

## COMMUNISM: DOCTRINE, EVOLUTION, POLITICAL PRACTICES

**Cezar AVRAM\***

ORCID: 0009-0008-7615-2613

**Ion-Leone GAVRILĂ-CIOBOTEA\*\***

ORCID: 0009-0006-4610-8828

**Abstract:** The interwar period produced a new form of social-political organization that was called totalitarianism. The communist ideal has always been proclaimed as the antidote to selfishness, especially selfishness materialized in property. Ideal communism in action appears very rarely in the historical evolution of mankind. In conclusion, the social and economic arrangement, which bears the name of communism, is defined by the fact that no member of it possesses more than any other, either because all property is held in common, or because the institution of property does not exist, either because ownership is limited to the means of consumption and is excluded as regards the means of production and exchange.

**Keywords:** communism, doctrine, political, economic, property.

The nature of the political regime and its form of expression in terms of social practice are given by the balance of forces between classes, parties, between citizens and civil and political society. The political regime cannot be identified with the form of government that designates the concrete way of formation and organization of the organs of state power, their characteristics and principles, the relationships between them and the other institutionalized forms of the political system. The political regime also represents the materialization of the hierarchization of political values<sup>1</sup>.

---

\* 1<sup>st</sup> Degree Scientific Researcher, PhD., “C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research in Social Studies and Humanities from Craiova, of the Romanian Academy; E-mail: avramcezar@yahoo.com

\*\* Research Assistant, PhD. candidate, “C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research in Social Studies and Humanities from Craiova, of the Romanian Academy; E-mail: leone.sima21@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Apud Thierry Wolton, *A world history of communism*, vol. II, Bucharest, Humanitas Publishing House, 2015, p. 21.

The interwar period produced a new form of social-political organization that was called totalitarianism. *The most effective totalitarian regime was the Soviet one*<sup>2</sup>, as it benefited from the longest lifespan, managing to destroy all traditional social organisms and exercise the most complete control over society. Its origins can be found in the years of the First World War, as well as in the civil war in Russia. Then the necessity arose that all institutions and all social categories should be subordinated to military victory, and it was also then that Lenin proved that a minority willing to make an all-out effort can defeat a less determined majority and that all institutions and human rights can be subordinated to the will of a group and its leader.

Communists have always claimed to be ideologically guided by Marxist-Leninist science, theorizing revolution as the only way to expropriate the bourgeoisie, remove it from power and install the dictatorship of the proletariat. In fact, the new regime hid the absolute power of *the communist party*, the only one that operated legally and recruited its members on the basis of unconditional loyalty. Organized in a pyramidal fashion (with collective decision-making forums becoming less and less numerous as you get closer to the top), it was led by a Political Bureau, dependent on the will of the general secretary, usually considered the supreme leader. The elite of the regime was the nomenclature (a blanket of privileged people), and the pillars of the regime were propaganda (the army of political indoctrination), terror (the repression exercised by the political police) and atheism.

The concept of communism preceded Marx by over two thousand years. In *Plato's Republic*, private property was forbidden to the ruling guards<sup>3</sup>. The first Christians practiced the community of goods (*primitive Christianity*) not only because they lived in enclaves and were under a permanent threat, but also because Christ's teaching urged them to renounce wealth. Although this phase of Christianity did not last long, the idea of community of wealth reappeared in medieval monasteries where personal poverty was the first covenant. The reasons were similar to those of Plato: the monks and nuns could not properly dedicate themselves to the service of the Lord if they were burdened by earthly possessions and worries. In addition, through the monastery's ownership of necessities and other resources, a closer connection of the members of the community to the community was ensured and independence and rivalry between them was prevented<sup>4</sup>. The abolition of personal wealth had two grounds: the purification of

---

<sup>2</sup> The origins of communism lie in the works of Marx, who founded the theory of class struggle by finding the source of evil in private property and in the desire of the individual to obtain profit at the expense of other fellows.

<sup>3</sup> The reason why Plato forbade property and the possessive relationship that marriage represented was that it would be impossible for rulers to adopt disinterested decisions if they had selfish interests.

<sup>4</sup> Just as the covenant of chastity prevented disorder and sexual competition.

the individual from material concerns and an increased cohesion of the community, best promoted by the elimination of economic independence and conflicts<sup>5</sup>.

