
ЗНАТЬ, ЧТОБЫ ПРЕДВИДЕТЬ...

TO KNOW SO THAT TO FORESEE...

УДК 32.01

ВЕКОВОЙ ОПЫТ НЕОМАРКСИЗМА: РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ НЕОМАРКСИСТСКОЙ ТЕОРИИ КАПИТАЛИЗМА

В. С. МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ¹⁾

¹⁾Белорусский государственный университет, пр. Независимости, 4, 220030, г. Минск, Беларусь

Показывается, что неомарксистская научно-исследовательская программа в социальных науках находится в состоянии эпистемологического кризиса. Проблемами неомарксизма являются излишний критицизм и идеологическая ангажированность познания, а также окончательная непознанность капитализма. В результате отсутствует научный ответ на ключевой вопрос марксистского дискурса: «Почему капитализм, как система публичного господства, до сих пор жив?» Отмечается, что разрешение кризиса неомарксистской научно-исследовательской программы предполагает актуализацию сциентистских ориентаций в неомарксистских исследованиях, а также использование в них синергетики для эффективного познания сложной системы капиталистического воспроизводства. По трем направлениям, таким как теория идеологии, теория глобального порядка и теория революции, произведена синергетическая деконструкция неомарксистской теории капитализма. Представлены три авторские концепции, преодолевающие проблемы современного этапа неомарксистской мысли: концепция капиталистического идеологического минимализма, концепция политической поддержки глобального капитализма, концепция экологического слома капитализма. Сделан вывод о том, что синергетическая деконструкция возвращает неомарксизм к научному выявлению объективных факторов капиталистической трансформации в рамках классической марксистской традиции, но на уровне новой теоретико-эмпирической определенности.

Ключевые слова: теория сложности; неомарксизм; идеология; глобальный порядок; революция.

Образец цитирования:

Михайловский В.С. Вековой опыт неомарксизма: результаты и перспективы неомарксистской теории капитализма. *Журнал Белорусского государственного университета. Социология.* 2022;3:65–71 (на англ.). <https://doi.org/10.33581/2521-6821-2022-3-65-71>

For citation:

Mikhailouski VS. Neo-Marxist's age-old experience: results and prospects of neo-Marxist's capitalism theory. *Journal of the Belarusian State University. Sociology.* 2022;3:65–71. <https://doi.org/10.33581/2521-6821-2022-3-65-71>

Автор:

Вадим Сергеевич Михайловский – кандидат политических наук, доцент; заведующий кафедрой государственного управления юридического факультета.

Author:

Vadzim S. Mikhailouski, PhD (political science), docent; head of the department of public administration, law faculty. mikhailouskivs@bsu.by
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6988-2473>



NEO-MARXIST'S AGE-OLD EXPERIENCE: RESULTS AND PROSPECTS OF NEO-MARXIST'S CAPITALISM THEORY

V. S. MIKHAILOUSKI^a

^aBelarusian State University, 4 Niezaliežnasci Avenue, Minsk 220030, Belarus

Neo-Marxist's research program in social science exists in epistemological crisis condition. Excessive criticism, ideological engagement as well as final obscurity of capitalism are among the problems of neo-Marxism. As a result, there is no scientific answer on a key question of Marxism discussion why capitalism as a system of public mastery is still alive. Finish of crisis of neo-Marxist's research program presumes presence of positivist's finding in neo-Marxist's research and applying of theory of complexity for efficient cognition of complicated system of capitalist's reproduction. Complexity theory deconstruction of neo-Marxist's concept of capitalism is realised in three main routes, such as theory of ideology, global order and revolution. There are three author's conceptions overcoming current neo-Marxist's problems are among results of present research. They are the conception of capitalist's ideological minimalism, conception political support of global capitalism and the conception of ecological destruction of capitalism. Complexity theory deconstruction brings neo-Marxism back to scientific detection of objective factors of capitalist's transformation within the framework of classical Marxist's tradition but on the level of new theoretical and empiric determination.

Keywords: theory of complexity; neo-Marxism; ideology; global order; revolution.

