

“Homo Nooeconomicus” as a Human Image for the Noospheric Epoch

Grigory Smirnov

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Ivanovo State University (Ivanovo, Russia)

E-mail: gssmirnov@mail.ru

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5797-2121>

Alena Odintsova

Postgraduate student, Ivanovo State University (Ivanovo, Russia)

E-mail: a.a.odintsova@mail.ru

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0562-5216>

The article is devoted to the conceptualization of the “new homo economicus” model through the ideas of noospheric human image and noospheric economy. The authors claim that the epoch of noosphere requires a thorough review of human qualities core. It is shown that the image of a “due” economic entity can be based on the model of “homo nooeconomicus”, whose key features are determined by the specificities of his worldview, realized from the perspective of the noospheric economic consciousness. The authors show that this form of consciousness provides the reflection and construction of relations between economic agents in the processes of manufacture, distribution, exchange and consumption of goods and services from the standpoint of fairness and responsibility in order to ensure reasonable sustainable socio-natural and socio-cultural development. It is stated that the cultural centers of the nooeconomic consciousness ensure creative, fair and responsible activity of the “homo nooeconomicus” in the biosphere, sociosphere, technosphere and the sphere of culture.

Keywords: homo economicus, homo sapiens noosphericus, homo nooeconomicus, nooeconomic consciousness, economic imperative

Received: November 20, 2018; accepted: January 25, 2019

Future Human Image, Volume 11, 2019: 91-97.

<https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/11/10>

Prominent scientists and philosophers have always been concerned about anthropological problems relating to human nature, life, and possibilities of his further development. In a global context, the problem of a human being is becoming the problem of humanity, capable both of generating the conditions for global catastrophes and of overcoming occurred tragedy,

© Smirnov, Grigory, 2019

© Odintsova, Alena, 2019

preventing it [Moiseev, 1998]. The catastrophism of the 21st century manifests itself in various spheres. Economic sphere is the structure where the ambivalence of human development is felt most profoundly: it destroys creating and creates destroying, and it is difficult to determine the point where its rhythms are "compensated".

Recent scientific works contain a considerable amount of findings devoted to the problems of the economic crisis both at global and national levels: economists are trying to identify its origins, to form some series of forecasts [Shahkeldov, 2016], to determine the relationship between the economic crisis and the crisis of economics; politicians are inventing measures of state regulation aimed at combating destructive phenomena; psychologists are exploring some problems of human adaptation to the crisis [Vorobyeva, 2016], etc. However, we must agree that humanity is only preparing to create planetary universal human forms of noospheric existence. Thus, the current world crisis emphasizes a significant discrepancy between the imperative of creative, purposeful environmental activity of human beings and its real state — actual ecological, economic, political, social and cultural opportunities. This raises the issue of adequate forms and ways of the world harmonization.

We consider, that the basis of these forms and ways lay in the "economics of the noosphere" and the "noospheric economy" concepts, which are found in the works of such scientists as Nikita Moiseev [Moiseev, 1998], Lindon Hermyle LaRouche [LaRouche, 2001], Yuriy Osipov [Osipov, 2016], and some other authors. A significant advantage of these modern nooeconomic paradigms is the "humanization" of economic activity: the noospheric economy is inevitably connected with the certain degree of the human participation in economic relations, with the human-saving way of social reproduction, with progressive humanization of the economic space [Galchinskiy, 2015: 49]. At the same time, from the above perspectives, the welfare of human beings is considered mostly as a result of noospheric economy. It seems that such a one-sided approach to the human function in the "new economy" can be supplemented by the emphasis on the active human role in the noospheric economy. For instance, according to Alexander Ageev and Eugene Loginov nooeconomy is defined as the "economic form of human realization of social self-maintenance for the harmonious development of anthropogenic environment with the use of material and spiritual factors and a dominant part of cognitive factors" [Ageev & Loginov, 2011]. Within the framework of this definition, humanity appears to be both a beneficiary and a creator of noospheric economy. In our view, in order to build a positively developing economic space we must consider the activity of humanity as the primary cause of the pressing global changes, "the source of all our problems, <...> and aspirations" [Peccei, 1985: 214]. It has to be accepted that the involvement of Mind in the economic mechanisms is "the most important stage in the evolution of market mechanism" [Moiseev, 1998: 152]. From this point of view, the causes of the global economic crisis can be found in the imperfection, "incompleteness" of human beings and humanity as a whole. Thus, the purpose of this work is to reveal the transitive logic of human qualities through the representation of "due" integral future human image in the discourse of noospheric economy.

