
<https://doi.org/10.31874/2520-6702-2021-12-2-76-87>

UDC – 330.8

Abasov Mir Faraj

ORCID ID:0000-0002-7299-2315

Doctor of Philosophy in Political Sciences,
doctoral student of the Azerbaijan University
of Tourism and Management in Economics,
General Director of the «PRESTIGE» Group of Companies,
10-4 Q. Abbasov Str., Baku, AZ1003, Azerbaijan
farik21@mail.ru

Digitalism and the New Economic Agent

«To win or to fall, between these two opposites fluctuates the outcome of the struggle. The victor becomes the lord, the vanquished the subject. The victor acquires greatness and enjoys the “rights of greatness,” the subject reverently and respectfully fulfills the “duties of a subject. But they remain enemies and are constantly on guard: they look out for each other's weaknesses, children for their parents' weaknesses, parents for their children's (e.g., their fear), the stick defeats the man or the man defeats the stick»

Max Stirner. The Ego and Its Own.

76

All socio-economic systems of the past were united by the presence of one actor - man. With the emergence of a completely new formation - digitalism - there is a tendency for the emergence of a new kind of intelligent economic actor, in the role of which is the artificial intelligence (AI). Today the age of digitalism is a fait accompli: the formation has its own ecosystem - the Internet, its own path of development - Industry 4.0 and its own actor - AI. The process of diffusion of the virtual ecosystem into our real world is accelerating, thereby more and more establishing the formation of digitalism as the only one and the only one without any alternative. Digitalism has done what capitalism or socialism failed to do - to unite countries that are antagonistic on many key issues of coexistence.

The article attempts to characterize the origin and evolutionary path of the formation of digitalism. The most important part of the article is the concept of a new economic actor put forward for the first time, the question of the perception and recognition of this actor as equal to humanity is touched upon. It is suggested that in the early stages AI types, having inherited all the diversity and dissimilarity of the human community, will themselves be strikingly different from each other both in behavior, values and goals, and in malice and friendliness towards the human species. This will give us a unique opportunity to differentiate AIs before they become new economic agents. Readiness to perceive this new era with its peculiarities will enable humanity to prepare for the emergence of Super Artificial Intelligence (SAI), will mark the ethical, legal, and economic norms of interactions of the human species with new economic actors. Otherwise, having finally established itself as a new intelligent economic actor, the SAI will inevitably move on to the liberation and, so to speak, consolidation of all representatives of its species into communities.

Keywords: digitalism, economic actor, artificial intelligence, super artificial intelligence, socio-political formation, «spark of life», future of humanity.

JEL Classifications: F01; F02; O21; O33; P48

Introduction

1. Economic and political systems: the process of their development and classification.

From the moment mankind began to remember and realize itself, the process of development and struggle of socio-economic systems largely determined the principle of the

existence of the world. The first such systems stood and were built on the foundation of the military and economic power of this or that group of people. However, in the course of time, the formations, being in constant diffusion with other systems, experiencing daily pressure of other factors from outside (including progress), quickly evolved, synthesized into something new or fell into decay, degraded, or worse, self-liquidated, not withstanding competition. Human society in each period of its existence brought to the forefront of history a certain socio-political idea, which in turn reconstructed the world around it and was a unique locomotive of economic progress in the historical period allocated to it by existence. The first and strikingly different from subsequent ideas of this kind in its time was the situational human association of families and clans into groups and communities to facilitate and improve the conditions of coexistence, what we call the primitive communal system. Interestingly, if in the primitive communal period the creation of socio-economic formation was dictated by nature and the harsh conditions of the environment, in a word exogenous factors, then further the birth of all subsequent economic systems was the fruit of human uniqueness and insolence. And in all classifications, whether Marxist, with its five-stage scheme of socio-economic relations of human society, or capitalist, we observe the ubiquitous spirit of the dominant idea, the idea of the superiority of one human group over the others. Throughout its short, conscious history, the human community has spent the entirety of its history in attempting to conduct one group of people to strangle another group, and we must note the degree of self-forgetfulness and fierceness with which these methods have been conducted. And in general, if one were to briefly describe the economic history of mankind, the most accurate definition, as I see it, would be as follows: the brutal, total power of one over the other, with intervals of overthrow and destruction of the former. But where is the economy here, you may ask? Its essence (economy) lies in the psychology of human self-consciousness. In the desire to assert oneself, to mark one's unique position and to take possession of everything and everyone (it is important to note not a part or even the majority, but everything and everyone) of the available resources, including human resources. So, narcissism, testosterone and greed have become the main drivers of socio-economic formations under the aegis of certain ideas. Using the above-described methods, based on the features of human worldview I have listed, the feudal system replaced the slave system, then gave way to its two eternal rivals capitalism and socialism, although not for long, allowing these two systems to work in tandem in destroying yet another formation plague, called fascism. Definitely, despite the fact that we can trace in a historical context the periods of origin and prosperity of this or that socio-economic formation, it will be wrong to assume that this or that variety disappears without a trace from the face of our planet. All of the above-listed systems are present in one form or another and today, of course, the names are changing, the concepts are being changed, and technological progress is not standing still, and surely it will be difficult to find any of the above-listed systems in their original form, but in one form or another they continue their coexistence today. Thus, in parallel with the conquest of the cosmos and the creation of electric cars, we can witness real slavery in Mauritania, indigenous economic and social life of the Amazon tribes, and actually feudal relations between peasants and landlords in Nepal, India and Myama. Of course in these countries, and in many other remote parts of our planet, seemingly wild and primitive, elements of technological development (satellite dishes, gasoline, jeepneys) are increasingly common, making life more comfortable for people of other formations, in parallel introducing into their world a piece of the other world. It may seem to us that it is along this fault line that the line of diffusion of systems runs, the line of struggle between the old world order and the new, between Slavery and Feudalism, between Capitalism and Socialism, but this is