Introduction

Neo-Marxism as an alternative of liberalism and an academic non-party direction of development of classical Marxism was formed in the beginning of the 20th century. Connection between neo-Marxism and classical Marxism is in specific paradigmatic focus on capitalist's nature of existence. The main doctrinal line of neo-Marxism is research of social structure where society is based on private property on means of production and exploitation of labour for profit making (capitalism). Defending the main Marxist's provisions neo-Marxism has generated new conceptual toolkit and capitalist's hegemony's become a significant problem. Neo-Marxists's analysis of mastery as a non-economic but cultural phenomenon is explained with mentioned position. The term «cultural Marxism» as a synonym of the whole neo-Marxism has also appeared due to cultural aspects of capitalist's hegemony.

The history of neo-Marxist's discussion has already existed almost 100 years. Scientific papers (written in 1923) of G. Lukacs, a Hungarian philosopher, «History and class-consciousness. Marxism dialectics research» and of K. Korsch, a German philosopher, «Marxism and philosophy» composes the first research in neo-Marxist's flow. Foundation of neo-Marxist's understanding of current capitalism specificity comprises scientific expansion of borders of political phenomena, making conception of domineering reproduction on a bio-political level, detection of capitalist's ideological negative impact in social and cultural area as well as research of capitalist's order as independent political actor. Neo-Marxism has become a self-sustained tool of critical research of «soft power» in social and political science. However, neo-Marxism hasn't finally solved the main scientific task of the whole Marxist's research program. Neo-Marxism hasn't answered the

question why capitalism as a system of public mastery is still alive [1]. A common situation in neo-Marxism can be determined as research confusion. In particular, S. Žižek, a Slovenian philosopher and neo-Marxist, writes: «We've begun to understand gradually something much more terrible, specifically that capitalism can reproduce its logics indeed for as long as you like and it truly reaches the limit. But this limit is neither socialism nor communism; it's vandalism» [2, p. 18].

The aim of the article is to generalise results and reveal prospects of neo-Marxist's capitalism theory. Analyses of neo-Marxist's capitalism theory will be realised in three main directions such as theory of ideology, global order and revolution. These directions comprise the main object of social and political research of neo-Marxism. Our hypothesis is based on position that the issue of neo-Marxist's approach on research of capitalism is solved within interdisciplinary synthesis of knowledge. Complexity of capitalist's reproduction determines search of topical methodological toolkit of its studying. Theory of complexity has such research potential [3]. The method of synthesis of neo-Marxism and theory of complexity is author's method of deconstruction exchange which presumes that synthesis of two theories can be realised by replacing a substant constant of a recipient theory with a constant of a donator theory [4].

Literature on the topic of present research is divided into three groups: neo-Marxist's, epistemological literature and sources of theory of complexity. Neo-Marxist's literature is extensive in its quantity and object variety. Original neo-Marxist's texts were studied for detection of neo-Marxist's theoretical founding of research of capitalism. Theoretical regulation of neo-Marxist's conceptions (realised in previous research by the author) has enabled to analyse neo-Marxism as a direction of social and political science which

is whole, on the one hand, and differentiated on object issue, on the other [5]. Generalisation of the results of natural and maths scientific projection in the theory of complexity as well as performance of them for social humanitarian research were realised by V. I. Arshinov, V. G. Budanov, V. E. Voitsekhovich, P. Bac, E. N. Knjazeva, S. P. Kurdjumov, G. G. Malinetskii, E. Moran, G. Nikolis,

I. Prigozhin. General theoretical papers on problems of methodology and theory of science (written by K. Poper, I. Lakatos, V. S. Stepin) have significantly influenced on determination of research strategy. Novelty of the idea of theory of complexity neo-Marxism predetermines the role of the present article among other scientific papers in chosen sphere.