The approach to the community of goods was renewed in the 16<sup>th</sup> century in the *Utopia* (1516) of Thomas Morus and in the 17<sup>th</sup> century by certain levellers who, invoking biblical passages, emphasized God's will for people to enjoy the world in common.

In the 18th century, Abbot Mably, who believed that property arose with the fall into sin, proposed an *ascetic communism* as a cure for luxurious living and aggressiveness. He particularly attacked entrepreneurs and bankers.

The Enlightenment thinker Morelly also predicted an *agrarian communism*, based on small communes, in which sumptuous laws were supposed to prevent variety even in clothing and prevent the development of inequality<sup>6</sup>.

No private property was allowed, except for the goods related to daily needs and the tools of one's craft. Everyone was to be supported by the community and work for its benefit, and work was to be a strict obligation.

The French revolutionary Gracchus Babeuf followed Morelly and Rousseau, emphasizing, in *the Manifesto of the Equals* (1796), the fundamental equality between individuals. If all people had the same needs and the same skills, they should have the same education and the same food. Babeuf believed that property and inequality were the source of all evils in society. He also predicted an agrarian communism that would have been carried out through revolution. In this new society property became community property and everyone was obliged to work. Although the goal of work was abundance, living had to be modest and frugal.

The French sociologist Emile Durkheim believed that these communists, including Rousseau, were looking for a solution to selfishness, debauchery and other vices, which made them emphasize asceticism. They did not challenge the social appropriateness of property, but its morality. Durkheim revealed the contrast between early communists, who were nostalgic for pre-industrial society and classical republics, and socialists like Saint Simon, who were realists with an eye toward the future. Of course, the French communists of the 18th century had not known industrialism and, as such, their speech for an agrarian communism is not surprising. An agricultural society is inherently more consistent with the principle of absolute equality than an industrial society, where the division of labor inevitably generates differences in status, function and income. The pioneers of communism, including Morus, also saw in tenacious work the key to solving the problems created by the insufficiency of goods. Of course, this simple equation was more suitable for an agrarian economy than an industrialized society.

The 19<sup>th</sup> century communists adapted the doctrine to the industrial age. Etienne Cabet, praising equality and *fraternal communism*, advocated large

---

<sup>5</sup> See also Gheorghe Dănișor, *Filosofia Dreptului*, Craiova, University Publishing House, 2003, p. 35.

<sup>6</sup> Similar proposals were made by JJ Rousseau.

factories and the widespread use of machines, as well as the communalization of lands. Communism should not be limited to small communities, but it should be extended to the new nation-states. Christianity was considered by Cabet to be an anti-property doctrine, and his communist utopia “*Voyage en Icarie*” (1840) was based on “true” Christianity.

The most subtle and profound theory of communism was elaborated by Marx<sup>7</sup>. He ridiculed *the rudimentary and idealess communism* (Cabet) which did not extend the principle of property (generalized private property) to everyone. This rudimentary communism was, according to Marx, the realization of *universal envy*, while true communism meant the complete abolition of the principle of property by which human self-alienation had to be put to an end and authentic moral relations between individuals, between man and nature, had to be created. It is the institution of property that has made people incapable of enjoying an object they possess and desiring an object they do not possess. This distorted the desires of individuals. Under the conditions of true communism, Marx believed that it would be possible to use goods in common. Communist production had to be a collaborative activity and finally, between physical and intellectual work there had to be no difference. Individuals had to practice both without excessive specialization. It remains open to debate whether the self-realization of the individual and the abolition of the division of labor envisioned by Marx in his early writings could be accomplished in a communist society, which he elsewhere characterizes as an industrial society. Industrialization in his conception tends to generate bureaucracy and specialization<sup>8</sup>.

A series of contemporary anarchists with Marx also pleaded for common property<sup>9</sup>, but they feared the centralization that Marx’s communism seemed to imply and that would threaten individual freedom. In the meantime, their fears about state communism proved to be justified.