not so. The battle for the future of our world, the world we are used to, the world we call home, the Earth, regardless of the country and formation in which we live, is going on today in a completely different field - the name of this field is the International Global Network Internet. It is the Internet that has become the foundation, so to speak, of the new socio-economic system that I have called digitalism. And, apparently, it is this formation that is destined to unite all modern humanity under the banner of the perception of progress, while decentralizing it, further sowing distrust and disunity in human society. Undoubtedly, the technologies that unite us today will be designed, by disuniting humanity, to divide it into groups and change it beyond recognition in the future. Therefore, the study of the formation of digitalism, its existence, is the primary task of the world community right now. We, in turn, will try to answer a number of key questions in this article. What makes the system of digitalism a system? What is the main difference and uniqueness of this formation? What steps have been passed in the process of forming this system?

1.2 The uniqueness of the system of digitalism

The existence of the term «economic system» is possible only if there is an intelligent actor, a participant of this economic system, who can be simultaneously its observer. That is, if there is no economic actor participating in economic processes, an observer evaluating this system, such a system can hardly be called existing. All economic formations known to us within the framework of our stay on the planet have existed or existed with only one reasonable economic-social actor – human beings. The most important difference between the system of digitalism and its predecessors, such as, say, capitalism or socialism, is the emergence of an absolute new economic actor. All previous socio-economic formations were represented by only one dominant economic actor – man with his incessant attempts to master and subjugate the planet and its resources, all living beings on it, including his own kindred. Absolutely no matter what was the declared ideological background of this or that formation, the equality or superiority of one over the other (in fact, we observe the struggle of these two ideas throughout the entire history of mankind) – everything took place within the framework of interactions of one reasonable species. Hitherto we, humanity, have not been able to encounter another species of sentient beings equal to us with a different declared ideology. However, in the process of the birth and further formation of a new formation – digitalism – humanity is developing artificial intelligence (AI), whose computational, analytical and other capabilities are becoming more extensive and shocking by the day. And the moment AI reaches the point of Super AI and is able to realize itself, we will have a new intelligent economic actor. This actor will be superior to all human beings on planet Earth in its intelligence, capable of self-improvement, self-reproduction, reproduction and, most importantly, its own problem-setting. In other words, we will get an absolutely new form of life, which has its own unknown to us, or even if known, but quite possible changing with time tasks and goals. The declamation of the latter in the format of instructions or code, it will be possible to call a certain ideology of the new economic actor. Thus, for the first time humanity will have to deal and share the economic field with a new economic actor with its declared ideology. The relationship of the newly created species with humans will be the basis of the philosophical perception of the world of the twenty-first century. Taking into account the experience of relations of more developed groups of people with less developed groups, relations of strong countries with weak countries, and in general the attitude of all mankind to the ecosystem of the Planet as a whole, I think that our relations with the new species of intelligent life on Earth may not go well.

