

Electronic Supply Chain Management Role in Marxism Economy in Russia

Lapteva Elena Vasilievna^{*1}, Ostroumov Vladimir Vladislavovich^{#2}, Gorohovairina Venediktovna^{#3}

^{*#} *Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia.*

[#] *State Social and Humanitarian University, Kolomna, Moscow region*

Abstract—This article investigates the electronic supply chain capitalism as a model for understanding both the continent-crossing scale and the constitutive diversity of contemporary global capitalism based on the Marxism Economy in Russia. The purpose of this work is to give a brief analysis of the development of Marx's doctrine in Western and Russian economic and social science thought, from the late XIX to the early XX centuries. The author presents a brief overview of how the attitude towards Marx and his main work 'Capital' changed from the era of his contemporaries to the present time in several main directions. The article also draws attention to the critical attitude of Marx towards Russia. The author emphasizes that Marxism (the conceptual legacy of Marx) became the basis for many doctrines around the world in the twentieth century. Karl Marx became popular not only as a great economist, but also as a sociologist, a creator of the doctrine of the downfall of capitalism and coming revolution, and a forecaster-futurist. The author in his article refers to various sources - from monographs of famous scientists to interviews published in press and online sources by representatives of various social strata. The author comes to the conclusion that at the present moment interest in Marx and his teaching persists in three main planes: among academics, in the left-wing radical environment and at the level of common interest, the latter, in crisis years, gaining momentum. The author also emphasizes that interest in Marx and his teaching was manifested regionally in different planes; Marx as an economist was more popular in the West and as a futurist and revolutionary thinker in the East. The continued constant interest in Marx and his works throughout the world testifies by considering the electronic supply chain management which is teaching of Marx still remains relevant.

Keywords: *Marx; Electronic Supply Chain Management; Marxism; 'New Left'; evaluation; Economy.*

1. Introduction

Karl Marx is a prominent German economist, philosopher, literary and public figure, sociologist and forecaster. According to the results of long-term public opinion polls conducted in Europe, he always occupies the top place as one of the greatest thinkers and intellectuals of our time.

In Germany, Marx is recognized as one of the spiritual fathers of the nation. The Berlin Academy of Sciences houses the world center for the study of Karl Marx's works. Annually, for more than 30 years, Marx's works have been prepared for printing and published there. To date, 117 volumes have been published, and work on the publication continues.

'Capital' is a main work of Karl Marx. It is a work on political economy, containing a critical analysis of capitalism; it is written in strict scientific language, on the basis of dialectical approach, and is evidential. Marx's main work was published in 1867 and is an extended continuation of his previous work 'Critique of political economy' published in 1859.

Marx's 'Capital' is a multifaceted work. In it, Marx, in particular, concerns accounting and defines it as a 'means of control and mental generalization' of the production process. The paper summarizes the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism, and it was this position that was close to the social democrats of many countries, especially in Russia (despite the fact that Marx himself was very critical of Russia and the prospects of building a communist society in this country).

Modification of interest in the Supply Chain Management

The supply chain is a set of factors that create value added in the economy. Failure to do so will hinder the creation of value added in a macroeconomic perspective. The school of thought known as Marxism made contributions to philosophy that has caused an upheaval of thinking about the place of individuals in society, while the work on politics and economics created a new paradigm for studying how the interactions of such individuals are dictated; this structure of human interaction was used to suggest an inevitable processes in history that culminated in a society free from social ills [8]. Marxism as a

philosophy focuses primarily on the comprehension of social reality, including its transformation as well [30].

Only those Marx's works that were published in a very limited edition in the working press were known to contemporaries. The influence of Marx's doctrine on his contemporaries was rather modest. More than three-quarters of Marx's works were not published during his lifetime. Those published were printed in different countries and in different languages. His publications in the New York Tribune were devoted to events of that time, such polemic works like 'The Holy family' (1845) or 'Poverty of philosophy' (1847) are known only to a narrow circle of friends. 'A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy' (1859) and 'Capital' (1867) at that time were not yet understood by the contemporaries and were ignored by the official academic science. The second and third volumes of 'Capital' were published by Friedrich Engels after Marx's death (in 1885 and in 1894), the fourth volume was published by Karl Kautsky in 1905-1910. However, the last volume became available to the general public only after its secondary publication by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in 1954-1961 [18].

