material production, and the material sphere, which will be the system of production, will itself satisfy the needs, non-simulative needs of men. And this system of relations is not some structure called “social self-management”. It will be a “self-managed”

¹ Bible, 1 Paul’s letter to the Corinthians, 8: 1-1.

² Cited from: Bodrunov S.D., Buzgalin A.V., Kolganov A.I. Colloquium of the Witte Institute for New Industrial Development (INID) on “Sharing Economics and Noonomy”. Transcript (05.02.2020г.). C. 421. – URL: <https://noonomy.ru/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/%D0%A8%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B3-%D1%8D%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%BC%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0-%D0%B8-%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%BC%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0.pdf> (access: 22.07.2021).

production system under human control. This is an important difference between the theoretical concept of noosociety and the model of communism.” [Bodrunov, 2020a, p. 60].

We have quoted this important words from Bodrunov’s work on the state almost in full because we will allow ourselves not to limit the sphere of social self-management in the transition to Noonomy to the production system alone. In the following two sections of this article we will show how a system of conscious management of society as a whole can emerge on the basis of the free and collaborative activity of people. In doing so, we will first consider human beings as a whole, drawing on the socio-philosophical theory of A. Honneth, according to which an institutional system is emerging today based on *social* freedom, which (while preserving and developing two other freedoms – *negative and reflexive*) will precisely ensure the development of modernisation in terms of a truly rational social structure. In the final section of this paper, we will look at people from a particular perspective – as citizens of a democratic constitutional state. We will show how, through their activity, the state is transformed into a complex of social institutions that implement a certain life project formulated by the citizens, which corresponds to the human dignity of each individual. In this aspect of our analysis, we will draw on Habermas’ philosophy of the democratic constitutional state.

2. On a society of dialectical synthesis of freedom and solidarity: A. Honneth’s ideas

Society as a complex system develops according to laws on which there are different views in sociology. However, if we abandon sociological monism and adopt a pluralist view, it becomes clear that the process of Noonomy cannot be understood only by analysing the qualitative changes in material production. Equally important to the social whole are subsystems of social institutions or organisations and normative subsystems in which guidelines for individual and collective action are defined (an illustrative example of such sociology developed from a pluralist perspective is L. Semashko’s “tetrasociology” [Semashko, 1999, pp. 131-132, 141-142, 186-190]). Interestingly, this tradition has always existed in indigenous social sciences. As an example, consider the ideas of N. Bukharin, developed by the contemporary St. Petersburg sociologist (this article refers to his book [Semashko 1999, pp. 134-135]: Society consists of four basic elements – things, people, ideas, linked together by the organisation of work [Bukharin 1928, pp. 94, 142-144]. Since Deng Xiaoping believed he had developed his reform programme on the basis of N. Bukharin’s ideas, we see a kind of empirical confirmation of this pluralist social-philosophical concept in the magnificent results of China’s development in recent decades [Pantsov, 2013, pp. 53-65]. L. Semashko’s book analyses the entire tradition of pluralist sociology and offers a description of the laws of development of these four main spheres of society (nicely called “spherons”). However, one of the aspects of this approach, namely that concerning the sphere of socialisation, is only considered “tangentially” in the article (otherwise one would also have to make excursions into family and educational theory).

The narrow scope of the article does not allow for a critical analysis and comparison between the tradition that tends towards social philosophical monism and the tradition that tends towards pluralism (which should by no means be confused with methodological anarchism). However, we have relied on the latter to move organically to the ideas of the leader (1999-2015) of the Frankfurt School, A. Honneth. (A. Honneth himself was in the tradition of pluralism in sociology, but in his work he paid special attention to the analysis of the normative and institutional sphere of society). According to the German philosopher, the change of the normative system

towards a synthesis of freedom and solidarity and the corresponding change of the institutional system towards a society with realised social freedom are the most important preconditions for the possibility of universal social change. A. Honneth understands them in one sentence as the emergence of socialism as the maximum expression of the modernisation project [Honneth, 2015, pp. 165-166]. Even though S. Bodrunov may not have agreed with this formulation, a closer look at Honneth's concept would nevertheless lead to the conclusion that the society of the future he refers to is more in line with Bodrunov's idea of the socialisation of society. And this socialisation will take place not only in the sphere of culture and science (i.e. will not be limited to the ennoblement of man and social mores under the influence of culture and science), but also in the normative and institutional system. On this point, A. Honneth's social philosophy can complement S.D. Bodrunov's theory of Noonomy.