The word *communism* connotes equal contribution and distribution as well as community. *Ideal communism* would bring an end to private wealth and private ownership of the means of production along with a new way of life based on community cooperation and solidarity. The words *equality* and *fraternity* are characteristic of communism. In *the communist project*, the ideal of freedom

---

<sup>7</sup> Karl Marx (1818–1883), born in Trier, Germany, was an economist and publicist, the founder, along with Friedrich Engels, of the theory of scientific socialism. He rose to prominence as a theoretician and leader of the labor movement, also having an important influence on the political history of the 20th century. Together with his friend Engels he wrote and published in 1848 *the Manifesto of the Communist Party*. His approach is visible from the first part of the first chapter: “The history of all known societies is class struggle”. Marx’s ideas exerted a major influence on the labor movement after his death, greatly increasing with the October Bolshevik Revolution (apud Cezar Avram, *Fascism, nazism, stalinism*, Craiova, Aius Publishing House, 2006, p. 173).

<sup>8</sup> Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *Writings from my youth*, Bucharest, Political Publishing, 1968.

<sup>9</sup> P. Kropotkin used the name of *anarcho-communism for his system* (Idem, *Opere*, vol. 19, Bucharest, Political Publishing, 1964).

occupies a central place. But it differs from the individualist concept of freedom. The logic of communism suggests that freedom from oppression, deprivation and exploitation can only be conquered simultaneously for all, by destroying the structures that oppose the freedom of the many and support the privileges of the few. Under communism, freedom would equally characterize the community and its individual members. M. Bakunin states that “everyone’s freedom is essential for my freedom”, which explains the essence of communism: “*everything, including freedom, is a common good*”.

The communist ideal has always been proclaimed as the antidote to selfishness, especially selfishness materialized in property. Ideal communism in action appears very rarely in the historical evolution of mankind. A number of researchers believe that it was realized only in religious communities and in a few secular communities (the few primitive populations that still exist), where ownership and joint work represent a way of life. In any case, and here there is a consensus in the world of contemporary political analysts, it does not seem to have been achieved in communist countries.

Communism as an ideology represents a process of class conflict and revolutionary struggle, which would lead to the victory of the proletariat and the establishment of a classless socialist society, in which private property would be abolished, and the means of production and subsistence would belong to the community. For Marx, communism represented the result of material development, especially of the productive forces. He considered that the important problem is to change the world and not to interpret it. Unlike Lenin and Stalin, Marx tells us little about the world of communism. According to the slogan adopted by the communist movement, communism was supposed to be the world where everyone received “according to his abilities and according to his needs”. Morality being abolished together with the lacks, the main criteria that had to govern the choice of projects in life were the scientific and aesthetic ones. In other words, the communist society was not one of consumption, but it was a society that mobilized everyone, whether poor or intellectually rich, to show virtue and noble feelings in the production of goods.

Marx and Engels believed that by offering a scientific explanation of the possibility and even the necessity of communism, they would distance themselves from the utopian socialists. They believed that the abolition of capitalism was possible because it creates its *own graves in the working class*, “who have no country and nothing to lose but chains”<sup>10</sup>. Capitalism proved to be extraordinarily revolutionary and able to revitalize itself, a fact highly appreciated by Marx. What he did not consider possible was that the pauperization of the working class did not occur in the advanced capitalist world where Marx believed the revolution should

---

<sup>10</sup> Friderich Engels (1820-1895), German political philosopher from the 19th century, will develop communist philosophy together with Karl Marx by editing several issues of *Capital*. Karl Marx, Friderich Engels, *Write from youth*, vol. 3, Bucharest, Political Publishing House, 1957, p. 139.

occur. The facts have shown that the size of the extremely poor class is a function of political and institutional factors and is not an inevitable consequence of capitalism as such. Marx's theory was completed by Lenin. He argued that workers do not go beyond their narrow economic demands for better pay and conditions to make explicitly political demands for the overthrow of capitalism. Only intellectuals could understand the emancipatory potential of communism, which was beyond the workers' experience, no matter how socialized the production. A party of intellectuals, organized, firm and unshakable, acting as a vanguard of the workers and armed with the knowledge offered by Marxist theory was therefore necessary in achieving the transition to the freedom of communism. According to Lenin, the homogenization of workers was not the spontaneous result of capitalist production. Likewise, the alliance of the "working aristocracy" with segments of imperialist capital resulted in the nationalism of the working class. This led to the disintegration of the international socialist movement at the outbreak of the First World War. That's why, Lenin said, the road to communism was going to take a different path. The weak links of the imperialist chain would be the first to give up capitalism, and Russia would be the first to fall in 1917, after defeat in the war.