Although Marx did not consider himself as a political thinker, it is believed that he was the first to try to describe politics in scientific categories, and in the future the trend of scientific analysis has spread to all social sciences. The views and ideas of Marx won a wider audience after his death, mainly through the works of his colleague, and the leader of the German socialists, K. Kautsky and Russian theorist G. Plekhanov [14]. Marx consciously assigned himself to the service for proletarians. Marxism philosophy was originally created as a proletarian philosophy [6].

In the future, Marxism, both as an ideology and as a scientific theory, penetrated not only into political philosophy, but also into political practice, and its spread was truly enormous [14].

K. Marx interpreted capitalism as a historically special method of production, in which capital is the main means of production, and as well includes private ownership of the means of production and the conflict over this property – class antagonism [26].

Today, Marx's position on the collapse of capitalism attracts special attention, since the severe economic crisis undermines the foundations of the economy and society.

The attitude towards Marx among his contemporaries in the Western world was mostly neutral. He was little known among economists and almost completely unknown as a scientist and forecaster futurist. Yet there was some interest in Marx's works in the academic environment. This concerned mainly the countries of Western Europe. This situation extremely offended some of Marx's relatives, who believed that the thinker himself, who put his life on the explanation of the phenomenon of capitalist exploitation and its prospects, deserves more attention. Jenny Marx (1963) wrote with bitterness and irony: "If the workingmen had an idea of the sacrifices that had to be made to complete this work, written only for them and in defense of their interests, they would probably have shown a little more interest themselves." But not all relatives shared this point of view. Marx's mother, Henrietta, told about the works of Marx: "You had better make money than write about them" [23]. And it was for a reason – K. Marx's 'Capital', after the publication in 1867, didn't sell well, despite all efforts made by Engels to promote it [7].

Interest in the works of Marx, and especially in 'Capital' gradually grew. Currently, Marx's works are of stable interest all over the world. The interpretation of Marx's teachings is very diverse. HSE (Higher school of economics) scientist O. Ananyin believes that in the West the perception of Marx has undergone a complex evolution. In the late XIX and early XX century Marx was known more as an ideologist of the labor movement than as a scientist. He was better known in left-wing political circles than in academia; more in Germany and Central Europe than in the Anglo-Saxon world. Leaders of academic science of that times, with the exception of Austrian E. Böhm-Bawerk and the Italian V. Pareto, did not regard the polemics with Marx as their urgent tasks [2].

In the XX century, Marx's doctrine aroused interest not only by their economic calculations. The doctrine of classes and social revolution gave rise to many branches and transformations, such as Juche (North Korea, Kim Il sung), Hoxhaim (Albania, Enver Hoxha), Titoism (Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito), Prachanda (Nepal, Pushpa Kamal Dahal), Luxembourgian democracy (Poland/Germany, Rosa Luxemburg), Guevarism (Cuba, Ernesto Che

Guevara). Marx's doctrine of classes and the social revolution was of most interest to Russia.

2. Materials and methods

Supply chain capitalism has been touted as key to new regimes of profitability. As one consultancy firm explains, "If is no longer the question. Today the undisputed answer "the path to enhanced efficiency, reduced costs, more robust feature sets is outsourcing. Shifting work to third parties, often on different continents, is now a given for most organizations".

The author in this article refers to various sources - from monographs of famous scientists to interviews published in press and online sources by representatives of various social strata. Based on the structural-functional method, the influence of works of Karl Marx on his contemporaries and modern society was defined. As methodological base of this analysis served general scientific methods, such as historical, comparative, systematic, as well as private method (content-analysis). The author described gradual development of public attitude to Karl Marx and his works at different periods of time, also referring to its historical grounds.

3. Results and discussion

Before the reforms of the sixties and particularly the emancipation of the peasants in 1861, the interest of Marx and of Engels in Russia was mainly confined to the effects of Russian policy on other countries, or to Russia's reactionary repression of revolutions. Marx and Engels saw Russia as the arch enemy of Europe in particular, and of progress in general [22].