Results and prospects of neo-Marxist's theory of ideology

The interest in studying sphere of consciousness and ideology is a distinctive feature of neo-Marxism which is sustainable. T. Adorno, L. Althusser, J. Baudrillard, A. Gramsci, S. Zizek, G. Lukacs, H. Marcuse, I. Meszaros, E. Fromm made a great contribution to development of neo-Marxist's theory on problems of ideology. Founding on Marxist's interpretation of ideology as a system of spurious ideas about themselves, theorists of neo-Marxism formulated more wide and complicated interpretation of ideology connected with creation and structure of ideology as a hegemony [6, p. 31]. The common idea of neo-Marxists stated that capitalist's ideology permeated the whole social area and provided stable reproduction of capitalism by that. Paradigm of ideological social reproduction in vast variety of social interactions enabled neo-Marxists to announce capitalism as a totalitarian way of influence on a person and society. H. Marcuse, a German philosopher, wrote that «current era is totalitarian even there, where it hasn't brought totalitarian states to light» [7, p. 5]. As a result, conception according to which capitalism exists as «the second nature» was formed in neo-Marxism. A bright quote belongs to T. Adorno, a German philosopher: «The world has transformed itself into ideology and people – in ideological elements» [8, p. 355–356]. Such an approach ensures criticism and determine specific role of neo-Marxism among liberal oriented and positivistic approaches in understanding of society, however, it isn't applicable for scientific research. Neo-Marxist's theory of ideology was founding within vicious circle of the position that all social interactions are repressive since they are included in reproduction of capitalism ideology, and capitalism ideology is repressive since it predetermines all social interactions.

It is necessary to reveal substant foundation for realisation of neo-Marxist's theory of ideology update with the method of deconstruction exchange. The principle of system sustainability exists in the basis of neo-Marxist's theory of ideology (in theory of complexity context). A sustainable system is a system the result of effect of which returns it to a stable set regime of reproduction (former state of functioning). Based on this, neo-Marxist's approach to ideology can be explained in the following way: capitalism order seeks for wide ideological provision (formation) of its universalism which is a factor of its sustainability. Theory of complexity deconstruction of neo-Marxist's theory of ideology presumes replacing a substant constant (foundation) with its antipode and

replacing the principle of system sustainability with the principle of a non-sustainable system.

Theory of complexity influences on a place of neo-Marxist's search of the main ideologeme of capitalism which stands outside the statement about total ideological nature of capitalism order and obligatory idea connection between the main structure of capitalism and the substance of capitalism relations. According to theory of complexity approach, capitalism is stable not because of total ideological formation but because of non-sustainable development standing within the attractor of functioning. Attractor in theory of complexity is an aim, program, vector, direction and a final condition of a system [9, p. 7]. Capitalism doesn't need in making everything with capitalism feature as well as in transmitting of essential capitalism logics in all possible social elements. Capitalism also doesn't need in providing universalism of capitalism relations. Ideological efficiency of capitalism presumes reverse process. It is enough to support the development of intention of all social elements within the framework of final condition prototype set structurally. Such an approach was assigned by the author as the conception of capitalist's ideological minimalism.

The statement that an actor dissatisfied with capitalism comprises proletariat and the unemployed (they who get benefits less than others in capitalism order) was the basic point of hypothesis of conception of capitalist's ideological minimalism. The task of verification was to prove capitalist's variant of ideological solution of dissatisfaction with capitalism of the mentioned actor. We guess that empirical evidence of ideological battle within European Parliament activity has a great value in verification. Active suffrage at European Parliament elections belongs to more than 400 million people. This makes these elections the most enormous in the world in electorate context. We've analysed key ideological documents (manifests) of such primary parties of European Parliament as European Nation Party, Alliance for Europe of Liberals and Democrats, European Democratic Party, Party of European Socialists, Party of the Left Europeans, party «Identity and Democracy», European Party of Green. The main result of this analysis is in provision that there is no European party which presents protective ideology concerning set capitalism order. All parties defend the necessity of social economic development and facilitate capitalist's transformation of dissatisfied. Thus, the example of European

ideological discussion (program documents of parties of European Parliament) proves that the attractor of a capitalism system is the idea of life improvement and it's verified.

So, theory of complexity neo-Marxist's conception of capitalist's ideological minimalism as a direction of the development of neo-Marxist's capitalism theory can be formulated in the following way. The basis of func-

tioning of current capitalism as a historical ongoing order comprises the ideologeme of life improvement for the dissatisfied with capitalism. Practical realisation of this ideologeme is applicable for supporting of sustainability of capitalism system. The reason of it is in the nearest and the most probable variant of solution of dissatisfaction with capitalism which must transform it into a state of satisfaction with capitalism.

