

March 12, 2013

Communism and Post-communism

The ability to form stable governance is essential to that of a society that is unified homogeneously across the globe. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels define Communism as one possible global ideology. In this system the destruction of individual property is essential where private property is no longer exchangeable for labor, and also where Communism dictates a decentralized mode of production. Collective property, instead replaces the property of individuals, and is controlled by proletarians represented by the Communist Party. Marx and Engels state that the homogenizing trend of societies is that of a Proletarian movement which will unite all laborers into a single Proletariat class. Noticing that each age has historical tendencies, Marx and Engels specify that based on one trend each ruling class demolishes the property rights of the prior ruling class. For example, the property rights associated with the ancient ruling class was demolished with the creation of feudal property; according to Marx and Engels bourgeois property negated feudal property in a similar manner, and the claim is that proletarian property will in turn replace bourgeois property. The apex of the communist argument is that inevitability will bring the downfall of capitalism. The insight of Valerie Brunce, Keith Darden and Anne Grzymala-Busse, Michael McFaul, and Azar Gat, describe institutional mechanisms that lead to a complete understanding of the transition between communism to post-communism.

Southern compared to Eastern Post-communism

In all regions of the world, and ultimately in any examination of governance, different conditions help to characterize a political geography. Similarly, Valerie Bruce describes that in Latin America and southern Europe transition from communism to post-communism varied due to a set of indicators which produced a set of outcomes. First, the specific occurrence of nationalist mobilization relative to the size and homogeneity of the mobilization, led to the development of a competitive

elections. The outcome of the election, if democratic, is a kind of litmus test that lowers the likelihood of continuing authoritarianism. Second, the military's historical relationship with the state is crucial in determining the amount of mobility that democratic movements have. Specifically, if the military was a tool that political elites could use, often the case in Latin America, then the tendency for a state to have continued authoritarianism increased. But in the cases of eastern Europe, the inverse was more likely; the authoritarian elites could not use the military and democratic movements tended to benefit. Third, nationalist opposition destabilized democratic order; path dependency increased the time needed for democratic governance. Fourth, the degree of certainty a populous has of democratic outcomes increases the likelihood of democracy. The final implication depicted by Valerie Bruce describes the scope of options that political elites had at their disposal. Elites in different states faced different effects for different choices, and different outcomes resulted accordingly. The transitions differed, and in each region the same variables as inputs varied based on the institutional arrangement of the state.

Education, Similarities between States, and Global Competing Ideologies

Keith Darden and Anna Grzymala-Busse find that different institutionalized schooling lead to different national tendencies. Darden and Grzymala-Busse note that while school is not the only factor that leads to resistance or acceptance of Communism, it was a nationalizing feature. In fact, the nationalizing tendencies of school created national identity. By strengthening the informal institution of nationalism, a state supported Communism if they identified as a friend to Russia or the Soviet Union. Michael McFaul analyzes the seven characteristics of the relationship between authoritarian regimes and the civic societies of Serbia, Ukraine, and Georgia. In each of the three case studies, McFaul finds that the civic society of the state was able to gain enough political capital to reform the authoritarian state, remove the autocratic elite, and create democratic order. Other post-communist states do not have the seven characteristics of Georgia, Serbia, and Ukraine – making them not most similar. Azar Gat compares fascist Germany and imperial Japan to post-communist Russia and China. Gat discovers

different outcomes in the cases of Russia and China in contrast to smaller states due to the greater role of that Russia and China hold on the international stage – similar to that of Germany and Japan in 1930. Gat also notes that Liberal Democracy is a global ideology that is influenced by the ideology of the role that the United States represents.

Modern Implications

To summarize the ideas of all the authors, the transition from post-communism to another form of governance varied based on the conditions of the society, culture, and the institutions of the state. Communism is a broad ideology with different interpretations. And if Communism in any sense were to flourish globally, then findings of the authors suggest that the global institutions must favor Communism instead of another ideology. The Soviet Union followed and implemented, what is often referred to as, Leninist Communism. Marx and Engels and other communists in their age lacked the foresight to know that their version of Communism would later be interpreted differently, variant to the original ideas presented in the *Communist Manifesto*. Whereas Leninist Communism is discredited, Marxist Communism is still arguably a political ideology represented by a global minority, and also has related historical events – past and present – that support the theories of Marx and Engels. Communism, as we know it represented by states like the Soviet Union and Cold War China, could not have worked. But, Marxist Communism still provides valuable insight. First, Marx and Engels argued that a communist society would see all men and women as equals; the historical trend of more political freedoms for every human being has increased since the *Communist Manifesto* was published in 1848. Second, the improved means of communication that unites laborers resembles the Modern Industry invention of The Internet. Third, Marx and Engels describe the process of education and political agency given to proletarians similar to that of improving literacy rates across the world. Perhaps the *Communist Manifesto* refers to the events as communists saw them in the 19th century, but the events of today more closely represent the Communism that they were describing.