3.1 Marx's attitude to Russia

Karl Marx and his colleague, Friedrich Engels, were very critical of Russia, which allowed some modern historians and political scientists to call them Russophobes. The negative attitude of Marx and Engels was manifested in a number of works – 'Eastern War', 'Eastern Question', 'Turkey and Russia', 'Speech at the Polish Rally in London on January 22, 1867', 'Alliance and Workingmen's Association', 'Appeal to the National Workingmen's Association of the United States', 'First International Review', 'Russian-French Union', 'On Poland',

'Persian Expedition to Afghanistan and Russian Expedition to Central Asia', 'Times', 'On the Prospects of War with Russia', 'Indulgence of Russia by the Ministry of Aberdeen', 'Turkish Question', 'Expansion of Russia', 'War in the Crimea', 'On the Liberation of Peasants in Russia', 'On the Abolition of Serfdom in Russia', 'Traitor in Circassia', 'Letter to Vera Zasulich', etc. Most of these works are articles in the press; they reflect the keen interest of Marx to the events from international life and internal developments of the Russian Empire. One thing is certain, they showed a negative attitude towards Russia and Russians people and towards Slavs as a whole. The peak of the negative attitude towards Russia fell on the period of the Crimean war (1853-1856), which, however, is not surprising: the British Empire, being an enemy of Russia in this war, strenuously fueled the negativity of society through a wave of newspaper publications and reports from the fields of hostilities, speeches of political and public figures.

Russian researchers tend to believe that the root of the negative attitude lies also in the origin of K. Marx, and in the denial of Russia's interference in world politics, which came after the wave of revolutionary events of 1848. Russia, as well as its ally, Austria, was still perceived as a 'gendarme of Europe' (since the 'Holy Union' of 1815). According to Marx, Russia for a long time occupied a niche of suppressor of revolutionary movements in Europe. Here the words of Marx's colleague, Friedrich Engels ('Democratic pan-Slavism'), should be cited: "Now we know where the enemies of the revolution are concentrated: in Russia and in the Slavic regions of Austria; and no sayings and instructions on the uncertain democratic future of these countries will not prevent us to treat our enemies as enemies."

But be that as it may, K. Marx and his faithful friend and colleague, F. Engels, understood the significance of Russia in world politics and welcomed the crucial events of its history (the fall of serfdom, for example). Engels even began to study Russian language in the early 1850s.

3.2 Marx's doctrine in Russia based on E-SCM

Marxism penetrated into Russia quite early, although at the first stage the doctrine of Marx was known to

few representatives of the Russian intelligentsia. The intelligentsia in Russia consisted of different social strata, at first mainly of the more cultural part of the nobility, later of the sons of priests and deacons, small officials, bourgeois and after liberation of the peasants. It was heterogeneous intelligentsia [20]. In 1867, the first copies of volume 1 of 'Capital', which was originally authorized by censorship, entered Russia. In subsequent years, Russian magazines set out the separate provisions of 'Capital', but especially important role in the dissemination of ideas of Marxism played Russian translation of 'Capital'. In 1868, the Brussels Congress of the First International recommended the translation of 'Capital' from German into other languages. The Russian edition of the 1 volume of 'Capital' was delayed and was published only in April 1872.

At first, the Russian translation of 'Capital' was addressed by M. Bakunin, but his translation hasn't been completed. The initiative group was formed on the translation of the main work of Marx; it consisted of G. Lopatin, N. Lubavin, M. Negrescul, I. Danielson.

Gradually Marxism began to penetrate into Russian public thought. G. V. Plekhanov played a large role in the propaganda of Marxism. Marxism in Russia began to develop especially rapidly with the reaction in 1881, after the murder of Emperor Alexander II. In 1883 Emancipation of labor group was established. The undisputed leader of the group was Plekhanov. In the first Marxist work 'Socialism and political struggle' Plekhanov put forward the main theses of this struggle, based on the works of Marx: the struggle for socialism includes the struggle for political freedom and the constitution, the leading force is industrial workers, between the overthrow of the autocracy and the socialist revolution should be a long historical period. The immediate goal of Russian socialists according to Plekhanov was the establishing of workingmen's party, he called for an alliance with the liberals and counted on the help of the peasantry. But in the work 'Our differences', which became a significant event in the development of Russian economic thought and in the social movement, Plekhanov proving that Russia has embarked on the path of capitalist development warned against attempts to force the socialist revolution. Created by G. V. Plekhanov and his associates Emancipation of Labor Group promoted

Marxism in Russia, contributed to its formation as an ideological trend that replaced Narodnichestvo (Populism). For the dissemination of Marxism in Russia there was a favorable situation: the peasantry was passive, and the labor movement, on the contrary, was rising from year to year. Marxist groups began to appear in Russia, and led propaganda among workers: in 1883 - D. Blagoev's group, in 1889 - M. I. Brusnev's group. In 1888, Marxist group emerged in Kazan under the leadership of N. E. Fedoseev. In 1888, V. I. Ulyanov joined the Marxist movement. He creatively reacted to the doctrine of Marx, developed his doctrine on the proletarian revolution and under the name of V. I. Lenin entered the history of the world revolutionary movement.

