

The Cosmoplanetary Economy of Lost Humanity: the Postnonclassical Version of Noospheric Ontology (Philosophical Reflection)

Grigoriy Smirnov

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Ivanovo State University (Ivanovo, Russian Federation)

E-mail: gssmirnov@mail.ru

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

Alena Artemyeva

Intern-researcher of Education Center “Complex Noosphere Research,” Ivanovo State University (Ivanovo, Russian Federation)

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

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

Smirnov, Grigoriy and Alena Artemyeva (2021) The Cosmoplanetary Economy of Lost Humanity: the Postnonclassical Version of Noospheric Ontology (Philosophical Reflection). *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 26, 156-168. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/26/13>

The article describes the theoretical basis of cosmoplanetary economy representations in their ontological, epistemological, axiological and praxeological dimensions that were suggested in science and philosophy in the 20th and 21st centuries. It is shown that the conceptualization of cosmoplanetary economy and economics comes from the works of Sergey Bulgakov, Sergey Podolinsky, Vladimir Vernadskiy, Nikita Moiseev, Vlail Kaznacheev, Pobisk Kuznetsov and manifests itself in various models of noospheric economy. It is concluded that in the current realities of the intensive scientific and philosophical search for some new economic and ecological theories, a complex model of “cosmoplanetary economy” is constructed as a meta-economy so as to ensure the survival of humanity in the face of the destructive force of global catastrophism of the 21st century.

Keywords: cosmoplanetary economy, noospheric economy, digital economy, market, economics, noospheric picture of the world

Received: 6 December 2020 / Accepted: 5 January 2021 / Published: 29 January 2021

© Smirnov, Grigoriy, 2021

© Artemyeva, Alena, 2021

Midway upon the journey of our life
I found myself within a forest dark,
For the straightforward pathway had been lost.

(Dante Alighieri. *Divine Comedy*.)

Metatheoretical preamble

The modern economy world consists of a huge number of elements-subjects: local, regional, interregional, transregional and global subsystems of different levels and personifications are inextricably linked by a number of insurmountable (and even antagonistic) contradictions. All previous economic activity of mankind was based on the principles of extensive development and exploitation of nature in order to receive the maximum of economic benefits and satisfy all social and economic needs of an increasing number of people. Each civilization tried to find some way of extensive development, providing both the nation's best survival and effective defense of national interests, associated with rich and super-rich minority priorities. There was a worldwide competition of national elites, which traditionally resulted in small and large wars (in the 20th century — in the World Wars) to institutionalize and constitutionalize different planetary economic models.

For two centuries, the civilizational approach had been explaining the economic technologies of world development; the creation of a global image of mankind had proved challenging for humanity divided by linguistic and cultural differences. Ultimately, the antagonisms manifested themselves in tragic series of both continental (O. Spengler) and planetary disasters (Meadows, 1991).

The first national not apocalyptic version of the Tower of Babel for global humanity was announced in literature in the 19th century (by Aleksander Pushkin, Mikhail Lermontov, Nikolay Danilevsky, Nikolay Gogol, Lev Tolstoy, Feodor Dostoevsky, Peter Kropotkin, Nikolay Fedorov, Vladimir Solovyov, Vladimir Vernadsky, Alexander Chizhevsky and others). On the border of the Western and Eastern worlds, they foresaw the inevitability of the country's existence in the grips of the geopolitical Eurasian future and so expressed the mission of absolute total-unity in the words of Vladimir Solovyov. "I call true or positive total-unity such a unity where the one exists not at the expense of all the other, but for the benefit of the whole," Vladimir Solovyov wrote. "A false, negative unity suppresses its elements and thus turns out to be emptiness" (Solovyov, 1988: 552).

Alexander Blok expressed a presentiment of insanely tragic but inexorably intervening globality in his "Scythians":

"For the last time — come to your senses, old world!
The barbarian lyre is calling
To a fraternal feast of labor and peace,
For the last time — to a light fraternal feast!" (Blok, 1960: 362).

The modern processes of cardinal transformation of political, social, cultural international relations pose the problem of proper ways of global economy reformation. Transnational corporations and leading national economic entities are gradually turning into key actors in the modern historical process. Thus, classical formational revolutions are changing their theoretical political and economic face, becoming not spontaneous but conscious forms of synergistic praxeology. The nuclear era put an end to the traditional forms of the violent

solution of problems of diverse humanity and at the same time opened the gates for the triumph of non-violent forms of global coevolution, in the framework of which, however, the classic “philosophy of non-violence” was converted into its nonclassical and postnonclassical forms with their doubtful non-violent nature. In the era of digitalization and computer communication, the “invisible world government” is no longer invisible: it is successfully scanned with the help of a global computed tomograph based on the technologies of the “nooscope” (Vaino, 2012).