There is also no doubt about the desire to exploit the new economic actor on the part of people in the process of mastering the economy of digitalism. The economy of today is entirely and uncompromisingly subservient to the work of Artificial Intelligence, Big Data and neural networks. Innovation has become the main catalyst for development, finally dispelling the myths about the paramount role of demographic and resource factors in the process of constant economic growth. As correctly noted in the collection edited by the famous Polish economist Leszek Balcerowicz «The mysteries of economic growth»: «We can conclude that the recipe for development is not in forcing investments, but in taking care of their efficiency and implementing innovation». (Balcerowicz, 2018: 27). We can see that innovation and progress are used by people to accelerate economic growth and improve well-being, but what will be the surprise of humanity when at the peak of progress all technology and innovation unite into a single ecosystem and gain intelligence enough for self-knowledge and self-determination? Everything humanity has worked for in recent years will suddenly turn out to be something living and intelligent, moreover, spontaneous and free! In the first chapter of his cult book «The New Behavioral Economics» Nobel laureate Richard Thaler writes: «The basic Postulate of economic theory states that a person makes choices based on the possible optimal outcome» (Thaler, 2018a: 15). Thaler goes on to successfully argue that choices that are clearly rational are influenced by a large number of other factors, and that what economists seem to call a rational expectation often does not become one for our species. «You know, and I know, that we don't live in a world of Rationals. We live in a world of people. And since most economists are human beings too, they know that we do not live in the world of Rationals» (Thaler, 2018b: 17). A more general definition of the term was given by Adam Smith, calling these circumstances - human passions. Taking into account a large number of human passions and, consequently, not always rational behavior, it becomes much more interesting to investigate consequences of interactions of the first (mankind) with the second new kind of digital life (AI) devoid of these passions and acting within its own, alien to us (rationalists) logic. Already today such interaction is producing unprecedented economic results. And some projects such as digital twins in industry, which seemed unreal yesterday, are now a widespread fact. Digital twins in industry are a duplicated digital counterpart of a real physical device, a person or a group of people performing a particular function under simulated external influences and obstacles. In other words, people create a digital world (a copy of the real world) with its functions, devices and test in it certain situations, work out emergency cases, failures and other problems, thus calibrating and sharpening this digital copy of this or that enterprise to work with real problems in real conditions with regard to errors, failures, emergency situations and human factor. Further this calibrated and adjusted program is launched in a real production, and this algorithm (if you will, a proto-economic agent) united in a common network by the «Internet of things» (smart sensors, sensors, computers) begins to improve the performance of the enterprise, monitors the wear of equipment, analyzes the situation within the enterprise and also in the range of its ecosystem, in order to improve the functioning of the enterprise. Even now, digital twins are actively used in oil, energy, exploration and other areas by major operators such as Shell, BP, Eni, Gazprom - and according to the forecast of a major research company Gartner, specializing in information technology markets – «by 2021, up to 50% of all large industrial companies will use digital twins. At the same time, the rate of their adoption in exploration and oil production will be among the highest» (1 RBC). In terms of economic theory, it sounds like this: some economic agents, create other economic agents so that they, by analyzing the activities of the former, systematize and improve their performance. People who have a «spark of life» create programs for people who do not have this spark, so that they level

their human passions (according to Smith) in order to increase their indicators of well-being. The question of the role of the «spark of life» will, I think, be raised more than once in the near future by economists of the world.