Marxism was considered to be scientifically strict, establishing the laws of social development, bringing together the fields of social science. Studying 'Capital', Russian 'explorers' were founding merged revolutionary policy in it, humanism and the power of science. It seemed to them that this unity gives the moral right to use Marxism for the revolutionary reconstruction of society [19].

Therefore, we see that despite the rather early penetration of Marx's teachings into Russia, the economic aspect of his works did not become the main subject of interest in this country. It was only a background for interpretation of the future outburst of national anger against exploiters, development of provision on inevitability of revolution and its distribution on a global scale. Russia was considered by Lenin and his associates Bolsheviks as a country from which the world 'revolutionary fire' would flame up (in the words of L. D. Trotsky). However, giving Russia such a role in the early twentieth century Russian social democrats sincerely believed that an ideal proletarian state could be built in Germany.

3.3 Growing interest in the doctrine of Marx. 'New left' and academic scholars

After a series of wars and revolutions in Europe in the second half of the XX century Karl Marx was of particular interest. In the 1960s, after the youth revolution of 1968, the 'new left' intensified in France. They considered the study of Marx as a challenge to old society; Marx as an economist was not particularly attractive to them. From

Marx's 'Capital' and Lenin's works they took out the idea that: a) capitalism itself has dug its own grave [13]; b) the downfall of capitalism was inevitable; c) this downfall was likely to be close, because capitalism had long been in the last stage - imperialism. For them the provision developed by Marx in the 24th Chapter of volume 1 of Capital was important: "Centralization of the production means and socialization of labor are reaching that point where they become incompatible with their capitalist shell. It explodes. It's the hour of capitalist private property. Expropriators will be expropriated..." (Marx, 1960).

But the 'new left' received criticism from scientists; from the pedantic point of view of science, Marx, who wrote that the developed countries will simultaneously approach the barrier of revolution, which will end capitalism, is not quite right. An example of this is the practice of transition from capitalism to socialism that took place in the USSR. This provision gave rise to a heated discussion, the main provisions of which were set out in the journal 'History of Political Economy' in 1995. In this controversy, S. Hollander, a British expert on classical political economy, noted that the Marxist forecast was contradicted more by the assertion of the Soviet command system in the early XX century than by its collapse at the end of the century, and, in fact, the Soviet experience could not testify against Marx if only because he did not have any elaborated project of the communist society. As [10] concluded: "The mere fact that Marx's portrait was not in Red Square is not a reason for historians to revise Marxist economic thought of their research programs." The appeal of the 'new left' to Marx was a kind of an attempt to explain the changing world, economy, culture, to find priorities.

For the 'new left', which include such figures as D. Lukacs, N. Poulantzas, L. Althusser and other, Marx was interesting not as an economist, but rather as a philosopher and social theorist. [1] stated: "My main goal was to show exactly what was claimed by Marx in reality." L. Althusser believed that the economic contradictions of capitalism, about which Marx wrote in 'Capital' are important, but do not appear in its pure form, remaining internal structure, hidden external political and ideological differences. Hence, Karl Marx is rather important not as an economist, but as a futurist, sociologist and philosopher. Many

ideas of the 'new left' are reflected in the works of representatives of 'European communism': Santiago Carrillo, Enrico Berlinguer, Antonio Gramsci.

However, the ideas of the 'new left', especially clearly reflected in the views of representatives of the so-called 'Frankfurt school', gradually lost popularity. In the 1970s, there was only one statement similar to that of Marx: the need for an anti-capitalist revolution. But the social base of the 'new' revolution, according to the views of the 'new left', will radically change: it will be the 'bottom' of society - lumpenproletariats, migrants, unemployed, rebellious youth, a narrow group of intellectuals, drug addicts, representatives of sexual minorities. The 'new left' believed that capitalism and bourgeois ideology had no future. It was claimed by the founder and President of the World Economic Forum in Davos (1971) Klaus Martin Schwab: "The capitalist system has outlived its purpose and does not fit into the model of the modern world" [11].