When a candidate for American President left-wing politician Bernie Sanders wins the hearts and minds of citizens, and the artist from New York David Datuna wants to buy Lenin’s Mausoleum and put it in the United States, officially stating that “America is moving towards communism and socialist ideas,” it should be recognized that the world has become radically different. The reality of this socialization of capitalist ideas in the context of the population growth was noted by scientists in their first reports to the Club of Rome in the 20th century (Meadows, 1991) and was finally stated in the 21st century in the Report “Come On!” (Come On, 2018).

In the foreword to the report “Come On!” the authors emphasize that “the world is again in a critical situation,” and therefore, this time they see a serious need to “question the legitimacy of the ethos of materialistic selfishness which is currently the most powerful driving force in the world.” “The time has come, we believe, for a new Enlightenment or for otherwise overturning current habits of thought and action that only consider the short term. <...> However, unless the destructive driving forces of purely materialistic economic growth are tamed, we cannot escape the fear that 15 years from now the world will be in an even harsher ecological situation than it is today,” the scientists are convinced. From this perspective the report “Come On!” is no longer just a diagnosis, it is a sentence for the lost humanity, to delay the execution of which Ernst Ulrich von Weizsäcker and Anders Wijkman (the authors of the report) offer a new economic paradigm for the future (regenerative urbanization, energy-efficient buildings, the orientation of public institutions towards the restoration of human and natural capital, implementation of “blue economy” principles according to which “product and consumption systems are inspired by nature”). Scientists admit that such “circular economy requires a new economic logic” in order to overcome the traditional “‘fast turnover’ principle — take, make and dispose”: “humanity needs to find ways of initiating an environmentally enhancing, restorative relationship between cities and the natural systems they depend on; the mainstreaming of efficient, renewable energy systems for human settlements across the world; new lifestyle choices and economic opportunities which will encourage people to participate in this transformation process” (Come On, 2018).

In other words, new environmental, economic priorities should replace discredited political and social principles. Like the goddess Gaia, the biosphere encourages humanity to change radically or disappear from the surface of the planet Earth.

Cosmoplanetary economy: in search of meganames

The proper consideration of the modern cosmoplanetary economy requires the definition of the content of this phenomenon.

At first sight, the cosmoplanetary economy can be regarded as an economy where human activity goes beyond Earth and is organized outside it. A striking example of such cosmoplanetary economy can be found in the modern nascent branch of space tourism. The general idea of space tourism was born in 1967 when Barron Hilton (the president of Hilton Hotels) described his vision of the hotel on the moon, where the richest elite could be enjoying

the luxury of stars. Today Richard Branson's Virgin Galactic aims to become the world's first commercial "space line" offering flights with six minutes of zero gravity and stunning views. There are already more than 700 confirmed travelers, who wish to take the opportunity to travel into outer space and patiently wait for flights. More than that, Richard Branson is not the only space travel operator: Blue Origin, led by the Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, is also developing space tourism. It appears that this kind of tourism will not be just a luxury for the elite and a source of enrichment for the owners of this new branch of business, but it also will help humanity to respect and awe the planet Earth — the house where we live (Fyall, 2016).

Another example of cosmoplanetary economy was successfully demonstrated in American economist and politician Lindon LaRouche's "The Economics of the Noosphere" (LaRouche, 2001). In the book, the scientist proposed the idea of extending the principles of planetary "basic economic infrastructure" to the creation of synthesized natural conditions in outer space. He was convinced that in the process of space research, "when people are in outer space for months or more, mankind cannot endlessly rely on so-called "artificial life support" <...>, it is necessary to use natural principles in space" (LaRouche, 2001: 167). Lindon LaRouche noted that just as the principle of life was included in inanimate processes to change their functioning towards the formation of the biosphere, the intervention of the human mind in the development of the biosphere changed the functioning of the biosphere (LaRouche, 2001: 168). Thus, the human mind is able to bring planetary biospheric principles to a new level both on the planet Earth and in outer space. Such understanding of the cosmoplanetary role of the human mind enriches the content of cosmoplanetary economy, because it involves the conceptualization of cosmoplanetary life not only from the standpoint of extensive economic activity scale, but also in the context of possible intensive, reasonable human impact on outer space.

It should be noted that the ideas of this "intensive" cosmoplanetary economy were set forth by Konstantin Tsiolkovsky in his book "The Goals of Starfleet" (Tsiolkovsky, 1929). Scientist's views on life in outer space were presented in the context of developing a cyclic economic ecosystem of life support, which was closely related to the principles of organizing of biosphere and the current scientific development of mankind. In particular, the author explained how "a certain temperature, humidity, a specific composition of air and good food for plants and human could be achieved in outer space." He substantiated the structure of the space economy, in which "there is no need for a constant inflow of water or food for plants and animals. A certain supply of gases, water, soil and fertilizers is never depleted." According to the scientist, "the same is happening on the Earth, but it is happening on a larger scale." In general, all the benefits of relocation to outer space "are not possible to imagine" (Tsiolkovsky, 1929).