The solution of the peasant problem will be a task of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They will lead "a class policy", of undermining and permanent destruction of private property, of the "exploiting class in the villages"<sup>11</sup>.

The effort to build communism in Russia, however, raised important theoretical and practical problems. The theory had assumed that the revolution would take place where the socialization of production, the potential for abundance, and a large working class were already realities. Russia was the poorest country in Europe, with an extremely large illiterate peasantry and an underdeveloped industry. In these circumstances, not only was it necessary for the party to educate the workers in such a way as to overcome the mentality of narrow economism, but it had to create the working class itself. Here we also find the reason why the socialist Mensheviks opposed the communist Bolsheviks who called for a socialist revolution before capitalism was established. Conquering power, the Bolsheviks found themselves without a program that went beyond the pragmatic slogans crowned with political success, *peace, bread and land*, which expressed the strong public desire for an end to war and deprivation, as well as the demand of the peasants to redistribute the land. As Lenin himself liked to say, there was no detailed plan of socialism for stepping on the road to communism. Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov Lenin considered the Bolshevik faction "a vanguard party of the working class, a party of professional revolutionaries who, in order to destroy the old social order and establish the new one, had to act subversively, conspiratorially.

---

<sup>11</sup> See *Establishing Communism between Resistance and Repression. Communication presented at the Sighetul Marmăției Symposium* (June 9-11, 1995), Civic Academic Foundation, 1995.

Marx expressed this through a famous metaphor<sup>12</sup>: “Communism had to mature in the womb of capitalist society, ready to emerge, if not fully formed then requiring only a short period of transition before standing up and fully functioning”.

Like the early Christians, the Bolsheviks sprang into action almost immediately, as if the end of the world were near. During the years of wartime communism (1918–1920), in the middle of a civil war, all property was nationalized, and money was abolished for a while. When peasant uprisings and unrest occurred, Lenin declared a brief lull in 1921, before *the paradise of communism was stormed again*. This respite was called *the New Economic Policy* (NEP). In the last three years of his life, however, Lenin became increasingly aware of the difficulties of building communism in Russia. This would have required a prolonged period of transition, in which both the antagonistic social classes and the relations of commodity production had to be maintained under the careful and guiding supervision of the party. Political and institutional factors worked to shorten this transition phase. While the Communist Party and industrial institutions, such as the Supreme Council for the National Economy, bore responsibility for governing the country during wartime communism, the *New Economic Policy* (NEP) was largely controlled by experts often of bourgeois origin and Mensheviks or elements with right-wing political beliefs. When the NEP ran into difficulties, it was difficult for the party and the other bodies to counter the claim that the abolition of market relations and the liquidation of the exploiting classes, such as the kulaks and small traders, would be a better strategy. It was unlikely that the NEP would survive as long as the party continued to hold political power, and it could not welcome the development of capitalist relations with too much enthusiasm. These political and institutional obstacles to the NEP were amplified by the rivalry within the party leadership, where Stalin took advantage of his control over the personnel to give politics a course to the left in 1929 – the “Great Turning”<sup>13</sup>.

The Stalinist version of socialism, with some important modifications, ruled the Soviet Union for the next 56 years. It began in the spirit of extraordinary optimism regarding the possibilities of building communism on the path of massive industrialization and the collectivization program.

The Bolshevik dictatorship reached its extreme form under IV Stalin, who managed to consolidate control over the party and the state in the period 1922–1927 and became the absolute master of the Soviet Union until his death

---

<sup>12</sup> Lenin viewed the state as an instrument of coercion, stating that his and the Bolsheviks’ desire was to transform “the state into an institution imposing the will of the people” and to organize “violence in the interests of the people” (George Leggett, *CEKA: Lenin’s Political Police*, Bucharest, 2000, p. 73.); see Mihai Stamatescu, Raluca Grosescu, Dobrin Dobrinu, Andrei Muraru, Liviu Pleșa, Sorin Andreescu, *A history of communism in Romania*, Iași, Polirom Publishing House, 2008, p. 11.

<sup>13</sup> See Nicolas Werth, *History of the Soviet Union from Lenin to Stalin*, Bucharest, Corinth Publishing House, pp. 66–68.