Let us now briefly consider first the normative changes and then the institutional changes that, according to Honneth, take place in society in the course of comprehensive modernisation.

With a sophisticated analysis that starts from the phenomenology of the feeling of invisibility, Honneth argues that the need for recognition is the basic social need of the individual. Recognition occurs simultaneously on three basic levels: 1) the physical individual who has needs and strives to love and be loved; 2) the abstract individual who has basic social rights and the rights of a member of a particular social and occupational group – here recognition of his rights is demanded; 3) and finally the concrete individual who has developed his skills and talents and embodied them in a concrete product – such an individual seeks recognition for his real achievements [Honneth, 1994, pp. 46, 211]. In modern society, however, there is what is called the conscious invisibilisation of the individual, when other people are quite clearly aware of the individual's right to recognition at some level, but withhold that recognition from him by treating him as non-existent [Honneth, 2009, pp. 82-91]. (For example, by ignoring a person's actual achievements and even withholding activities that correspond to his or her nature because one does not want to endow a person with the material component of recognition as a professional).

Nevertheless, ignoring recognition as a deliberate violation of the normative system leads to an irreversible destruction of the personal identity of those who do so (and in the minds of those who do not receive recognition, pathologies also arise). The reason is that the other and all together are the precondition and condition for the possibility of the identity of each self: society exists as many selves in a "we", qualitatively changed, and the issue is how this qualitative change turns out, i.e. with real or pathological relations between these selves that lead to the enrichment of their selves or the distortion of their sensory capacities. Genuine recognition arises from each participant in social interactions acquiring a special capacity to make a sudden and devastating blow to his or her ego [here A. Honneth refers to J. Kant [Honneth, 2009, p. 88; Kant, 1997, p. 83]. When such an act is reciprocal, each participant (or participants) in the interactions recognises that the purposiveness and purposefulness of the other(s) changes under the influence of his (their) activity, and in this he (they) sees that he (they) brings something new into the social world. This mutual recognition turns out to be the core of genuine sociality [Honneth, 2010, p. 32]. In terms of the development of the capacity for moral self-mastery in individuals, leading to a state in which all participants in interactions can recognise each other, a crucial component of the socialisation of society can be understood in terms of S.D. Bodrunov. Without this, pathologies arise, including the distortion of our rational faculties (here Honneth aptly complements other sociologists who see the widespread sense of emotional burnout as the price of not being

recognised: see e.g.: Rosa, 2013). It is only through the development of a moral conscience that a full human being can emerge, capable of using the opportunities afforded by the blatant progress of production in the NIS-2 for his own benefit and that of society as a whole (rather than realising the version of an electronic concentration camp, a totalitarian technotronic society, etc. that Bodrunov himself warns against in his book).

The previous long paragraph described the changes within the normative system of society that will serve as conditions for the possibility of transition to Noonomy. We now describe the changes in the institutional system on the basis of Honneth's concept. In one sentence, this is the emergence of a full-fledged social freedom society (which Honneth calls socialist).

In analysing this institutional environment, Honneth refers to the processes of goal setting and goal attainment by individuals. The whole question revolves around what others are to the individual. If it is those who can potentially act as opponents, obstacles to the achievement of a goal or as means, then this would be an expression of an insufficiently rational social order. If as those who can pursue individual goals independently of me and whose results I can join or use to achieve my goals (and they will do the same to me), then this variant is more rational, but still far from the state of fully-fledged social freedom. This will only be the case if everyone in the process of goal-setting not only takes into account the goal of others, but also sees their success in achieving their goals as a crucial condition for the success of their own goals. In the process of realising their goals, individuals will undertake joint activities that are consistent with their underlying needs and interests, based on an attitude of mutual recognition and moving towards a fuller, deeper and more multilayered unfolding of the content of solidarity relations in their dialectical unity with freedom. Everyone will be supported by others and will only realise their goals if others realise their goals [Honneth, 2015, pp. 40-42].

This is the form of activity that will result from the gradual emancipation of man from material production in the course of Noonomy. Around this activity will emerge a completely different institutional environment in which everyone will not simply be "at home" but will be clearly aware of how his (her) efforts will lead to a change in the social world for the better, to the formation of an increasingly intelligent social order. That is, according to Honneth, the formation of socialist relations is a consequence of the unfolding of a certain socialisation process, which means the gradual realisation of the highest value of social freedom in the world [Honneth, 2015, p.166]. Let us specify that social freedom in this case is realised in unity with negative freedom (by virtue of which everyone has spheres of activity that are beyond the control of others and do not violate moral and legal laws) and reflexive freedom (by virtue of which everyone chooses not arbitrary goals but those that correspond both to moral law in the Kantian sense and to the creative purpose of his self) [Honneth, 2011: on negative freedom: pp. 33-43; on reflexive freedom: pp. 58-80; on social freedom: pp. 101-118].