In the last third of the XX - the beginning of the XXI century, the interest to Marx in the academic environment increased. In 1970-80s, neo-Ricardians were building their theories based on Marx's theory of value. Huge discussions among Marxist scientists caused commentaries by Piero Sraffa (Cambridge school), who emphasized the transformation of value into the price of production, highlighting the quantitative emphasis [24].

Some scholars of this period thought that it was necessary to create a synthesis of the Marx's labor theory and the concept of Sraffa [17],[4]. names the representatives of this point of view: R. P. Wolff, S. Bowles, H. Gintis, etc. Other scientists believed that Marx's theory must be freed from foreign accumulations of ideas and their synthesis (A. Bhaduri, P. Garegnani, S. Pack).

Since the 1970s, voices have been increasingly raised on the need for revision of the concepts Marx described in 'Capital'. In 1973, M. Morishima's 'Marx's Economics: A dual theory of value and growth' was published, where he put forward the idea of the need for 'theoretical reconstruction' of Marx's theory of surplus value. K. Marx distinguishes between 'absolute surplus value' (which is superfluous labor obtained by increasing the length of the working day) and 'relative surplus value' (which results from an increase in productivity with a reduction in the required labor) [25].

In the academic environment, supporters of the revision of the foundations of Marx's concept had opponents. In 1977 came the work of Roman Rosdolsky 'Making Marx's 'Capital'', where he analyzes 'Capital' and cites the response of some of the contemporaries of Marx as well as analyses of the work of scientists-Marxists and political figures of the XX century dealing with Marxism. His assessment of Marx's 'Capital' [21], from the standpoint of the scientist of the late XX century, is very high: "... we hope to show that we are dealing with a very complex and delicately structured theoretical construction, which, despite a significant period of time that separates us from its origins, is still, apparently, in good condition today and has the nature of a sharp analytical tool." He believes that the degradation of Marxist theory and its development in the first half of the XX century is not an accident and the whim of history, but a consequence of the prevalence of conservative interests in society. He has a negative attitude to the idea of distillation and purification of Marx's teachings to the state of certain 'eternal values', believing that 'eternal values' are difficult to reconcile with the critical-revolutionary dialectics of Marx" [21]. Rosdolsky believes that it is necessary "to deal with the pressure of 'conservative interests' in all areas. This is the only way to go beyond 'neo-Marxism' (or rather, 'vulgar Marxism') both in sociology and in Economics" [21].

In the 1980s, another movement emerged under the name 'Analytical Marxism' (John Roemer, G. A. Cohen, G. Hodgson). Representatives of this trend reject Marx's labor theory of the value, but partially apply the theory of surplus value, replacing it with the 'concept of surplus.' The contribution to the development of Marxism was also made by the Tokyo University Professor Kozo Uno school, who tried to clearly define what from the Marx's 'Capital' can be attributed to the general laws of the capitalist mode of production, and what only to its pre-monopolistic stage [27].

In the 1980s the scientists-Marxists discussed the idea to create 'General Theory of Exploitation' (M. Stephenson and P. Roberts) basing on the concepts of Karl Marx. In 1982, on the eve of the year of Marx (1983), there was published a book 'General theory of exploitation and class' by Professor J. Roemer from the University of California, where the author abstracts from the Marx's theory of value and puts

forward the position that modern capitalist exploitation is comparable to 'Marx's Theory of the Surplus Value'. He developed a general theory of exploitation, including exploitation in a socialist society, and that made him a lot of enemies. The work by B. Mazlish named 'The Meaning of Karl Marx' (1984) ended interest to Marx prevailing in the 1980s.

But in the 1980s the new movement under the name 'post-Marxism' began its development, it focuses on the study, analysis and updating of Marx's teachings related to class theory. The concept of 'post-Marxism' emphasizes both the continuity with the tradition of Marxism and the need to radically overcome the theoretical impasses of Marxist legacy, especially those that arose in the new historical period. In the most difficult years for the socialist movement (1980-1990s) post-Marxists remained committed to Marxist humanistic (development and theoretical grounding of the liberation of mankind from oppression and material needs) and scientific principles (emphasis on the antagonistic nature of society), which contributed to the preservation of the continuity of Marxist thought. The main methodological difference between post-Marxism and the previous tradition is expressed in the move from Marxist philosophical objectivism towards social constructivism [3]. Representatives of this socio-philosophical movement, which emerged from neo-Marxism in the late 1970s – early 1980s, emphasize their loyalty to the ideals of Marxism and their readiness to overcome radically the 'theoretical impasses' of Marxist legacy at the same.