The cosmoplanetary function of the human mind in economic activity was also shown in the work of Sergey Podolinsky "Human labor and its relation to the distribution of energy on our planet" (Podolinsky, 2005). In his opinion, man is the only force of nature that is capable of increasing the share of the Sun's energy accumulated on the Earth by certain volitional acts called labor. Mental labor is cosmic in its nature and represents the only way that, with the help of more advanced machines and technologies, makes physical labor more productive, increases the energy budget of mankind, reduces the increase in entropy and eliminates the threat of the end of the Universe (Podolinsky, 2005).

For the understanding of human cosmoplanetary economic activity, the law of power conservation (as a universal law of nature), discovered by Pobisk Kuznetsov, is also significant (Bolshakov & Kuznetsov, 2014). According to the law, there is the preservation

of the exchange energy flow modulus, expressed in the universal language of space-time quantities. Modern scientists have shown how the development of specific social relations systems represents the universal law of nature: in private social systems, there are non-linear processes of the struggle for power and the possibility of its use in certain interests (Bolshakov & Kuznetsov, 2014: 27).

The economic ideas of Pobisk Kuznetsov are also interesting. The scientist noted the importance of discovering new forces of nature for the benefit of society. His ideas involved the discovery of new types of energy used by the economic system and the creation of physical devices that could allow changing the direction of energy flows (Afanasyev & Kuznetsov, 2014). Moreover, Pobisk Kuznetsov predicted: “There will be ideas about the using of the full volume of the energy flow that permeates our planet, but at present science does not know anything about them” (Afanasyev & Kuznetsov, 2014).

All these ideas bring to mind the forgotten thoughts of ancient sages about the reverse effect of cosmic energy on humanity, about the fundamental unity of macro- and microcosm, and that “there is only the manifestation of the will of the Universe in the will of a human being and all other creatures (higher and lower). The voice of a human being, his thoughts, discoveries, concepts, truths and delusions are only the voice of the Universe” (Tsiolkovsky, 1928: 14).

Taking into account this interconnection of space and anthropogenic factor and increasing influence of mankind on near and far outer space, it seems true that modern humanity is witnessing “a new stage of evolution — geocosmic, geopolitical, social, demographic and noospheric” (Kaznacheev, 2010). The active role of humans and humanity in this process raises the issue of life-giving values and dominants of cosmoplanetary economy. From the axiological perspective, an increasingly manifesting itself link between humanity and outer space generates “the idea, that mankind is responsible for the cosmic evolution and influences it by good or evil” (Kaznacheev, 2010).

It also seems that this responsibility can be explained through the etymology of the term “economy” («οικονόμος») that includes two roots: “οἶκος” (home) and “νόμος” (a rule, a law). It appears that the concept of “home” can be understood both narrowly (“a man’s home is his castle”) and broadly (“my home is the planet Earth”). Taking into account this concept, it seems that the ontology of cosmoplanetary economy is generally constructed within the framework of econology (Reimers, 1990) (the science, which claims the connection and inseparability of economy and ecology, economic activity and ecological limitations from the coevolutionary point of view) and related concepts of “biosphere economy,” “green economy,” “blue economy.”

Philosophical sense of cosmoplanetary economy also can be shown through the prism of Kant’s “creative agnosticism” (Kant, 2017) from the perspective of delimitation of “economy in itself” and “economy for us.” The “economy in itself” is aimed at expanded self-development in order to suppress competitors regardless of their economic goals. For example, for several centuries, the philosophy “big fish eat small fish” has become a form of oligarchic economy. Simultaneously, many areas of the real economy need not pyramidal but network values, providing the survival of humanity as an integral system, not as an antagonistic multiverse of separate global entities. Such cosmoplanetary “economy for us” (for multifaceted humanity in its relationship with the biosphere of the Earth and the whole Universe where “everything is connected to everything” (Commoner, 1974)) could become a real alternative to the modern “economy in itself.”

Thus, the logic of the understanding of cosmoplanetary economy can be represented from its quantitative description (cosmoplanetary scale) to its qualitative characteristics (values and dominants of human interaction with the Universe).

Cosmoplanetary economy in the context of the “biosphere — noosphere” transition

It is difficult to consider the cosmoplanetary nature of human economic activity in isolation from the ideas of Vladimir Vernadsky, who first outlined the philosophical poetry of “cosmoplanetary unity” in the language of scientific discourse. His ideas about the cosmic process of the origin of a human being and his mind, about the strong link between humanity and the biosphere, about scientific thought and its role in the organization of planetary processes are especially significant for understanding cosmoplanetary economy. Academician noted: “A man must understand <...> that he is not random and independent of biosphere or noosphere natural phenomenon. He is the inevitable manifestation of the natural process that has been going on for two billion years at least” (Vernadsky, 1991: 21). The establishment of the noosphere “requires the manifestation of mankind as a whole” (Vernadsky, 1988: 35).