Turning to the problem of the "new homo economicus", it must be mentioned that some general ideas of human evolution in the economic sphere can be formed on the basis of anthropogenesis research, according to which the modern man — homo sapiens sapiens — has passed through several development periods from "Proconsul" primates (which had few common physiological characteristics with a modern man) through "homo habilis" and "homo erectus", who could produce tools for gathering and hunting, to the intelligent human being, capable not only to carry out economic activities, but also to anticipate their

results. So does this mean that human evolution in the economic sphere has stopped? We strongly believe that it is continuing. More than that, it seems that this evolution is entering its revolutionary phase.

In science and philosophy, the image of a human being in the economic sphere is determined by various characteristics of “homo”. The most recognizable model among them is “homo economicus”, the essential features of which were outlined by Adam Smith in the 18th century [Smith, 2007: 350] and the abstract research model was presented by John Stuart Mill in the 19th century [Mill, 2007]. The egoism and consumerism of the 21st century lead to the conclusion that scientific abstraction has become a reality.

Modern philosophers indicate the following features of “homo economicus”: his existence is strongly connected with the choice in terms of a limited number of available resources; this choice is determined by relatively stable preferences (subjective needs) and changing limitations (objective opportunities); “homo economicus” is rational, utilitarian; he lives in the state of limited and expensive information.

Selfishly exaggerating his local interests and reducing the functions of his mind to forecasting the size of personal benefits “homo economicus” actually goes back to his ancestors — homo habilis and homo erectus — who were running economy without looking far into the future, without predicting global consequences of their activity. In this regard, the philosophical question about the “homo economicus” transformation into “homo sapiens”, “homo cognitivus”, “homo creator” (“creativus”), “new homo economicus” and into other types in which “homo economicus” “becomes a human” [Oleksenko & Fedorova, 2017] seems to be interesting and important. For instance, alongside with the “homo economicus” the concepts of the economic individual and the economic personality appear, where the main quality of the economic personality in comparison with the economic individual is considered to be his involvement in social structures. Thus, the philosophy seems to be aimed at overcoming the limitation of “homo economicus” through the development of alternative, the holistic image of human being in the economy. In Russian socio-philosophical discourse the notion of such an image goes back to the religious philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov [Solovyov, 2012], Nikolay Berdyaev [Berdyaev, 2008], Sergey Bulgakov [Bulgakov, 2009] and is defined in modern literature as an economic entity organizing economic activity, endowed with an endless desire to produce and consume material and spiritual goods through its own free creative activity; inclined to “continuous thinking in the process of economic action, which sets unlimited possibilities not only for economic problems solution in the modern era but also for understanding that economy is knowledge in action, and knowledge is economy in the idea” [Miroshkin, 2016: 101] (hence, such a model appears to be an “antipode” of the concept “homo economicus”).

An urgent need for changing human relations as far as the relations in the systems “human — nature” and “human — artificial environment” arisen on a global scale requires a spiritual revival. From our point of view, the transition toward the noospheric economy requires humanity to possess a system of specific — nooeconomic — cognitive qualities. In other words, we are talking about the “homo economicus” transformation into the model of “homo nooeconomicus” through the redistribution of the balance between material and ideal values of economic consciousness in favor of a reasonable sustainable socio-natural and socio-cultural development and of the economic life integrity.