Results and prospects of neo-Marxist's theory of global order

One of the significant areas in neo-Marxist's research is study of interstate relations and search for patterns in functioning of modern international order. The reason of the emergence of this neo-Marxism direction was in the need in theoretical understanding of the world's change after the process of decolonisation and dynamic modernisation of states in the second half of the 20th century. Neo-Marxist's theory of global order consists of two parts: theory of neo-imperialistic global order (world-system analysis and theory of dependent development by S. Amin, I. Wallerstein, E. Balibar, T. dos Santos, R. Prebisch) and theory of imperial global order (the empire conception by M. Hardt and A. Negri). The whole variety of neo-Marxist's understanding of global order comes down to an unverifiable capitalist's conspiracy theory, the main provision of which is centre-periphery structure of the world in the interests of global capitalism mastery.

Neo-Marxist's theory is based on protective explanation of the centre: the centre is an element of global capitalism system including the most developed states that receive the biggest benefits from global capitalist reproduction. The centre seek for keeping its borders that influences on its policy towards the semi-periphery and periphery. T. dos Santos, a Brazilian researcher, wrote that backwardness (underdevelopment) of the semi-periphery and periphery should be understood not as their insufficient integration into international order, but, on the contrary, as a result of this integration and acceptance of development paths recommended by countries-hegemonies [10]. According to neo-Marxist's opinion, capitalism sets global order by classical Marxism dichotomy of the exploiters and exploited. Dichotomy can comprise different actors (such as states, groups of states, territories), but it can't disappear since it reflects the essence and sustainability of the global class interest in the capital.

We've made the following neo-Marxist's provisions discussive with means of theory of complexity due to exchange from one of the basic neo-Marxist's theoretical principle of additivity to the principle of dynamic hierarchism.

Firstly, in accordance with theory of complexity the centre as a dominant element of the system seeks not for keeping itself but for absorbing adjacent elements to become an independent system with internal ele-

ments [11, p. 11]. The centre as an element of capitalism system is motivated by only one intention which is increase of the capital. That requires to include in capitalist's production the whole world's labour power with simultaneous decrease of its cost. The aim of capitalism formation (in global context) is in structural setting of the whole proletariat, not of states. The ideal of capitalist's reproduction is one global capitalist's organisation protected by one state which is «a night guard». The indicator of this intention is transnational corporations.

Secondly, global order consists of elements directed on mutual penetration. This means that the centre wants to absorb the semi-periphery and periphery meanwhile they want to be in capitalism relations like the centre. However, the result of this mutual intention is not a transnational economic organisation. Changed internal area of the centre-periphery world's structure becomes such a result. The intention of Russia and China to go out from a semi-periphery condition to the centre or their intention to dominate over the centre could be the examples of mentioned intentions. According to theory of complexity, this means that higher level of organisation than horizontal correlation between the centre, semi-periphery and periphery exists in global order. A feature of this level is a feature of the system of global order and it doesn't match the intention of dominant element (the centre) including formation of one economic capitalism area. In accordance with theory complexity approach, centre-periphery structure of global capitalism could be defined not as the structure of capitalist's sustainability but as the barrier for the whole global realisation of capitalism.

We don't agree with neo-Marxist's statement that capitalist's nature of economics confirms capitalist's nature of politics. Neo-Marxism theory mostly exists in the paradigm of superstructural understanding of politics. In this context a global political system (a system of states) must serve for the interest of capital in getting more profit. Finally, this capitalist's interest also includes liquidation of a state as an economic surplus. However, neo-Marxists haven't considered that either reduction or liquidation of a state will be enabled by a state mechanism. Famous V. I. Lenin's phrase states that economics is the most important politics. Political system can support capitalism if it corresponds its interest. However, this doesn't mean that the po-

litical interest in current global order has the only capitalist's feature.

Thus, neo-Marxist's research should be focused on detection of factors of synchronisation of political and economic dimensions of globality instead of scientific search for the means of political establishment of capitalism hegemony. Centre-periphery world's structure is not the best for global capitalism reproduction, but it's barely possible within the framework of global political conjuncture. Politics isn't the tool of capitalism on a global level. But capitalism is a tool in politicians' hands and they could either support it or not in addition to criteria of political efficiency.