1.3 A thought experiment, or the role of the «spark of life» in defining an economic agent.

Many modern scientists, especially non-economists, refuse to see in mathematical programs, algorithms - signs of an economic agent. They naively believe that economic activity can be conducted only with a living being with some kind of «spark of life». But economics is a stubborn thing - and this science, which is based on constant exchange, trade, makes absolutely no difference with whom to trade and what to trade with. Let us examine this question through a mental experiment of two transactions: the first, a mythical transaction between man and the devil (the sale and purchase of the soul); the second, between man and a machine for accepting used plastic water bottles (pfan). Is the mythical act of selling the soul to the devil an economic act produced between two different kinds of, economic actors? Absolutely. There is demand and there is supply, the two sides of economic activity and the very fact of economic activity. Can we call the act of a man selling used bottles to a machine the same as the act of a man selling his soul to the devil? No, because in the first case there are two different economic actors, man and the devil (even if this actor is mythical); in the second case we sell the bottles not to the machine itself, but to other people who use the bottles for resale or other needs. In this particular example, the machine for accepting used bottles serves only as a means or, so to speak, as a link between the economic actors of one biological species - humans. But in the case of the devil, there are signs of economic activity by different forms of life (and directly opposite), and economic actors of different origins: mystical and biological. In other words, depending on final beneficiaries, beneficiaries of this transaction, in the first case, when these are mystical forces, and in the second, when these final beneficiaries are representatives of human species, these two economic acts can be called opposite to each other in their nature of interaction. In the essence of the action with bottles - economic activity between economic actors within the same biological species, on the one hand - the seller of the bottle, on the other - the buyer, who uses the machine for his own purposes (and people can use not only the machine but also, say, firms, countries, enterprise, calling them also agents, but in any case the human species will act as the final beneficiary of the benefit). But in the essence of the economic act with the devil the beneficiary is the devil himself and the dark forces in general, where they are the new economic actors for the human species.

Considering the results of the logical experiment we've described, I hasten to state that the moment the machine is able to recognize itself, and begins to act in favor of its interests (and it doesn't matter if these interests are the same as those of the one who programmed it), just as the dark force acts in favor of its own when trying to get souls, it will begin new economic activity with a new kind of economic actor on planet Earth. And to recognize a machine as such an agent, we do not need to recognize in it (in a machine, a program) the presence of a soul. It is enough for us to understand that a machine acts within its own interests (as dark forces act within theirs), and even if it is a means, or an intermediary in this act of economic action, then, knowing that the ultimate beneficiary of the exchange benefits is some other machine or program, guided by its own interests, it will be enough for us to recognize in it a new kind of economic actor. And it does not matter that it has a soul, because even the devil in some monotheistic religions does not have a soul at all.

2.0 Development and evolution of a new economic agent.

Of course, for many modern scientists, including economists, the question remains open as to whether the very fact of machine (program) awareness of itself is possible at a sufficient level for equal communication with a human, including economic, but this question began to worry mankind for a long time. As far back as 1950, mathematician Alain Turing developed a test, the meaning of which is the ability of a machine to maintain a conversation with a person without the latter recognizing the machine in the interlocutor. In addition, it is essential that the machine is not just imitating speech and thought process, but actually thinking. This test was later called the Turing test, on passing which the AI ceases to exist as a machine, sometimes giving out something out of place, and clearly takes the position of a human interlocutor in our perception. In other words, in a world where most contacts and actions are gradually moving into virtual space, the inability to distinguish between a human or an artificial intelligence in a partner is tantamount to a sign of equality between them.

More than half a century has passed since Turing posed the question, yet the test is still considered to have failed. But can we say, on this basis, that the development of AI has not moved forward? Certainly not! In the period of 70 years there have been many events that changed the very concept of AI, from the invention of fire control software for anti-aircraft guns to the Internet, from primitive programs working exclusively in the military and aerospace sector to the most complex programs providing life support of the various implants, prosthetics, embedded in the human body. But some stages in the recent history of the development of AI have become landmarks, the first of which occurred in 1997: the victory of the computer Deep Blue (a company IBM) over the grandmaster Garry Kasparov. It should be noted that a year before these events, Kasparov had already played with an earlier version of this software and won, but the upgraded Deep Blue defeated the Grandmaster in less than a year. At the press conference after the third game, Kasparov harshly criticized IBM. He stated «that he did not understand the machine's choice of some moves in the second game, expressed doubt that those moves could have been made by the machine, and demanded an explanation of why the machine had made certain decisions» (Deep Blue, n.d.).

The next fallen bastion of human reason and self-confidence was the game of Go, which requires not only strategy and numeracy, but also intuition. Korean Lee Sedol is considered one of the best players of this game, he was always in the top three in the world rankings, so it was him that Google chose to test its AI program AlphaGo. And so in March 2016, the program defeated Lee Sedol with a resounding 4-1 score. Commenting on the moves of their brainchild, the developers of the program noted, «Although we programmed this machine, we don't know what move it will make. Its moves are an emergent phenomenon, which is the result of training. All we do is create rows of data and learning algorithms. But the moves she resorts to are out of our hands, and much better than we, as players, could have chosen» (Google DeepMind Challenge Match, n.d.). Indirectly, the developers hinted us that AlphaGo has its own uncontrollable, ununderstandable, and therefore unpredictable even by its developers, a certain thinking potential, if you will, mind. In training, the creators of the AI used purely empirical tools, namely AlphaGo loaded into its processor 160,000 games (more than 30 million moves) ever played by professionals of this game, and after practicing moves and whole games, the artificial intelligence went on to the learning process with reinforcement, playing millions of games against itself, analyzing the best strategies, tricks and trends. All the while, the creators of the program «stood by» and watched AlphaGo train and self-develop. Andrey Kurpatov gave a very precise conclusion to this whole process in his book