This research of “homo nooeconomicus” as a particular “subspecies” raises the problem of theoretical conceptualization of his “species” fundamentals. We consider that the concept of

"homo economicus" cannot be used due to its previously approved "spiritual impoverishment" and value discreteness. We are convinced that the current state of social relationships, where the emphasis has been shifted to the "essence" instead of the "proper", < ... > total consumerism is gradually becoming a global ideology; civilization threatens the very existence of national cultures, modern technologies with all their increasing power step on "subject concepts", meta-anthropology and human individuality pushing it to the periphery of the historical process, the concept of "homo nooeconomicus" should obviously be based on another system, another pole of human qualities by adapting it to the peculiarities of the economic sphere. We suggest that such a "quality system" can be found in the model of "homo sapiens noospherus" — a reasonable subject, able to model the large number of world variations and his place in it, to choose and implement the invariant of the choice adequate from the point of absolute beginning, semiotic, existential, moral, ecological and noospheric imperatives of life. The key quality of "homo sapiens noospherus" is, therefore, a special form of consciousness — noospheric consciousness. We share the view that "the near future is the time of a cognitive human revolution" [Smirnov & Smirnov, 2019]. Thus, in our opinion, the difference between "homo economicus" and "homo sapiens nooeconomicus" lies in the features of their worldview: "homo nooeconomicus" like a "homo sapiens noospherus" is a whole personality with noospheric consciousness, the main energy of which is thinking in accordance with the basic noospheric law: thought generates energy, the energy structures the matter. The distinction between "homo nooeconomicus" and "homo sapiens noospherus", in turn, is determined by the particular sphere of "homo nooeconomicus" thinking and activity: the special form of "homo nooeconomicus" consciousness — noospheric economic consciousness — is heavily oriented towards consideration of human, society and nature as a single integrated system with a focus on global substrate. In this light nooeconomic consciousness implies the reflection and construction of relations between economic agents in the processes of manufacture, distribution, exchange and consumption of goods and services from the standpoint of fairness and responsibility in order to ensure reasonable sustainable socio-natural and socio-cultural development, cosmic integrity of economic life [Odintsova, 2018]. Thus, our position correlates with that of Oleg Bazaluk, concluding that "the intelligent matter represented on Earth in the form of human society has cosmological roots, so the consideration of the human social existence outside the scope of the whole world is impossible" [Bazaluk, 2016]. The consciousness and activity of "homo nooeconomicus" are carried out in the coordinates of the noospheric picture of the world, which suggests universal coherence of scientific thought. Because of this, all his economic activities are determined by the priority of spiritual, ideal structures over material constants.

In our view, axiological and praxiological differences between "homo economicus" and "homo nooeconomicus" in the noosphere can be successfully described through the distribution of the economic relations balance within the noospheric picture of the world. As far as "homo economicus" is concerned, his consciousness seems to be mosaic: it only provides consumption in the biosphere, manufacture in the technosphere, distribution and exchange in the sociosphere, but the sphere of culture is fully excluded from the economic relations. The balance of "homo nooeconomicus" activity, in contrast, is shifted: all the production activity is carried out in the light of the cultural sphere: "homo nooeconomicus" produces ideal goods, shares, distributes and actively uses them. Moreover, "homo nooeconomicus" takes into account not only scientific, but also other aspects of culture: religious (which causes certain business ethics), aesthetic ("homo nooeconomicus" is guided by the principle of beauty in all his activities), philosophical (which provides a holistic, planetary perception of the economy,

prescience, global thinking). It is fair to point out that the intelligence system is based on scientific thought (at the level of the structure), philosophy and religion (at the level of the concept).

“Homo nooeconomicus” activity in other structures of the noospheric picture is also guided by culture: it determines responsible and innovative manufacture in the technosphere, fair distribution and equivalent exchange in the sociosphere, regeneration of nature in the biosphere. Cultural centers become the foundation structures in the consciousness of “homo nooeconomicus”.