These philosophical reflections of Vladimir Vernadsky were received by the Novosibirsk school of academician Vlail Kaznacheev. The contribution of Vlail Kaznacheev to the development of knowledge-intensive and human-oriented economic activity cannot be overemphasized. The scientist admitted that mankind was on the verge of very serious trials: “Today these trials can be distinguished both in social and in cosmophysical planetary (geocological) aspect” (Kaznacheev & Trofimov, 2019: 122). One of the central ideas of the academician is connected with the fact that a person has five socio-natural dimensions, the primary of which are human health and a set of socio-natural valences (the economic structure, family institutions, cultural traditions, a language) that determine the possibilities and the direction of human social activity. These dimensions must necessarily be taken into account when designing socio-economic, political, cultural and educational programs. Vlail Kaznacheev was deeply concerned that the logic of life “was reduced to the accumulation, concentration of economic potential, money and property values, not human lives.” He wrote: “If we turn back to the past of science, to the most ancient times, it turns out that science and culture did not possess this important factor of accumulation, wealth and property, it went into the space of the intellectual movement of practice, life, the relationship of a man with the Earth, to his essence (which, apparently, is defined as a soul) and the space where a man exists on the planet Earth in the cosmic and solar world” (Kaznacheev & Trofimov, 2019: 122). Within this framework, the modern cosmoplanetary economy appears as a very ill patient, and some extreme measures are necessary in order to treat it.

Nowadays, this spiritual and intellectual component of the world-historical process has already become clearly visible. The ideas about socio-economic formations turn into theories of noospheric and ecological formations that suggest that the material and technical forms of human existence give place to rational and ecological priorities in the global historical process. For that reason, the development of the Noospheric ethical and ecological constitution of humanity, which “forms the legal basis of the global evolution of humanity and biosphere as a new — Noospheric, geocosmic stage of development” (Article 1), proclaims “the protection of the spiritual, ecological, energetic and information human rights” (Article 3), endows humanity with “ethical and ecological (cosmic), biological and social rights, freedoms and duties” (Article 4), seems to be important and timely (Gordina & Limonad, 2007). Of course, the interests of humanity require further implementation of these noospheric principles in regional, national and international law, but the importance of this political and legal process is not evaluated at the appropriate level or not considered at all. Consumer economic consciousness neglects the idea that human economic activity can only

rely on biospheric sources and exists only to assert the logic of noospheric processes. So the real organization of a proper cosmoplanetary economy as a valuable economic activity of mankind in the Universe faces formidable obstacles.

Cosmoplanetary economy in the noospheric picture of the world

One of the difficult problems of cosmoplanetary economy conceptualization is connected with the search for an adequate theoretical dimension. The real cosmoplanetary economy's tragedy is that it is constantly placed in immeasurably smaller formats than it requires. According to its definition, its dimension cannot be less than the biosphere organization. Still, at the same time, it is affected by very strong fluctuations of the noospheric (social and socio-economic), but, in fact, anti-noospheric (unreasonable and irrational) order. Such an ambivalent situation presupposes an attempt to embed ideas about cosmoplanetary economy into the noospheric picture of the world (Lebedev & Panchenko, 2010). The application of the sphere approach to the representation of cosmoplanetary economy seems to be reasonable, because "a planet" itself already presupposes some spheres. So we offer to dwell on the model of the noospheric picture of the world that received its justification in Nikolay Antonov's work (Antonov, 2003).

Nikolay Antonov proposed a transitive chain "lithosphere — hydrosphere — atmosphere — biosphere — sociosphere and — technosphere-noosphere" (Antonov, 2003: 170). This interpretation performs an important explanatory function: it shows the intermediate links between biosphere and noosphere. In this context, it is obvious that the transition from the biosphere to the noosphere cannot ignore these intermediate links. So, it seems quite possible to imagine "the transition from the biosphere to sociosphere" or "the transition from the biosphere to technosphere," which take place in literature.

Modern noospherology has adopted this global evolutionary transitivity from the lithosphere to noosphere and enriches it, building an increasing number of planetary spheres: the noospheric picture of the world in the context of the sphere approach in its minimalistic representation demonstrates the interaction between anthroposphere, biosphere, technosphere, sociosphere, cultural sphere (Smirnov, 2003) and also information sphere, ecosphere, semiosphere (Smirnov, 2011b) and energy sphere (Zhulkov, 2013). The theoretical completion of the sphere approach is achieved through the complementarity of the basic noospheric law (information generates energy, energy structures matter) (Dmitrevskaya, 1990) and the basic semiotic law (matter unfolds into energy, energy is "unpacked" into information) (Smirnov, 2008: 54). Thus, adequate consideration of cosmoplanetary economy within the noospheric picture of the world requires the identification of a large number of cause-and-effect chains.