Thus, thanks to the theory of A. Honneth, it was possible to reveal some additional important aspects in the content of the process of socialisation of society opened and described by S. Bodrunov, thanks to which it will be possible to overcome important threats related to the formation of Noonomy (e.g. dissociation) and to overcome important challenges (e.g. the necessity of transition from "zoo" to "noo"). Only an individual who is recognised by others and is himself recognised by others can freely develop his intelligence and thus improve the world; and only in an institutional environment where he feels "at home" can he develop his individual activity in solidarity with others.

In the next section, we will show that it is the democratic rule of law, in Bodrunov's terminology, that can provide such a well-developed institutional environment for people in the contemporary period (corresponding to the emergence of NIS-2). We will thus proceed to an analysis of the ideas of the late Habermas. At the same time, we will address the problem of state transformation in the course of the transition to Noonomy outlined by Bodrunov in his theory. Bodrunov outlines in the texts known to the author and cited above.

3. The democratic rule of law as an institutional complex through which social freedom can be achieved

The state has two aspects which complement each other dialectically: society as a whole is ruled both for the purpose of realising the general interest and for the purpose of realising the will of the ruling class. The extent to which the ruling class (in capitalism it is the bourgeoisie, which regards the multiplication of capital as its *raison d'être*) realises the general interest is a subject of a special analysis. The state creates the necessary preconditions for the whole of society so that this accumulation of capital is carried out as smoothly and effectively as possible.

However, Habermas has already shown in his works of the early 1980s and especially in his "Theory of Communicative Action" that this society has an enormous price to pay: a consequent destruction of the lifeworld in which the symbolic reproduction of society takes place [Habermas, 1987, pp. 576-587] (this diagnosis of modernity by Habermas was concretised by A. Honneth through his doctrine of artificial invisibility, which we discussed above).

The transition to Noonomy depends, metaphorically speaking, on the starting point of the process: if the pathologies described are not overcome, instead of Noonomy we will get a general digital concentration camp and other apocalyptic phenomena (not to mention a growing ecological crisis that, above a certain threshold, could mean the end of human civilisation).

Therefore, it is necessary to redesign the state as the only suitable governing authority for the whole of society in such a way that it gradually contributes to the formation of a rational social order in the sense Axel Honneth presents it in his works.

The core idea of Habermas' theory of the democratic constitutional state is simple and at the same time very insightful: it is up to the citizens themselves to define, in free discussions, the meaning of their state, i.e. the basic principles of its functioning, which, if implemented, will gradually build a society that corresponds to the human dignity of all [Habermas, 1994a, pp. 536-537; Habermas, 1994a, pp. 536-537]. Habermas, 1994a, pp. 536-537; Habermas, 1994b, pp. 625-631; Habermas, 2009, pp. 162-169]. But the basic conditions must be in place: economic, ecological, social, cultural, etc., on the basis of which all those concerned can participate in the discussion (Habermas, 1994a, pp. 155-157, 165). In this sense, the crucial changes in production that S.D. Bodrunov writes about create preconditions, but there must also be serious joint activity in institutions based on social freedom, in the course of which these other preconditions will gradually emerge. So it turns out that any purposeful activity in the four main spheres of society (we refer here to the ideas of L. Semashko to clearly define these spheres: Economy, Organisation, Culture and Socialisation [Semashko, 1999, pp. 186-190]) – has a political significance, because the first act of adopting the principles of a democratic constitutional state without carrying out this extensive preliminary work will prove impossible or incomplete.

Moreover, the state must create the legal conditions for all relevant voices (i.e. relevant opinions expressing the interests of social classes and groups as well as individuals) to be heard in such

discussions on the principles of the state and the goals of state development and to be reflected in the results of the discussions. This is the main function of the constitutional court – to examine whether the described procedural (i.e. determining the course of political discourse) requirement, which is crucial for the success of this debate, is fulfilled [Habermas, 1994a, pp. 328-329, 345-348].