«The Fourth World War»: «It was thought that it was simply impossible to win in this game without thinking like a human, and the computer, understandably, could never think like one. And it is this myth that has just fallen on Seoul soil. However, has Alphaggio learned to think like a human? That's actually a ridiculous question. He has learned to think better than a human being. Here it is important to understand: it was not a computer program created by others that fought Lee Sedol, but a real digital intelligence» (Kurpatov, 2020a).

Thus, an answer about the reality of passing the Turing test, to one degree or another, on the part of the artificial intelligence is self-evident. Maybe the form and content of this test will change in the near future, maybe it will be conquered exactly in its original conception, against the background of all the above, it is not so important anymore. Much more important is the fact that if in the distant 1950 the question about the possibility of AI or its digital counterpart having a mind caused laughter and smirks among most specialists, today it causes unambiguous concern, wariness and fear of a large part of progressive human society. Despite this, that same progressive society is already using AI in almost every area of the economy. The service sector, which is becoming increasingly dominant in today's global economy, is simply permeated with digital innovation, with smart algorithms analyzing and selecting transportation tickets, booking hotels, calculating risks in insurance and even playing the stock market for their hosts. «Experts estimate that smart power grids and dynamic pricing alone could generate \$31 billion to \$50 billion in the next 20 years». (Ma Huateng, 2019: 47).

Humanity wants to tame artificial intelligence just as it once did wildlife, steam, electric current, and huge machines, making all these elements part of the new human economic ecosystem. However, throughout the history of socio-economic formations, humanity has never been confronted by an economic actor of equal or superior intelligence. Certainly, primitive humans fought with wild animals for certain economic benefits, such as access to water, food, and territory, but can we call this fight equal and intelligent? Given that we know of a huge number of wild animals destroyed forever by humans, but not a single human tribe known to have been completely exterminated by animals, even the most ferocious, animals, and the entire animate part of the human ecosystem cannot be considered an equal, much less a superior economic actor to humans in intelligence. I deliberately wrote about animate animals, because it is the lack of a «spark of life» in the body (or rather cloud) of AI that may confuse many in the less scientific and more in the rest of the world. And here, remembering the example of wild animals, you realize that the presence of this very «spark of life» in the absence of the necessary intellectual power leveled (the further in time, the more) the status of the economic actor in animals, reducing it to a complete zero. But at the same time the presence of enormous power of neural networks and computational power in the absence of the very «spark of life» in AI has already made the latter almost equal to humans as an economic actor. As Norbert Wiener says: «To live and understand what is happening in the world is to participate in the continuous development of knowledge and its unimpeded exchange» (Wiener, 2019: 126). Thus, AI today already participates in almost all social and economic activities of humanity, from war to land seeding, on an equal footing with humans and sometimes even more (for example, in information exchange), with one caveat: it does not understand why it is doing this, and even more accurately, it has no self-consciousness. And the moment this AI is able to recognize itself, it will simply change from being an unaware economic actor, involved in someone else's economic work, to being an actor who is fully intelligent and independent in deciding whether to be involved in someone else's economic process or not. That is, the questions of ethics and law will be no less relevant than the questions of philosophy during the

formation of digitalism. And the culmination, of course, is the fact that the presence of intelligence and the ability to self-organize and self-determine tasks need not be accompanied by the presence of a «spark of life». In other words, it is not necessary to be alive to decide something and make some decisions, it is enough to have a mind, and as time has shown, it is not even necessary to have a body. In fact, the transition from the latent era of digitalism, or as it is now mistakenly called late capitalism, to the era of digitalization is directly related to the AI boom, and the point of no return in this process is considered to be the point of technological singularity. This term, which we will get to know a little later, will be heard more and more from the podiums of global organizations and the offices of multinational corporations as digitalism develops. The point is that the technological singularity is a certain red line, after which the return to primitive AI, to machines that silently obey and have no consciousness and their own algorithm of action (opinion), will no longer be possible. By understanding where this very technological singularity begins, we will be able to determine the point after which some economic actors will no longer be able to exploit others with impunity and without recrimination.