At first glance, it seems that cosmoplanetary economy should be confined to the anthroposphere as self-realization of the principle of anthropocentrism. However, upon closer examination, it turns out that the anthropological principle presupposes the consideration of a human being precise as a rational being (Vernadsky, 1991). Thus, the concepts of the harmonious relationship between humanity and nature, of human-oriented economic activity, noospheric autotrophy (Zhulkov, 2011) and noospheric asceticism (Artemyeva, 2020) are becoming the integral markers of cosmoplanetary anthroposphere. The sociosphere of the life-giving cosmoplanetary economy is impossible out of high scientific social and natural standards for the organization of human activity, noospheric law (Borodin, 2015), collectivism and solidarity of mankind. For example, in the works of Vladimir Vernadsky

these “standards” are formulated as the law of the “unity of mankind” (Vernadsky, 1991: 34), violation of which entails the inevitability of collapse and global destruction. The struggle for survival and natural selection in cosmoplanetary sociosphere thereby should be replaced by the philosophy of mutual assistance of Peter Kropotkin (Kropotkin, 1995) and the theory of altruism of Pitirim Sorokin (Dolgov, 2015).

Modern concepts of cosmoplanetary technosphere surpass the classical problem of the negative impact of technology on the environment and humanity (which, however, have not lost their relevance) and turn out to be closely related to the problem of interaction between the natural mind and artificial intelligence. It is clear that the epoch of the living matter development has been evolutionarily replaced by the epoch of the techno-substance (Balandin, 1993) development and in the third millennium is moving towards the dominance of intelligent matter (Bazaluk, 2016), built on the principle of complementarity of natural mind and artificial intelligence. The economy of matter gradually appears as the economy of energy and, at a certain stage, turns into the economy of information (in this case, “digital economy” is considered as an important part of it). These three historical forms of economy are subject to the principle of conformity. Only energy in its various socio-economic forms provides a transformation of matter, and only the human mind embodied in a variety of information forms makes the transformation of living and non-living matter possible.

The emerging informational formation (noo-formation) differs from the previous formations, because so-called artificial intelligence unexpectedly arises and even dares to claim the status of a special managerial (algorithmic) matter, showing its advantages in providing “optimal” similar to biosphere processes. The current dialectic of the natural mind and artificial intelligence achieves a new level of interaction, “overcoming the archetypes of an all-devouring crocodile as well as unconsciously working horse through the cognitive blast” (Smirnov & Smirnov, 2019: 138) and ensuring the processes of techno-social cephalization.

Thus, such paired ontological opposites as “technosphere and sociosphere,” “biosphere and cultural sphere,” “surrounding” anthroposphere (and genosphere (Savchenko, 2009), ethnosphere, natiosphere (Timofeev, 2005) associated with it), pose a universal set of values and goals and show the axiological coloring of the economic ontology of human existence.

The epistemological dimension of cosmoplanetary economy

The problems of the cosmoplanetary economy proper values are closely related to the study of modern economic consciousness.

Methodologically this understanding is possible through the environmental and economic ideas of academician Nikita Moiseev, particularly about the multiple meanings of the term “market”: a “commodity market” (“market” with a small “m”), “Market” (“market” with a capital “M”) and “MARKET” (“market” in capital letters). The scientist used the concept of “Market” to explain complex social processes. He noted: “Market in its usual sense as a distribution tool is only a particular case of the Market as the only natural form of the comparison of the various forms of living matter organization and their rejection, the main factor determining the development of the world” (Moiseev, 1996: 49). Thus, the “principle of market” was understood by Nikita Moiseev as a universal regulator of human relations and so corresponded to the synergistic ideas of academician-mathematician, represented in the theory of universal evolutionism. The concept of this planetary “Market” (“market” with a capital “M”) is strongly associated with the processes of cosmoplanetary organization, described through the prism of “MARKET” (“market” in capital letters) (Moiseev, 1995a). Nikita Moiseev noted the value of rational factors in human life (especially from the

perspective of the “rational society” organization (Moiseev, 1995b)) and was convinced that “at the new stage of anthropogenesis human life would be controlled by a new type of MARKET capable of foresight” (Stepanov, 2013: 56). He wrote: “If the birth of LIFE is considered as the first fundamental bifurcation of the process of cosmic evolution, then the second bifurcation is the birth of MIND. This is a restructuring of the very content of biosphere development, because qualitatively new principles of selection, formulated by human MIND, appear” (Moiseev, 1995b: 163). Thus, the birth of MIND and its influence on the evolution processes turns “Market” into “MARKET.”

All three meanings of “market” also suggest that its concept includes the dimensions of continental, regional, local and individual markets. In this sense, it seems that the term “MARKET” is well correlated with the idea of Sergey Bulgakov about “the understanding of the world as an economy” (Bulgakov, 2009: 38) and in modern socio-philosophical discourse is close to the views of Karen Momdzhyan, who considers the economy not as an independent sphere of production, but as “a system of distributional relations” (Momdzhyan, 2019: 32) in various subsystems of society. This approach reveals a significant epistemological dimension of economy (as a way of the understanding of the world as a whole (Sergey Bulgakov), as a way of the study of cosmoplanetary evolutionary processes (Nikita Moiseev), as a way of benefit sharing in various spheres of public life (Karen Momdzhyan)), that expands its content to the methodological level. This meaning of economy brings it closer to the concept of economics (as a science, a field of knowledge about various ways of efficient organization of production and distribution relations, exchange and consumption of necessary goods).