3.4 Marxism and its transformation to E-SCM

In the two decades of the 60s and 70s, organizations were working to increase their competitive ability to produce a better quality product at a lower cost through standardization and improvement of their internal processes. At that time, the prevailing thinking was that engineering and design, as well as coherent production operations, were prerequisites for achieving market demands and, consequently, gaining more market share. That's why the organizations focused their efforts on increasing efficiency.

A new round of interest in the 'Capital' of Marx and his other works appears in the early 2000s, with the economic decline in a protracted period of crises.

During this period, as a result of a series of economic crises, social tension in Western countries have significantly worsened. A property division in society and a significant influx of migrants have increased.

Marx's doctrine was revived and his works were considered in terms of prognostic and futuristic point of view, trying to find an answer to the questions, was this situation predicted by Marx and whether or not there is an answer what to do in his works?

Until the early 2000s, the attitude towards Marx and his work 'Capital' among the representatives of economic history was mainly critical. O. Ananyin writes about it, referring to the article of 1995 in the journal 'History of Political Economy'. Western researchers believed that Marx's works did not have a significant impact on the development of economic science and were mostly "the conveying of known ideas by new terms" [2], therefore, the study of Marx's works is necessary only for further criticism and establishing the 'impasse nature' of his research. However, during the 2000s crises there was a new interest in Marx and his works.

It was caused by a new interpretation of his position on the role of man and machine in the future. In 'Capital' as one of the main trends Marx noted the displacement of direct labor from the modern production process and the expansion of technological applications of science. He foresaw that the era of automated production would come, where "...the means of labor passes through various metamorphoses, the last of which is a machine, or rather an automatic system of machines" (Marx, 1960), in frame of which informational, organizational and regulatory functions are dealt with by a person. This will undoubtedly cause some difficulties. K. Marx foresaw that the move to this type of production (automated and informational) will have profound socio-economic consequences.

It is also necessary to emphasize the position of Marx about the transition of the role of the main source of wealth to scientific knowledge. It is in this context appears Marx's catch phrase about the transformation of "universal public knowledge... in direct productive force" [15]. Speaking about the role of science, Marx implied that the man of the future would not be able to conduct the production process without it [16]. This gives food for thought in a period of crisis, when many workers, trying to keep their jobs, think about their competence.

The crisis world economy is experiencing now contributed to the growth of sales of 'Capital', as reports Associated Press. Berlin publishing house Karl-Dietz Verlag, which publishes political literature, delivered 1,500 copies of 'Capital' in stores since the beginning of 2008 [5]. "The book is popular now, certainly" says Director of the publishing house JörnSchüttrumpf. Director of the publishing house believes that the popularity of 'Capital' is due to the current financial crisis, which was a reason for many world's largest economies being on the brink of recession. JörnSchüttrumpf says: "There is a younger generation of scientists who pose difficult questions and look for answers for them from Marx[5].

During the crisis, the publishing of Marx's 'Capital' became a successful commercial project. In October 2008, at the Frankfurt book fair, 'Capital' became the best-selling book, and in Britain, demand for Marx's main work has tripled. 'Capital' began to be republished in Turkey, it should be noted that it was soon after it was listed as banned books there. The homeland of Marx was visited by 40,000 'pilgrims' over the past two months. Against the background of stock market crashes, defaults and the collapse of the credit system Karl Marx was perceived as a kind of a prophet.

After the crisis of 2008, Chris Harman's book 'Zombies Capitalism: Global Crisis and the Relevance of Marx' was published, in which the author tried to answer the question of how much Marx is needed in modern society and whether or not his teachings can answer the questions posed by the modern economy during crises [9]. Interest in Marx among young people in the post-crisis period has increased, which indicates a certain restoration of Marxism today.