The result of these discussions is that the fundamental demands of the citizens of the state can be expressed in the language of law. Therefore, Habermas examines in detail the properties of law as a universal medium (i.e. as a means of regulating social relations). Firstly, it formulates the norms of action for the state bureaucracy, sets limits to its arbitrariness and forms the framework for its actions – i.e. it is the language of law that is understandable and binding for the authorities. Even more: legal norms can reasonably express this common will, which has emerged in the course of the described discussions about the principles of state building and the goals of state action, than the arbitrariness of the ruling class, which seeks to suppress the resistance of the humiliated and oppressed, or the decisions of the autocrat, for which he is responsible only to God, etc. Thus, through an analysis of the legal system, a critical social theory can draw scientifically valid conclusions about the rationality of the institutional system, which provide progressive social forces with clear guidelines for their political struggle. Finally, law also provides a framework for the actions of citizens and thus orients them towards lawful conduct in the Kantian sense, i.e. it requires that their conduct (which can be based on anything, i.e. both morality and inclination) must not interfere with the free pursuit of goals by other subjects of law. (In other words, as V. Soloviev said, and his thought can be quoted to illustrate this idea, the rule of law may not guarantee the establishment of paradise on earth, but it will prevent society from falling into a veritable hell). But at the same time, law in the universal sense understood by Habermas allows everyone to change their attitude: instead of being the addressee of the legal norm in the sense described, one can become the author of law at any time, i.e. enter into discussions and formulate the content of the legal norm with the others. The citizens of the rule of law will therefore regard the legal system as reasonable, i.e. as one that expresses their real interests, if they are able to unite their efforts both in the process of knowing and formulating this universal interest and in the struggle for its realisation, which involves, among other things, competition between political parties. And therefore such a legal system would have legitimacy in their eyes – citizens would thus obey the laws “not out of fear, but out of conscience”, as a Russian saying goes [Habermas, 1994a, pp. 57-60, 101-108].

This is the system of democratic rule-of-law institutions detailed in Habermas' writings. Habermas has outlined the main features here. The citizens of a state first agree on the principles and goals of state activity, on its organisation and other fundamental matters and formulate them in the Basic Law, the constitution [Habermas, 1994a, pp. 196-210]. Noonomy in the sense of S. Bodrunov creates the necessary material conditions for participation in these discussions, while the cultural, ecological, socialisational conditions in other spheres of activity (which can take place according to the laws of social freedom described by A. Honneth) and the organisational conditions are created by the state itself (which creates the legal conditions for the discussions and ensures that all meaningful opinions are expressed and heard). Moreover, they express their collective will in the language of law, which is binding on both the state bureaucracy and citizens, making moral behaviour enforceable (because a person placed within the framework set by legal norms can at least refrain from completely immoral behaviour). As a result, the citizens within the institutions of democratic state based on the rule of law carry out society-wide governing

actions, in which each person can be aware of himself/herself, if he/she actively uses his/her civil rights [Habermas, 1994a, pp. 430-434]. These actions of governance would be the socialisation of society in the sense of S. Bodrunov, i.e. contribute to the ennoblement of each person, promote “transition from zoo to noo”. And only such an ennobled person can truly take advantage of the opportunities that Noonomy will open, i.e. opportunities in which the free development of everyone will be a condition of the free development of all.

Conclusion

Thus, the social philosophical developments of the thinkers of the Frankfurt School complement the ideas of S. Bodrunov in the sense that they help to reveal the content of the concept of “socialisation of society”. According to A. Honneth, it has two aspects: the normative and the institutional, and according to J. Habermas, the political aspect. Normatively, the socialisation of society is based on the mass spread of the attitude of moral self-restraint (overcoming the ego) in people, on the basis of which they will be able to recognise and be recognised by others. Through a relationship of mutual recognition, an institutional environment can be created in which social freedom can be realised. This means that if everyone sets and achieves goals, they will count on the support of others as a crucial condition for the possibility of successful action, and in turn will support both certain individuals and institutions in order to achieve collective goals.

Habermas has shown that a universal collective goal – which can only be achieved within a society – is to create a life of human dignity for all. But to achieve this, citizens of the state must formulate, in the language of law, the concrete content of the idea of a human society and the ways to realise it, while the state itself also ensures that all the necessary conditions for the organisation and success of such discussions are met. Moreover, citizens create an extensive and diverse institutional environment for the rule of law itself. In this environment, every individual can participate in the development of legal norms and thus become the author of the law or be obliged as an addressee to comply with the legal norms, but not only compulsorily through external coercion, but also voluntarily, since the law has an appropriate legitimacy in his or her eyes. This means that the state creates all the conditions for the legal system to become increasingly reasonable and consistent with the collective project (although this global goal depends only on the activity of citizens).