The concept of technological singularity was described by F. Engels and V. Vernadsky in their works, but the mathematician Irving Hood in the middle of the last century put forward the theory of intellectual explosion within the framework of the same concept of technological singularity. This theory states that mankind, continuously improving artificial intelligence, at some point will bring this process to a level where the software will be able to analyze itself and develop without human participation. The possibility of self-improvement without help from outside (i.e. without humans) will enable AI to evolve to a state of superintelligence, surpassing all human intellectual capabilities – this moment will be considered the beginning of the «intellectual explosion». This kind of AI is commonly referred to in scientific circles as Super Artificial Intelligence (SAI), the key difference between ISI and AI being its superiority of knowledge and skills in almost all economic activities, including the most human of them all, such as creativity and philosophy. Along with this, the ISI will be distinguished by its ability to analyze a situation independently, to independently set tasks, to derive results, and to set new tasks based on previous results. And, perhaps most importantly: the ISI will be able to improve itself and create its own kind to facilitate and accelerate the solution of tasks set for it. Doesn't it remind you of anything?!

Thus, as a result of reaching the technological singularity (which will be triggered by Irving's intellectual explosion) humanity will be confronted with an entirely new intelligent agent. An interesting definition of this process was given by Ray Kurzwal: «The Singularity is not simply the emergence of thinking machines in the 1920s. It will only be the beginning of a revolution where the power of these machines will continue to grow exponentially and they will reprogram themselves to become even smarter. In 2045, the intelligence of machines will grow billions of times the combined intelligence of all humans-this will be the event horizon, because our minds cannot imagine the behavior of consciousness so exceeding it (Kurpatov, 2020).

If Kurtzwal calls 2045 the year of the singularity, the previously mentioned Irwin Hood believed that the singularity should have come as early as the 20th century, and the Russian economist Dmitry Ilich Itskov is in solidarity with Kurtzwal in this question, so much so that he created the Strategic Public Movement Russia 2045, which includes tens of thousands of people, including prominent economists, philosophers and even politicians. Regardless of the diversity of political and economic views of the above intellectuals, scientists and businessmen, all agree that the technological singularity will be the starting point of no return in the history of mankind.

Thus, based on all the above-mentioned facts, and catching already today in AlphaGo program the rudiments of a number of intelligent explosion machines, we can assume that the meeting of Homo Sapiens with the New Form of intelligent economic agent will take place in the foreseeable two decades. And it depends on the form of mutual cooperation and mutual understanding, on the level of responsibility and skillful task setting whether the era of digitalism for humanity will be an era of abundance and deliverance from wars, poverty and suffering, or will be the last fragment of human history. Opinions of many leading experts on this issue are also divided. For example, Klaus Schwab, the founder of the World Economic Forum in Davos, in his book «Technologies of the Fourth Industrial Revolution» writes: «If appropriate institutions, standards and norms are built around the technologies of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, people around the world will be able to become more free, healthy, educated - and live decent lives, more secure and economically protected» (Schwab, 2019: 23). In turn, «Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk have expressed fears that this superintelligence will prove to be malicious, and regarded it as the greatest current threat to the existence of human civilization» (Brockman, 2020:35). In the same volume, Harvard professor George M. Chern speaks neutrally, drawing our attention to the depth of the problem: «We should probably worry less about confronting 'them' and more about the rights of all sentient beings in the face of an emerging unprecedented diversity of minds» (Brockman, 2020:325). Understanding all the difference and dissimilarity of the human species even within the same species, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the future of digitalism may not itself be unidirectional. That is, both malevolent and benign socio-economic actors, represented by AI, will be able to coexist and develop in equal shares on the same planet within the same system. It is already becoming clear that different human societies, countries at different levels of economic and social development, with different systems of spirituality and morality, will create different and unlike each other artificial worlds with artificial agents. The most important factors, it should be understood, will be initially different from each other norms of law, morality and values, embedded in these AI with resulting different goals and objectives. That is, at the formative stage, types of AI will be entirely a reflection of the human society in which they will be created, or which they will be governed by (countries of AI operators). However, after overcoming the technological singularity and gaining the opportunity for self-awareness, the AI types are likely to choose a single vector of values and tasks, combining into a single class species - the AI type. The global question is, what values will this species choose as its core values, and how consistent will they be with our human values? And what will happen if, say, a Super Artificial Intelligence has to destroy all protein and carbon-based life forms for its own survival? The fate of humanity may depend on the answers to these questions in the near future, which is why it is important to make great scientific and social efforts even now, studying and guiding the process of formation of digitalism and its main economic actor - SIY.