It must be noted that the important part in “homo nooeconomicus” consciousness belongs to information. This correlates with the characteristics of nooeconomy, which include the increasing role of organizational capital, enhancing the role of virtual, cognitive information, intellectual part in value of goods; the formation of convergent network with information and computing services for noo-based knowledge and management; humanity’s awareness of the need for universal priority of the society (and noospheric) values and others [Ageev & Loginov, 2011].

Thus, the subject of noospheric economy appears to be an informed person but associated with a social substrate. This enables “homo nooeconomicus” to be regarded as a semiotic person, whose consciousness and cognition are associated with the following skills: ability to see multilevel values and meanings in a particular phenomenon, process, object; the analysis of the fact as a sign; definition of the system and structural relationships between signs and symbols within a particular semiotic situation; investigation of the functional role of the signal, symptom, sign, symbol, etc.; operation by cultural signals, symptoms, signs, symbols, etc. for the purpose of socialization and identification within the framework of the certain society; building of the noospheric picture of the world which is appropriate to reality.

In addition to the value of information we must note that axiological basis of “homo nooeconomicus” includes, except justice and responsibility mentioned above, freedom (however limited by rights of other subjects and humanity in general), all forms of ownership, noospheric democracy, individual and collective unity, knowledge, culture, possession, entrepreneurship, scientific work, invention, love for all people, respect for nature, etc. Furthermore, the vital activity of “homo nooeconomicus” is defined by the economic imperative, which could be worded as follows: act in the interest of the main goal of economy, which is to provide the harmonization of the human, society and nature goods through the process of people’s and economic goods’ integration. The content of the economic imperative can also be supplemented and expanded at the expense of the environmental [Moiseev, 1998: 79], semiotic, moral [Kant, 2015], noospheric imperatives. The balance of these imperatives in noospheric economy can be summarized as follows: the noospheric imperative determines the ontological foundations of the economic sphere, the semiotic imperative characterizes its epistemological side, the moral imperative describes the axiology of noospheric economy, and the environmental and economic imperatives build its praxiological basis. In addition, we shall notice, that there is an interdependence between the content of economic and environmental imperatives: the first one alters the economic mechanisms of “rational choice” in favour of harmonization of the social needs and environmental interests, and the second one determines the very opportunity of this “choice” since it guarantees the very possibility of the environment and social life on the Earth.

The praxiology of “homo nooeconomicus” can be presented through his focus on the “labor restoration of the world” [Bulgakov, 2009: 193], creative manufacture, ascetic attitude

to life [Osipov, 2016], overcoming superheterotrophy through the transition to the autotrophic mechanisms of generating resources [Vernadsky, 1940]. In this sense, economic austerity can be defined as a system of values, that provides conscious economic relationship between human beings, society and nature, based on the self-restraint of mankind while consuming in order to preserve and restore material and spiritual integrity of the whole world with the use of the mechanisms and principles of intellectual development, active labor activity.

Thus, “homo nooeconomicus” can be defined as an economic subject with economic noospheric consciousness focused on creative activity in the conditions of ascetic self-restraint, based on the system of imperatives in order to provide reasonable sustainable socio-natural and socio-cultural development with its result which is the integrity of the cosmo-planetary economic life. In this sense, homo nooeconomicus is a synthetic model of ‘due’, which includes economic qualities of homo cognitivus, homo creator, homo ecologicus, homo religiosus, homo symbolicus, homo globalis, homo cosmicus and other actors of noospheric history.