This approach of understanding of the features of global order within neo-Marxist's theory was named by the author as the conception of political support of global capitalism. According to it international relations within the framework of current global order are determined by state rivalry for the dominant position in formation of global capitalism order as a way of achievement of political efficiency. This excludes determination of international relations by coordinated political idea of establishment of the world as a global transnational organisation.

M. Hardt and A. Negri guess that the main institute of global class aimed at keeping and regulation of global order is the World's Economic Forum. Existence and activities of this institute reflects the idea that «there is no economic market probable out political order and regulation» [12, p. 207]. Thereby, representatives of neo-Marxism approach emphasise that all levels and forms of interaction between a class-ruler and economically dominant class facilitate the becoming of the similarity of global government (or quasi-government). Global acts of a class-ruler and dominant class «are coordinated for decisive influence on global economy and for keeping and reproduction of current order» [12, p. 217]. We've substantiated conception of political support of global capitalism by content-analysis of the last final documents of the World's Economic Forum¹. The aim of verification was detection of political counteraction of states to full realisation of capitalism on a global level. If global order had existed in interests of capitalist's economy in approved way, economy would have determined agenda. However, there are provisions about economic function in political world's reproduction in documents of the World's Economic Forum.

Results and prospects of neo-Marxist's theory of revolution

Marxism theory of revolution is a consequence of materialistic understanding of dialectical development of social history. In its turn, genesis of neo-Marxist's theory of revolution is connected with recognition of the role of consciousness in social and political transformation of society (J. Baudrillard, G. Lukacs, H. Marcuse, E. Fromm). Even in the beginning of the 20th century G. Lukacs noted that the main barrier for original transformation of society had been «the split of proletariat's consciousness» [13, p. 167]. This meant that overcoming majorities' persuasion in sustainability of set order and their illusions about approximation to the solving social and political issues through success of economic fight is incredible complicated task. The approach of understanding of revolution as the change of real condition of existence of actors and their individuals' believes was forming in neo-Marxism. Neo-Marxists analysed significance of values in capitalism reproduction and began to understand a revolution as full revaluation of values, revision of needs and as a cultural revolution [14]. But, there was no realisation of analysis of objective factors of current capitalism transformation in neo-Marxism. Scientists focused on the necessary efforts which should have been made by the resistance force for establishment of a new social formation. This issue constitutes the main scientific problem of neo-Marxist's theory of revolution.

Neo-Marxist's thought was based on persuasion that current capitalism provides the best variant of physical human existence. This is the reason of majorities' support the capitalism order. We guess that according to classical Marxism physical existence threat has induced an individual to enter into capitalism relations. That's why we also consider that physical existence threat will be an objective factor of human outcome from capitalism order. In other words, capitalism development based on the ideologeme of permanent improvement of human lives will cause physical existence threat of a human being because of ecological catastrophe finally.

One of significant provision of theory of complexity in explaining the hypothesis of the ecological factor which can overcome capitalism order is that progress in sense of life improvement as a function of capitalism will cause to failure in functioning (to fluctuation) [15, p. 29]. The main content of conception of ecological destruction of capitalism is in statements that overcoming capitalism is impossible through spreading anticapitalism ideas among majorities and call to refusal to reproduction capitalism relations, firstly. But, the beginning of ecological catastrophe is capable to lead to impossibility to provide human physical reproduction in capitalism order, secondly.

Nowadays conception of ecological destruction of capitalism resides a phase of political prognostication.

¹Annual report 2019–2020 [Electronic resource]. URL: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Annual_Report_2019_2020.pdf (date of access: 02.08.2022).

That's why it can be verified with applying of mental modelling. The UN's data on sustainable development of the Earth point out to impossibility of further nature exploitation. This fact demonstrates that positive feedback in capitalism formation reproduction has been broken². However, capitalism can overcome caused by negative feedback systemic deflection by means of «green economy», specifically – of «green capitalism». We guess that «green economy», or «green capitalism», isn't capable to overcome process of capitalism system decay. Firstly, «green economy» is a metamorphosis of a highly developed economy. As for developing economies, they need to pass phases of developed and highly developed functioning for achievement a «green» form. This will strengthen fluctuation process of global capitalism. That's why K. Marx also said that communism is primarily possible in the group of the most developed countries. Likewise, we share the idea that «green» or postmaterialistic social aim at life improvement and its realisation are possible only in highly developed countries. Demographic factor of global periphery and semi-periphery determines continuance of materialistic and nature exploitative sup-

port world's development within the framework of the idea of achievement consumer convenience like in the centre (the West). Secondly, according to The World's Wildlife Fund's data, «the day of ecological duty» (date where world's economy exhausts resources that can be reestablished for a year) was the 28th of July in 2022.