In 2012, the festival 'Marxism-2012' was held in London. The organizer of the festival Joseph Choonara, a member of the Socialist Workers Party, notes that there are more and more young people among the participants of the festival [29]. The modern interest in Marx in China has manifested itself in a very peculiar way. Chinese TV showed a film of nine episodes dedicated to Marx. The soundtrack to this film was a rap-composition on the theme 'Marx belongs to the 1990th'. On the TV, the young man says that he learned about Marx in political science lessons, learned his theory to pass

the exam. But then became keen on him, after finding out how 'stunning' he is...

In 2011, a book dedicated to the current crisis was published: 'The Failure of Capitalist Production: Underlying Causes of the Great Recession' [12]. Its author, Andrew Kliman, Professor of Economics at Pace University in New York, upholding the Marxist positions, proves that the modern crisis was inevitable; moreover, its certain characteristics, unknown in the days of Marx, deepen the crisis and accelerate the inevitable end of capitalism, predicted by the great economist. There is no doubt that in the near future interest in the main work of Karl Marx will continue, and new works on the crisis will be created, in which the main provisions of 'Capital' will be reflected.

"Marx is a toolbox. It is up to modern theorists to use it correctly" [5], - believes Dr. Manfred Neuhaus, a member of the International editorial Board for the publication of the works of K. Marx and F. Engels in the original languages.

As a result of consideration of the increased interest in the early 2000s to the works of K. Marx as a whole, and to the 'Capital' in particular, there are three levels of interest:

1. The interest of academic scientists struggling for the purity of Marxism or vice versa, building on the basis of Marx's teachings a variety of theoretical constructs;
2. The interest of the left-wing radicals seeking in the writings of Marx the answer to acute social issues and a program of struggle for the freedoms of the lower classes;
3. The interest of the ordinary population, which in difficult times for the economy, especially in times of crisis, trying to cope with their own problems by referring to the works of classical economists.

The first level is characterized by a traditional for science passion to study and analyze, building their own theoretical constructs on the basis of well-known works and concepts. In most cases, scientists, criticizing Marx as time-bound narrow-minded economist, are trying to resort to his separate provisions related to the theory of labor, consumption and surplus value.

The second level attempts to re-consider Marx's 'Capital' as a timeless true theory and guide to action. Marx is also popular among intellectual youth,

standing on the left-wing positions. The interest of Marx in social differentiation and in how could end this differentiation is important in our days. Marx's position that the collapse of capitalism is inevitable affects their political choices. The political life of young people is becoming left-wing; Marx becomes a sign of the future path for them. The experience of building a 'society of the future' in the USSR has slowly become forgotten in the world. After all, history repeats itself and maybe the 'great experiment' has the right to a second life? For this social class, Marx is 'stunning' (in the words of a Chinese rapper) and never-dying.

The third level is characterized by an attempt to find in the writings of Marx an answer to their own, common personal important questions: how to survive the crisis, to find or keep a job, to be competitive, to resist the aggressive wave of migrants, etc[28].

4. Conclusion

In the 1990s, along with improvements in the production processes and the use of reengineering patterns, many industry managers found that for market continuation only improvement of internal processes and flexibility in the company's capabilities was not enough, but suppliers of components and materials They must produce the best quality and lowest cost, and product distributors must also be in close proximity to the market development policies of the manufacturer. With such an attitude, the supply chain management and management approaches came into being. On the other hand, with the rapid development of information technology in recent years and its widespread use in supply chain management, many key chain management activities are under way with new methods.

Despite the difference in approaches and goals, the fact of increased interest in Marx and his main work – 'Capital' in the present period makes the legacy of Karl Marx extremely relevant. Nowadays, due to economic crisis threatening economic and social stability standpoint of Marx referring to the collapse of capitalism draws more attention of modern society. Marx's doctrine and his prominent work 'Capital' continues to be reflected and referred to in numerous works of current authors. It should be noted that currently Marx is more popular in the West as an economist and in the East as a futurist and revolutionary thinker. It should also be noted that Marx's doctrine remains relevant and will

undoubtedly be attractive in the future, both for academic scholars and for social reformists and ordinary citizens.