Multiple forms of solidarity activities in an institutional environment outside the purely economic sphere (above all political, cultural and organisational activities) will thus not only “occupy” people detached from material production, but help them to pursue universal goals that correspond to the underlying rational purpose of both each individual and the human species as a whole.

References

- Bodrunov S.D. (2018) Noonomy. Moscow: Cultural revolution. 432 p. (In Russ.)
- Bodrunov S.D. (2020a) On the question of a comparative analysis of theories of noonomy and socialism // Questions of political economy. № 3 (23). Pp. 52-66. DOI: 10.5281 / zenodo.4067045 (<https://zenodo.org/record/4067045>). (In Russ.)
- Bodrunov S.D. (2020b) Socialization: a thorny path to noonomy // Economic revival of Russia. №. 4. Pp. 5-13. (In Russ.)

- Buzgalin A.V., Kolganov A.I. (2015) The global capital. Moscow: Editorial URSS. Vol. 1. – 656 p.; Vol. 2. – 888 p. (In Russ.)
- Bukharin N.I. (1928) The theory of historical materialism. A popular textbook on Marxist sociology. Ed. 5, stereotype. Moscow – Leningrad: State publishing house. – 390 p. (In Russ.)
- Pantsov A.V. (2013) Deng Xiaoping. (Series “The Life of Remarkable People”). Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya. – 558 p. (In Russ.)
- Semashko L.M. (1999) Sociology for pragmatists. From monism to tetralism. Textbook for university students. Part I. Saint-Petersburg: European Publishing House. – 376 p. URL: <https://peacefromharmony.org/docs/sociologiya-dlya-pragmatikov.pdf> (date accessed: 22.07.2021). (In Russ.)
- Kant I. (1997) Foundations for the metaphysics of morals // Kant I. Works in 4 volumes in Russian and German. Vol. 3. Moscow: Moscow Philosophy Foundation. – Pp. 39-276. (In Russ.)
- Honneth A. (2009) Invisibility. On the moral epistemology of recognition. Translation from German into Russian by A. Shachina and S. Shachin. // Kant’s collection. № 1 (29). – Pp. 79-91. (In Russ.)
- Bodrunov S.D. (2021) Noonomy as the Material Basis for a Prospective Humanitarian Model of Public Order // Sustainability. 2021, 13, 1454. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031454>. – 20 p. (In German)
- Habermas Jürgen (1987) Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns. 4 Aufl. Frankfurtam-Main: Suhrkamp-Verlag, 1987. Bd. 1. – 534 p.; Bd. 2. – 596 p. (In German)
- Habermas Jürgen (1994a) Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zu einer Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaates. 4., erw. Aufl. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp-Verlag. – 704 p. (In German)
- Habermas Jürgen (1994b) Volkssouveränität als Verfahren // Habermas Jürgen. Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zu einer Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaates. 4., erw. Aufl. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp-Verlag. – Pp. 600-631. (In German)
- Habermas Jürgen (2009) Der demokratische Rechtsstaat – eine paradoxe Verbindung widersprüchlicher Prinzipien? // Habermas Jürgen. Philosophische Texte: Studienausgabe in 5 Bänden. Bd. Politische Theorie. Frankfurt am Main: SuhrkampVerlag. – Pp. 154-176. (In German)
- Honneth A. (1994) Kampf um Anerkennung: Zur moralischen Grammatik sozialer Konflikte. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag. – 352 p. (In German)
- Honneth A. (2010) Von der Begierde zur Anerkennung. Hegels Begründung von Selbstbewusstsein // Honneth A. Das Ich im Wir. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag. – Pp. 15-32. (In German)
- Honneth A. (2011) Das Recht der Freiheit: Grundriss einer demokratischen Sittlichkeit. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag. – 628 p. (In German)
- Honneth A. (2015) Die Idee des Sozialismus: Versuch einer Aktualisierung. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag. – 168 p. (In German)
- Rosa H. (2013) Beschleunigung und Entfremdung: Entwurf einer kritischen Theorie spätmoderner Zeitlichkeit. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag. – 154 p. (In German.)

Information about the author

Svyatoslav V. Shachin

Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences at Murmansk Arctic State University (16, Captain Egorov St., 183038, Murmansk, Russian Federation)

E-mail: s_shachin@mail.ru