Conception of ecological destruction of capitalism is an alternative of revolution discussion on neo-Marxism and «green» oriented antiglobalist and the left powers because of two reasons. Ecological catastrophe is not an ideological tool (source) of capitalism transformation. It is the forecast of further capitalism development. Ecological catastrophe, which will cause physical human reproduction threat, will also stop capitalism relations reproduction objectively. This should be understood in order not to replace the reason of the ending of capitalism with fear of ecological catastrophe. Transition to anticapitalism social reproduction is possible within the framework of peoples' intention to improvement of existence conditions. The difference is that socialistic (communistic) project should be based not on anticapitalism discussion but on the idea of human survival.

Conclusion

Contradictions of world's development make traditional (in sociological sense) powerful dimension of human existence topical. Due to this scientific interest in Marxist's theory and methodology has returned. The issue of engagement of applying classical Marxist's approach, elaborated with empirical material of past centuries, hasn't disappeared from scientific discussion. Distance from this problem occurs due to the fact that Marxism has never braked but always developed as a research program. Marxism has program nature since it defends that a scientific theory is historical. Classical Marxism protected from shock of intellectual conflict with capitalism in 20th century in Lakatos' way that means renewal of research program within neo-Marxist's scientific discussion.

Solution of problems of neo-Marxist's research program goes ahead of current neo-Marxist's research. We guess that such solution presumes topicality of positivistic directions in neo-Marxist's approach as well as applying of theory of complexity there for efficient research of complicated capitalism system. Theory of

complexity neo-Marxism is a project of topical current interdisciplinary development of neo-Marxist's theory which is capable to solve the main problems of neo-Marxist's research of society. Theory of complexity neo-Marxism conception of capitalist's ideological minimalism overcomes non-verifiable interpretation of ideology as a total hegemony above all social interactions in the interest of ruling class. Theory of complexity neo-Marxism conception of political support of global capitalism moves neo-Marxism away from discussion of conspiracy theory. Theory of complexity neo-Marxism conception of ecological destruction of capitalism overcomes an idealistic direction in neo-Marxist's research which is connected with either detection of new ways of revolution fight or search of new actors of revolution. Thus, theory of complexity deconstruction returns neo-Marxism to scientific detection of objective factors of capitalist's transformation within classical Marxist's tradition, however, on the level of new theoretical and empirical determination.

Библиографические ссылки

1. Михайловский ВС. Три проблемы неомарксизма, или Что необходимо знать при использовании неомарксистского подхода. *Журнал Белорусского государственного университета. Социология*. 2021;3:38–46. DOI: 10.33581/2521-6821-2021-3-38-46.
2. Жижек С, Руда Ф, Хамза А. *Читать Маркса*. Москва: Высшая школа экономики; 2019. 176 с.
3. Михайловский ВС. Развитие марксизма: методологические возможности синергетики. *Журнал Белорусского государственного университета. Социология*. 2017;2:52–58.

²Sustainable development [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://sdgs.un.org> (date of access: 02.08.2022).