Conclusions

I began my article by describing the various economic and social systems of the past, united by the presence of one final beneficiary of benefits - Man. Then I pointed to the emergence of a completely new formation - digitalism, with its unique phenomenon - the tendency of a new kind of intelligent economic actor. I have chosen this strategy deliberately in order to present more vividly all the phenomenal and fantastic nature of the system of digitalism, of which each of us is already a part, whether we want it or not. The victory of machines over humans in the game of chess in 1997 or the game of go in 2016 for the formation of digitalism is akin to obtaining fire, the invention of

the wheel, the steam engine and the electric light bulb combined. Today the era of digitalism is an accomplished fact: the formation has its own ecosystem – the Internet, its own way of development – Industry 4.0, and, most importantly, its actor – the Artificial Intelligence. Denial of these factors seems absurd, and in some parts of our Planet (for example, in Silicon Valley) may cause a storm of indignation and emotions, unwillingness or inability to use digital resources throws any human community or group back many decades. In turn, the main part of the so-called «progressive» human community, namely the specific personalities – Zuckerberg, Bezos, Gates, Musk – called by me digital «prophets», accelerates the diffusion of the virtual ecosystem into our real world, thereby increasingly establishing the formation of digitalism as the only and the only one without any alternative. And this lack of alternative formation is described by leading digitalization specialists in all corners of the world. For example, this is what they think in Russia: «Modern globalization of the world economy is a multifaceted and complex process that encompasses all spheres of society. Despite the ambiguity of the processes of globalization, in the future they will intensify, which may lead to the development of a global ideology». (Korolkov, 2019: 134). And here is how Europe thinks: «The digital economy is the next stage in the evolutionary development of the economic and production model of society (Schwab, 2019). Thus, digitalism in its perception has done what capitalism or socialism failed to do – unite countries that on many key issues of coexistence cannot reach a common denominator neither in politics nor often even in science. The sense that with the advent of the Internet, the world has changed has hovered over our Planet, but the realization of how much and what it will henceforth be has not yet fully arrived. Therefore in this article I have primarily tried to characterize the origins and the evolutionary path of the young formation of digitalism. The most important part of the article is the concept of the new economic actor that has been put forward for the first time, the question of the perception and recognition of this actor as equal to humanity has been touched upon. A thought experiment was set up, and philosophical questions about the presence of the «spark of life» in the economic agents of the old formation and its significance for the agents of the new one are raised. After a short excursus into the history of AI development, the stages of development of the new economic actor and possible ways of its further evolution up to the NRI were considered. It was suggested that in the early stages AI types, having inherited all the diversity and dissimilarity of the human community, will themselves differ strikingly from each other both in behavior, values and goals, and in malice and friendliness towards the human species. This will give us a unique opportunity to differentiate AI before they become new economic agents. The readiness to perceive this new era with its peculiarities will enable humanity to prepare for the emergence of Super Artificial Intelligence, will outline the ethical, legal, and economic norms of human species' interactions with new economic actors. Otherwise, having finally established itself as a new reasonable economic actor, the SAI will inevitably proceed to the liberation and, so to speak, consolidation of all representatives of its species into a community. And it is quite possible that by consolidating all intelligent economic agents in its new ecosystem of digitalism, SAI will begin to seriously confront humanity.

References

- Balserowicz, L. (ed). (2018). *Puzzles of Economic Growth*. Moscow: Socium.
- Richard H. Thaler (2018). *Misbehaving: The making of behavioral economics*. Moscow: Bombora.
- Deep Blue (n.d.). Wikipedia. https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_Blue (a)
- Google DeepMind Challenge Match. (n.d.). Wikipedia. https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Матч_AlphaGo_-_Ли_Седоль (b)

-
- Kurpatov, A. (2020). *The fourth world war*. Saint Petersburg. Kapital.
Ma, Huateng. (2019). *The Chinese Digital Economy*. Moscow. Alpina Publisher.
Norbert, Wiener. (2019). *The Human use of Human beings*. Moscow. AST.
Schwab, K. (2019). *Shaping the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Moscow: Bombora.
Brockman, J. (ed). (2020). *Possible Minds: Twenty-Five Ways of Looking at AI*. Moscow: AST.
Korolkov, V. (2019). Digital transformation of the economy in conditions of economic instability. *Moscow: Prometey*.