The list of Nobel Prizes in Economics (Namyatova & Semin, 2020) illustrates some features of modern economic consciousness: the awards are almost always for some specific economic achievements in a particular area of global economy, but in the list of “high-quality Nobel products” there are not any versions of cosmoplanetary economy. Of course, it would be wrong to insist that there are not any fundamental cosmoplanetary economic theories at all. For example, some reports to the Club of Rome could claim the prize of the Swedish State Bank, but they are not nominated for it, as if they are outside the human future. However, the transition from the “Earth” economy to cosmoplanetary economy is the reality of the contemporary world where mankind is waking up from “consumer fever” under the influence of COVID-shock.

Unfortunately, Barry Commoner’s “environmental laws” have not been implemented in the modern political economy yet. The capitalist economy does not understand that “Everything is connected to everything,” “Everything must go somewhere,” “Nature knows better,” and “Nothing is given for free” (“Everything has to be paid for”) (Commoner, 1974). An integral “political econology” (“biospheric political economy,” “econoomics”) has not been created yet, and humanity is still in captivity of economic anthropocentrism, which destroys nature — the sphere of human existence and consciousness. Modern capitalist society is unable to give up its “extreme dreams” of over-consumption in conditions of overexploitation of “the nature of nature” (Morin, 2005) and “the nature of human.”

Econoomics provide a necessary integral way of considering the modern cosmoplanetary economy — the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary field of knowledge, describing the noospheric face of human economic activity and aimed at finding some “proper” attractors of harmonious social, natural and cultural development of cosmoplanetary life, where the economic entities of different degrees of complexity and organization pursue their goals and values that sometimes coincide and sometimes contradict the interests of other praxeological actors (Smirnov & Odintsova, 2019).

We believe that the problem of econoomics' subject area can be viewed from the perspective of the laws of Barry Commoner. For example, the formula "Everything is connected to everything" is not only ontological (as it seems at first glance): it contains the diverse philosophical palette of the world-building process (including cognition processes, value orientations and activity approaches) and shows that the consideration of cosmoplanetary economy should not be unconsciously limited to one or another kind of "centrism" (sociocentrism, anthropocentrism, economic centrism). This formula shows the dialectical complementarity of "Everything in everything" and "All in one." The problem is that the real universal meaning of this thought in the modern economy is often "limited" ("everybody is connected to everyone," "everything is connected to everything materially," "everything is connected to everything energetically") and serious difficulties also arise due to the fact that few people know how "everything is connected to everything." Thus, the way to overcome the crises of modern economic thought is to develop econoomics as a due synthetic paradigm.

The advancement of econoomics is significant because the traditional ecological paradigm of economic development is no longer valid: the informational paradigm is being implemented in the economy as a key driver. In fact, the role of the digital sphere (as a certain part of the infosphere) can be expressed in terms of additionality: a more complex digital paradigm includes both economic and ecological, technological, anthropological, cultural paradigms. Such digital "common denominator" can unite in the numerator all the forms of human cosmoplanetary life in the noospheric epoch with its advantages and disadvantages. All these digitized forms can be properly organized in the context of econoomics, intended to provide the orientation of the infosphere (and digital sphere) to reconstruct life-giving socio-natural and socio-cultural integrity.

Cosmoplanetary economy and noospheric economy

This research on cosmoplanetary economy should be supplemented by the analysis of the relations between the concepts of "cosmoplanetary economy" and "noospheric economy."

In modern literature, the authors' concept of the noospheric economy is considered primarily due to a proper, reasonable, creative, green economy. For example, Peter Nikitenko considers noospheric economy as "a reasonable way of social reproduction of goods, works and services based on improving the system of corporate innovative production relations and predominantly postindustrial productive forces in order to provide the development of human personality, preservation of nature for future generations, sustainable growth of the gross domestic product and its reasonable distribution between relatively rich and relatively poor members of society with maximum employment of the working-age population in a socially-oriented economy" (Nikitenko, 2006: 16-17). Aleksander Subetto, in his "Manifesto of Noospheric Socialism," defines noospheric economy as "a noospheric-socialist mode of social production, which is built on the basis of the Synthetic Civilization Revolution, on the basis of intelligent, knowledge-intensive market-planned economies. It is presented as a result of the transition from the 'epoch of political bourgeois economy' to the 'era of social economy' [...], the basis of which is a 'social economy of labor' [...]. Noospheric economy is both the labor economy and the economy on the foundation of the unity of labor and intelligence and manifests itself through the quality of management of socio-economic, scientific-technical and socio-natural development of society as a whole and the development of noosphere" (Subetto, 2011: 73, 75).

From this point of view, the noospheric economy can be considered a real due concept of

the cosmoplanetary economy — the tragic reality of modern mankind. At the same time, taking into account the axiological approach to the understanding of cosmoplanetary economy as an economic activity focused on achieving life-giving integrity in the Universe, the concepts of noospheric and cosmoplanetary economy can be considered as future synonyms. Nowadays, such a change of the modern economy concept from regional to global and from global to cosmoplanetary seems the only way for humanity to survive.