4. Михайловский ВС. Способы междисциплинарного синтеза политической теории. В: Михайловский ВС. *Эвристические основания развития современной политической теории*. Минск: РИВШ; 2020. с. 141–153.
5. Михайловский ВС. *Политологический неомарксизм: история, методология, теория*. Минск: РИВШ; 2017. 204 с.
6. Therborn G. *The ideology of power and the power of ideology*. London: Verso; 1999. 144 p.
7. Маркузе Г. *Эрос и цивилизация*. Москва: АСТ; 2003. 528 с. (Philosophy).
8. Адорно ТВ. *Негативная диалектика*. Москва: Академический проект; 2011. 538 с.
9. Князева ЕН, Курдюмов СП. Синергетика как новое мировидение: диалог с И. Пригожиным. *Вопросы философии*. 1992;12:3–20.
10. Сантус ТД. Структура зависимости. *Скепсис* [Интернет; процитировано 2 августа 2022 г.]. Available from: http://scepsis.net/library/id_2297.html.
11. Малинецкий ГГ. Предисловие. Глядя в будущее... В: Малинецкий ГГ, редактор. *Будущее России в зеркале синергетики*. Москва: КомКнига; 2006. с. 6–16.
12. Хардт М, Негри А. *Множество: война и демократия в эпоху империи*. Москва: Культурная революция; 2006. 559 с.
13. Лукач Г. *История и классовое сознание. Исследование по марксистской диалектике*. Москва: Логос-Альтера; 2003. 416 с.
14. Маркузе Г. Пересмотр концепции революции. *Скепсис* [Интернет; процитировано 2 августа 2022 г.]. Доступно по: http://scepsis.net/library/id_3442.html.
15. Князева ЕН, Курдюмов СП. *Основания синергетики. Синергетическое мировидение*. Москва: Либроком; 2010. 252 с.

References

1. Mikhailouski VS. Three problems of neo-Marxism, or What you need to know before using a neo-Marxist approach. *Journal of the Belarusian State University. Sociology*. 2021;3:38–46. Russian. DOI: 10.33581/2521-6821-2021-3-38-46.
2. Zhizhek S, Ruda F, Khamza A. *Chitat' Marksa* [Read Marx]. Moscow: Higher School of Economics; 2019. 176 p. Russian.
3. Mikhailouski VS. Marxism development: methodological possibilities of synergetics. *Journal of the Belarusian State University. Sociology*. 2017;2:52–58. Russian.
4. Mikhailouski VS. [Methods of interdisciplinary synthesis of political theory]. In: Mikhailouski VS. *Evristsicheskie osnovaniya razvitiya sovremennoi politicheskoi teorii* [Heuristic foundations of the development of modern political theory]. Minsk: National Institute for Higher Education; 2020. p. 141–153. Russian.
5. Mikhailouski VS. *Politologicheskii neomarksizm: istoriya, metodologiya, teoriya* [Political science Neo-Marxism: history, methodology, theory]. Minsk: National Institute for Higher Education; 2017. 204 p. Russian.
6. Therborn G. *The ideology of power and the power of ideology*. London: Verso; 1999. 144 p.
7. Markuze G. *Eros i tsivilizatsiya* [Eros and civilisation]. Moscow: AST; 2003. 528 p. (Philosophy). Russian.
8. Adorno TV. *Negativnaya dialektika* [Negative dialectic]. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt; 2011. 538 p. Russian.
9. Knyazeva EN, Kurdyumov SP. [Theory of complexity as a new worldview: a dialogue with I. Prigogine]. *Voprosy filosofii*. 1992;12:3–20. Russian.
10. Santos TD. Dependency structure. *Skepsis* [Internet; cited 2022 August 2]. Available from: http://scepsis.net/library/id_2297.html. Russian.
11. Malinetskii GG. [Preface. Looking to the future...]. In: Malinetskii GG. *Budushchee Rossii v zerkale sinergetiki*. Moscow: KomKniga; 2006. p. 6–16. Russian.
12. Hardt M, Negri A. *Mnozhestvo: voina i demokratiya v epokhu imperii* [Multitude: war and democracy in the age of empire]. Moscow: Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya; 2006. 559 p. Russian.
13. Lukach G. *Istoriya i klassovoe soznanie. Issledovanie po marksistskoi dialektike* [History and class consciousness: studies in Marxist dialectics]. Moscow: Logos-Al'tera; 2003. 416 p. Russian.
14. Marcuse H. Revisiting the concept of revolution. *Skepsis* [Internet; cited 2022 August 2]. Available from: http://scepsis.net/library/id_3442.html. Russian.
15. Knyazeva EN, Kurdyumov SP. *Osnovaniya sinergetiki. Sinergeticheskoe mirovidenie* [Foundations of theory of complexity. Theory of complexity worldview]. Moscow: Librokom; 2010. 252 p. Russian.

Received by the editorial board 05.08.2022.