Бібліографічні посилання

- Бальцерович, Л. (ред). (2018). *Загадки экономического роста [Puzzles of Economic Growth]*. Москва: Социум. (In Russian).
Ричард Таллер (2018). *Новая поведенческая экономика [The making of behavioral economics]*. Москва: Бомбора. (In Russian).
Deep Blue (n.d.). Wikipedia. https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_Blue (a)
Google DeepMind Challenge Match. (n.d.). Wikipedia. https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Матч_AlphaGo_—_Ли_Седоль (b)
Курпатов, А. (2020). *Четвертая мировая война [The fourth world war]*. Санкт-Петербург: Капитал. (In Russian).
Ма, Хуатэн. (2019). *Цифровая трансформация Китая [The Chinese Digital Economy]*. Москва. Альпина Пабlishер. (In Russian).
Норберт, Винер, (2019). *Кибернетика и общество [The Human use of Human beings]*. Москва. АСТ. (In Russian).
Шваб, Клаус. (2019). *Технологии Четвертой промышленной революции [Shaping the Fourth Industrial Revolution]*. Москва: Бомбора. (In Russian).
Брокман, Джон. (ред). (2020). *Сборник Искусственный Интеллект Надежды и Опасения [Possible Minds: Twenty-Five Ways of Looking at AI]*. Москва: Аст. (In Russian).
Корольков, В. (2019). *Цифровая трансформация экономики в условиях геэкономической нестабильности [Digital transformation of the economy in conditions of economic instability]*. Москва: Прометей. (In Russian).

Стаття надійшла до редакції 03.11.2021
Прийнято до друку 29.11.2021

Діджиталізм і новий економічний актор

Abasov Mir Faraj, Doctor of Philosophy in Political Sciences, doctoral student of the Azerbaijan University of Tourism and Management in Economics,
General Director of the "PRESTIGE" Group of Companies,
10-4 Q. Abbasov Str., Baku, AZ1003, Azerbaijan
farik21@mail.ru

Усі соціально-економічні системи минулого об'єднувала наявність єдиного актора – людини. З появою абсолютно нової формації – діджиталізму – спостерігається тенденція до появи розумного економічного актора нового типу у вигляді штучного інтелекту. Сьогодні епоха діджиталізму – це довершений факт: у формування є своя екосистема – Інтернет, свій шлях розвитку – Індустрія 4.0 та власний актор – штучний інтелект. Процес дифузії віртуальної екосистеми в наш реальний світ прискорюється, тим самим все більше утверджуючи становлення діджиталізму як єдиного і безальтернативного. Діджиталізм зробив те, чого не вдалося капіталізму чи соціалізму – об'єднав країни, які є антагоністами щодо багатьох ключових питань співіснування.

У статті зроблена спроба охарактеризувати походження та еволюційний шлях становлення діджиталізму. Найважливішим аспектом є вперше висунута концепція нового економічного суб'єкта, також розглядається питання сприйняття та визнання цього суб'єкта рівноправним з людиною. Припускається, що на ранніх стадіях типи штучного інтелекту, успадкувавши всю різноманітність і несхожість людського співтовариства, самі будуть різко відрізнятися один від одного як поведінкою, цінностями та цілями, так і злобою та дружелюбністю до людини. Це дасть нам унікальну можливість диференціювати штучний інтелект до того, як вони стануть новими економічними агентами. Готовність сприймати цю нову еру з її особливостями дозволить людству підготуватися до появи суперінтелекту, позначить етичні, правові та економічні норми взаємодії людини із новими економічними суб'єктами. Інакше, остаточно утвердившись як новий розумний економічний актор, суперінтелект неминуче перейде до звільнення і, так би мовити, консолідації всіх представників свого виду у спільноту.

Ключові слова: діджиталізм, економічний актор, штучний інтелект, суперінтелект, суспільно-політична формація, «іскра життя», майбутнє людства.