It should be recognized that in the epoch of noospheric disasters “new homo economicus” as the image of a “due” economic entity is intended to become not just an actor, but, in the words of Werner Sombart, a “hero” of the new — noo — economy, the antipode of the technospheric “trader” who wants only “to take, wants at the expense of the least possible action to exchange for himself as much as possible, wants to make a great deal with life” [Sombart, 2005: 52]. Such a “deal” of “homo economicus-technospherus” has already gone through and put at risk the life of the whole mankind on the planet. Obviously, the time of the economic hero — homo nooeconomicus — is approaching in order to ensure the restoration of fragile harmony on the Earth.

References

- Ageev, Alexander, and Eugene Loginov. Nooeconomy: a certain economy in an uncertain future. *Journal of the ES*. 2011. <http://spkurdyumov.ru/economy/nooeconomika> (in Russian).
- Bazaluk, Oleg. *The Theory of Evolution: From a Space Vacuum to Neural Ensembles and Moving Forward*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016.
- Berdyayev, Nikolai. *The Russian idea*. St. Petersburg: ABC-classics, 2008 (in Russian).
- Bulgakov, Sergey. *Philosophy of economy* / Resp. edited by O. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian civilization, 2009 (in Russian).
- Galchinskiy, Anatoliy. Political nooeconomics. *Economic theory*. Vol. 3, 2015: 43-56.
- Kant, Immanuel. *The Critique of Practical Reason*. Moscow: Eksmo-Press, 2015 (in Russian).
- LaRouche, Lindon H. *The Economics of the Noosphere*. Washington D. C.: EIR News Service, Inc., 2001.
- Mill, John. On the issue of the definition of the political economy subject and of its research method. *Fundamentals of political economy with some applications to social philosophy*. Moscow: Eksmo, 2007: 985-1023 (in Russian).
- Miroshkin, Michael. The anthropological meaning of Bulgakov’s philosophy of economy. *Bulletin of the Moscow State Regional University. Series: Philosophical Sciences*. Vol. 3, 2016: 100-108 (in Russian).
- Moiseev, Nikita. *The fate of civilization. The way of Mind*. Moscow: Publishing house of the International Independent Ecological and Political University, 1998 (in Russian).

- Odintsova, Alena. From nooeconomic consciousness to nooeconomic consciousness: the categorical discourse of the philosophy of economy. *Philosophy of economy*. Vol. 1, 2018: 102-117 (in Russian).
- Oleksenko, Roman, and Lidiia Fedorova. Homo Economicus as the Basis of ‘Asgardia’ Nation State in Space: Perspective of Educational Technologies. *Future Human Image*. Vol. 7, 2017: 113-119.
- Osipov, Yuriy. Economic gnosis: stray from abstract theorizing to an adequate view of reality. *Philosophy of economy*. Vol. 2, 2016: 9-26 (in Russian).
- Peccei, Aurelio. *Human qualities*. Moscow: Progress, 1985 (in Russian).
- Shahkeldov, Friedrich. On the issue of the world economic crisis and the prospects of economic development of Russia. *Modern scientific thought*. Vol. 1, 2016: 104-112 (in Russian).
- Smirnov, Grigory, and Dmitry Smirnov. Cephalization of the Noosphere: Socio-Philosophical Aspects. *Philosophy and Cosmology*. Volume 22, 2019: 137-143. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/22/12>
- Smith, Adam. *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. Moscow: Eksmo, 2007 (in Russian).
- Solovyov, Vladimir. *The justification of the good*. Moscow: Institute of Russian civilization, Algorithm, 2012 (in Russian).
- Sombart, Werner. Merchants and heroes. *Works in 3 vol*. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2005, 2005: 8-104 (in Russian).
- Vernadsky, Vladimir. Autotrophy of humanity. *Biogeochemical essays*. Moscow, Leningrad: Publishing house of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1940: 47-58 (in Russian).
- Vorobyeva, Anastasiia. Economic and psychological factors of adaptation to the economic crisis in the field of leisure and employment. *Values and interests of modern society: proceedings of the IV international scientific and practical conference*. Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow University for the Humanities, 2016: 28-35 (in Russian).