Conclusion

Finally, it should be noted that the importance of the cosmoplanetary economy investigation is determined both by the ontological status of the phenomenon (in its extensive and intensive dimensions) and by the urgent necessity of filling its content with an axiological and epistemological component. An effective, life-giving reorganization of cosmoplanetary economic order that is now under the severe strain of the technosphere is seen as the only way to overcome modernity's global catastrophism.

Some proper attractors of economic development are found in the noospheric thought of Vladimir Vernadsky (Vernadsky, 1991) and related philosophical ideas about rational society as “a society moving in the era of noosphere” (Moiseev, 1995b: 318), about noospheric consciousness (Smirnov, 1998), econoomics (Smirnov & Odintsova, 2019), noospheric strategy of the transition to the sustainable development (Ursul, 1998), about basic noospheric law (Dmitrevskaya, 1998) and basic semiotic law (Smirnov, 2011a), a noospheric human being (Melikyan, 2013), which can provide the re-formation of cosmoplanetary economy towards preservation and enhancement of the world economic integrity as a necessary condition for the survival of mankind.

References

- Afanasyev, Viktor and Pobisk Kuznetsov (2014) *Some Questions of the Management of Scientific and Technical progress*. Available online: http://xn--80adbkckdfac8cd1ahpld0f.xn--p1ai/files/Kuznetsov/contents_vol3.pdf
- Antonov, Nikolay (2003) *The philosophy of Consciousness and Noosphere*. Ivanovo: The Publishing House of Ivanovo State University.
- Artemyeva, Alena (2020) Asceticism as an Anthropological Paradigm of Global Economic Consciousness. *The Bulletin of the Ivanovo State University*. Series: Humanities. Volume 2, 89-97.
- Balandin, Rudolf (1993) *The organism of the biosphere and the mechanism of the technosphere*. Available online: <http://claw.ru/1news/referaty/biologiya-i-estestvoznanie/tri-koncepcii-noosfery.html>
- Bazaluk, Oleg (2016) *The Theory of Evolution: From a Space Vacuum to Neural Ensembles and Moving Forward*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Blok, Alexander (1960) Scythians. In *Collected Works in Eight Volumes*. Edited by V. Orlov, A. Surkova and K. Chukovsky. Volume 3. State Publishing House of Artistic Literature, 360–362.
- Bolshakov, Boris and Oleg Kuznetsov (2014) P. G. Kuznetsov and the Problem of Sustainable Development of Humanity in the System “Nature — Society — Human.” *The Bulletin of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences*. Volume 4, 26–34.
- Borodin, Evgeniy (2015) Noospheric Law: Philosophical Representation of Legal Global Consciousness. *The Theory and Practice of Social Development*. Volume 20, 245–248.

- Bulgakov, Sergey (2009) *The Philosophy of Economy*. Edited by O. Platonov. Institute of Russian Civilization.
- Come On! *Capitalism, Short-termism, Population and the Destruction of the Planet* (2018) Available online: http://filipmalinowski.net/Club_Of_Rome-report-2018_ComeOn.pdf
- Commoner, Barry (1974) *The Closing Circle*. Leningrad: Gidrometeoizdat.
- Dmitrevskaya, Irina (1990) Noosphere as a systemically organized universal. In *Philosophical origins of V. I. Vernadsky's doctrine of the biosphere and noosphere*. Ivanovo: The Publishing House of Ivanovo State University, 44–46.
- Dmitrevskaya, Irina (1998) “Timaeus” of Plato: the Myth of Living Outer Space. In *Noospheric idea and the future of Russia*. Ivanovo: The Publishing House of Ivanovo State University, 29–32.
- Dolgov, Aleksander (2015) The Theory of Altruism by Pitirim Sorokin: Global Perspective. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*. Volume 2, 32–44.
- Fyall, Alan (2016) *The Next Big Adventure. Opinion: Space Tourism*. Available online: <https://www.ucf.edu/pegasus/space-tourism/>
- Gordina, Lubov and Michail Limonad (2007) *Noospheric Ethical and Ecological Constitution of Mankind (Noo-Constitution)*. Moscow-Toropets: RITA.
- Kant, Immanuel (2017) *The Criticism of Pure Reason*. Moscow: AST.
- Kaznacheev, Vlail (2010) *The noosphere of V. I. Vernadsky is the autotrophy of humanity*. Available online: <http://www.trinitas.ru/rus/doc/0203/001a/02030010.htm>
- Kaznacheev, Vlail and Alexander Trofimov (2019) The Spirituality of Humanity is a Cosmoplanetary Phenomenon (Possible Ways of Spiritual Consistency and Preservation of Life in the Nookosmos). In *Social and Demographic Potential of Russia: State and Prospects*. Moscow: Publishing house “Econ-Inform”, 121–146.
- Kropotkin, Peter (1995) *Mutual Assistance as a Factor of Evolution*. Moscow: Nauka.
- LaRouche, Lindon (2001) *The Economics of the Noosphere*. EIR News Service, Inc.
- Lebedev, Sergey and Aleksander Panchenko (2010) Noospheric picture of the world. *Man*. Volume 5, 5–18.
- Meadows, Donella (1991) *The Limits to Growth*. Translated by G. A. Yagodina. The Publishing House of Moscow State University.
- Melikyan, Merine (2013) *Category “Noospheric Man” in the Modern Russian Philosophy of a Human Being*. Available online: <https://evestnik-mgou.ru/vi/Articles/Doc/485>
- Moiseev, Nikita (1996) *Agony of Russia. Does it Have a Future?* Moscow: Ecopress.
- Moiseev, Nikita (1995a) *Historical Development and Environmental Education*. Moscow: MNEPU.
- Moiseev, Nikita (1995b) *Modern Rationalism*. Moscow: MGVP KOKS.
- Momdzhyan, Karen (2019) Economy as an Object of Social and Philosophical Consideration. *Economic Revival of Russia*. Volume 3 (61), 30–34.
- Morin, Edgar (2005) *Nature of Nature*. Moscow: Progress-Tradition.
- Namyatova, Lyudmila and Aleksander Semin (2020) *Laureates of the Nobel Prize in Economics (1969–2019)*. Moscow: The Fund for the Development and Support of Youth “Personnel Reserve.”
- Nikitenko, Peter (2006) *Noospheric Economy and Social Policy: the Strategy of Innovative Development*. Minsk: Belarusian Science.
- Podolinsky, Sergey (2005) *Human Labor and Its Relation to the Distribution of Energy*. White Alvy.