References

- [1] Althusser, L., *Essays in Self-Criticism*. London: New Left Books, 1976.
- [2] Ananyin, O., *Karl Marx and his 'Capital': from XIX to XXI century*, 2007. Retrieved from <https://www.hse.ru/pubs/share/direct/document/74836409>.
- [3] Barbaruk, Y.V., *Post-Marxism. Znanie, Ponimanie, Umenie*, 4, 278-279, 2011.
- [4] Chepurenko, A. U., *Methodological problems of K. Marx's economics teaching in current discussions in the: the critical analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Moscow: Marx-Engels Institute at CC CPSU, 1989.
- [5] Crisis generated an interest to Marx's 'Capital'. Vesti, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=253873>
- [6] Dudko, K. A., *Proceedings from XXVI International student scientific and practical conference No. 11(25) 'Scientific community of students of XXI century. Social studies': Humanism as a basis for social work activities*, 2014. Retrieved from URL: [http://sibac.info/archive/social/11\(25\).pdf](http://sibac.info/archive/social/11(25).pdf)
- [7] Engels, F. Democratic pan-Slavism. In *K. Marx and F. Engels works* (2nd ed.) (V. 6).
- [8] Grabovskiy, A., *Reception of Marxism in 20th Century Russia*. CMC SeniorTheses, 2011.
- [9] Harman, C., *Zombie Capitalism: Global Crisis and Relevance of Marx*. Chicago: Haymarket, 2010.
- [10] Hollander, S., *Comment. History of Political Economy*, 27(1), 167-171, 1995.
- [11] *Is Marx's teaching still relevant today?*, 2012. Retrieved from <https://www.proza.ru/2012/02/15/380>.
- [12] Kliman, A., *The Failure of Capitalist Production: Underlying Causes of the Great Recession*. New York: Pluto Press, 2011.
- [13] Lenin, V. I., *On so-called market question. In Complete works of Lenin V. I.* (5 ed.). (V. 1). Moscow: Izdatelstvopoliticheskoyliteratury, 1967.
- [14] Markina, N. L., & Tvirova, Y. A., *Impact of Marxism on the political theory condition in the XX century*. IzvestiyaTulGU, series 'Gumanitarnyenuki', 3 (1), 296-304, 2011.
- [15] Marx, J., *To Ludwig Kugelmann*. In I. A. Armand & I. A. Bakh (Eds.), *K. Marx and F. Engels* (2nd ed.). Moscow: Izdatelstvopoliticheskoyliteratury, 1963.
- [16] Marx, K., *Capital: Critique of political economy. In K. Marx and F. Engels* (V. 23). Moscow: Politizdat, 1960.
- [17] Morishima, M., *Marx's Economics: A dual theory of value and growth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- [18] Nureev, R. M., *Russia: pros and cons of early spread of Marxism ideas in breadth*. Journal of Institutional Studies, 5 (3), 14-57, 2013.
- [19] Rogov, K. A., *A problem of emergence of Marxism in Russia in domestic historiography*. Vestnik KGPU, 3, 62-72, 2007.
- [20] Rogov, K. A., *Forming processes of Marxism in Russia*. Vestnik KGPU, 2, 31-36, 2008.
- [21] Rosdolsky, R., *The making of Marx's 'Capital'*. London: Pluto press, 1977.
- [22] Schapiro, L., *Marxism in Russia. In: Avineri S. (eds), Varieties of Marxism*. The Van Leer Jerusalem Foundation Series, vol 2. Dordrecht: Springer, 1977.
- [23] Smith, D., & Evans, F., *Marx's 'Capital' in comics. Moscow: 'E' Publishing house*, 2017.
- [24] Staffa, P., *Production of commodities by means of commodities: Prelude to a critique of economic theory*. London: Cambridge, 1960.
- [25] Tsarkova, S. B., *Importance of Marx's works in development of economic theory and practice*. Vestnik VUiT, 22, 82-86, 2011.
- [26] Turgeneva, O. Y., & Kalyuzhnaya, K. V., *Proceedings from LI international scientific and practical conference 'Relevant issues of social studies: sociology, politology, philosophy, history': 'New capitalism': on interpretation of socio-economic characteristics of modern society*. Novosibirsk: SibAK, 2015.
- [27] Uno, K., *Principles of Political Economy: Theory of a Purely Capitalist Society*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester; Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1980.
- [28] *Why 'Capital' has become a best-seller due to crisis?* 2009. Retrieved from <https://otvet.mail.ru/question/19002900>
- [29] *Why Marxism is at height again?* 2012. Retrieved from <http://inosmi.ru/europe/20120706/194575698.html>.
- [30] Yudin, A. I. *Is there a future for Marxism in Russia?* Vestnik Tambovskogo universiteta, series 'Gumanitarnyenuki', 3, 11-15, 2008.