-
-
- Reimers, Nikolay (1990) *The Management of Nature. Reference Dictionary*. Mysl.
- Savchenko, Vladimir (2009) *Geogenomics. Organization of the Genosphere*. Minsk: Belarusian Science.
- Smirnov, Dmitriy (2008) Semiosophy of Noospheric Reality: Philosophical and Methodological Discourse. *The Bulletin of the Ivanovo State University. Series: Humanities*. Volume 2 (8), 52–59.
- Smirnov, Dmitriy (2011a) The Semiotic Foundations of the Evolution of the Universe. *The Bulletin of the Kostroma State University of N. A. Nekrasov*. Volume 3, 80–84.
- Smirnov, Dmitriy (2011b) *The Universe of signs: noosphere versus semiosphere*. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing GmbH & Co. KG.
- Smirnov, Grigoriy and Alena Odintsova (2019) Economics as a Philosophy of Noospheric Economy. *Philosophy of Economy*. Volume 2, 16–37.
- Smirnov, Grigoriy (1998) *Noospheric consciousness and noospheric reality. Philosophical problems of noospheric Universe*. Ivanovo: Ivanovo State University.
- Smirnov, Grigoriy (2003) The Noospheric Picture of the World and Modern Education. *The Bulletin of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences*. Volume 1, 57–64.
- Smirnov, Grigoriy and Dmitry Smirnov (2019) Cephalization of the Noosphere: Socio — Philosophical Aspects. *Philosophy and Cosmology*. Volume 22, 137–143.
- Stepanov, Stanislav (2013) A Teacher and a Citizen. *State Management of Resources*. Volume 7-8 / 97-98, 54–57.
- Solovyov, Vladimir (1988) The First Step towards Positive Aesthetics. In *Collected Works in Two Volumes*. Volume 2. Mysl, 548–555.
- Subetto, Aleksander (2011) *The Manifesto of Noospheric Socialism*. Saint Petersburg: Asterion, Publishing house of KSU of N.A. Nekrasov.
- Timofeev, Mikhail (2005) *Natiosphere: Experience in the Analysis of the Semiosphere of Nations*. Ivanovo: The Publishing House of Ivanovo State University.
- Tsiolkovsky, Konstantin (1929) *The Goals of Starfleet*. Available online: <http://epizodsspace.airbase.ru/bibl/tsiolkovskiy/tseli-zvezd29/tseli-zvezdopl1929.pdf>
- Tsiolkovsky, Konstantin (1928) *The Will of the Universe. Unknown Intelligent Forces*. Published by the author.
- Ursul, Arkadiy (1998) *Russia's transition to sustainable development. Noospheric strategy*. Moscow: Publishing house “Noosphere.”
- Vaino, Anton (2012) The Capitalization of the Future. *The Problems of Economics and Law*. Volume 4, 42–57.
- Vernadsky, Vladimir (1988) *Philosophical Thoughts of a Naturalist*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vernadsky, Vladimir (1991) *Scientific Thought as a Planetary Phenomenon*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Zhulkov, Mikhail (2011) Cosmic Nature and Social Face of Noospheric Autotrophy. *The Bulletin of the Ivanovo State University. Series: Humanities*. Volume 2, 26–36.
- Zhulkov, Mikhail (2013) Towards the Development of the Sphere Approach: Energosphere. *International Scientific Research Journal*. Volume 10 (17), 120–123.