(1953). After a bloody confrontation between the camp led by Trotsky and the camp whose leader was Stalin in the new regime, the fight broke out for the establishment of the monopoly of the Communist Party for industrialization and forced collectivization, for unconditional submission and re-education of individuals through the concentration system called “gulag”<sup>14</sup>. Against Leon Trotsky, his main opponent of the Leninist legacy, who supported the theory of permanent revolution and the export of revolution as an essential condition for maintaining the Soviet communist regime, Stalin opposed the theory of socialism in one country, with which he won the Soviet youth and which helped to create an image of a moderate leader.

Stalin imposed the first five-year plan (1928–1933) also due to the fact that it proposed the acceleration of industrialization, the radical transformation of the agricultural system through collectivization, which actually meant the establishment of a new way of life. The new way of life had to generate new attitudes and new loyalties. The resistance encountered especially to the change in the form of property was a good opportunity for Stalin to establish the forced labor camps (*Gulag Archipelago*) where approximately 8 million people arrived annually and where, only between 1929-1936, more than 9 million people.

In continuation of the action initiated by the first five-year plan, Stalin ordered *the Great Terror* directed specifically against the members and leaders of the Communist Party, later extended to the officers of the Red Army. Apparently aberrant, this repression had its logic, that no one would feel safe, while any error, no matter how insignificant, could be considered an act of treason that had to be punished.

*The Great Terror* sent a clear signal in the Soviet Union about what communism could be when a leader wanted to become all-powerful. In the new political regime established in Russia in 1917, fear and lack of trust in the other, no matter how close to you, became dominant. Only the unconditional support of the regime was accepted, as a rule formulated in the *wooden language* of official speeches, independent thinking being absolutely excluded. Master of the USSR, Stalin also interfered in the political life of other states through the communist parties affiliated to the Third International (1919–1943).

The rapid development of industry and above all the victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War, maintained the optimism of the years 1917–1920 even during the Khrushchev period (1953–1964), when the party adopted the program in which the establishment of communism was promised in the next 30 years<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> In the USSR, the gulag represented the State Directorate for the administration of labor camps. See in detail Mihai Stamatescu, *op. cit.*, p. 15; (Cezar Avram, Radu Roxana, *op. cit.*, p. 183).

<sup>15</sup> See Nicolas Werth, *History of the Soviet Union from Lenin to Stalin*, Bucharest, Corint Publishing House, p. 70.



However, more and more facts came to light which, in the end, destroyed the belief in the possibility and desirability of an irrevocable communism. First of all, Khrushchev himself revealed the monstrous repressions that had taken place. Second, industrial development was organized by state institutions that began to act as a dead, conservative hand in the way of progress. As development declined, rentierism (rent-seeking) and corruption among civil servants increased, which undermined the legitimacy of the system. Third, the allies that the Soviet Union had won through the war in Eastern Europe, as a result of the collapse of imperialism in Africa and Asia, became a financial and military burden. Finally, while the development of the Soviet Union slowed down, that of the capitalist West accelerated, introducing new technological developments that the Soviet economy could not assimilate. No communist revolution took place in the capitalist centers of the west. That's why in the 80s, confidence in the ability of the Soviet Union to make the transition to communism evaporated and that's why the whole system of this left-wing totalitarian regime collapsed.

Marx and Engels saw in socialism, in the strict sense of the term, a transitional phase between capitalism and full economic and social communism. As socialist movements and parties of all kinds came to power in many countries of the world, interest in socialism inevitably shifted from theory to practice. The most important disputes between socialists concerned the role of the state as owner, organizer and control factor of the economy (state socialism), the relationship between socialism and democratic politics, and the tension between gradualist (i.e. parliamentary) and revolutionary<sup>16</sup>.

In the 1930<sup>s</sup>, two completely different systems of socialism represented the polar extremes of doctrinal interpretation: socialism. The Soviet Union under Stalin and Hitler's National Socialism in Germany. Liberal, conservative and even anarchist critics emphasize the totalitarian tendency of any socialist thought. After World War II, the division of Europe into the pluralist and democratic Western bloc and the Marxist-dominated Eastern bloc further accentuated the distinction between alternative concepts of socialism.

In Western Europe, social democratic and labor parties used Keynes to underpin the non-Marxist approach to the regulation and control of capitalism, emphasizing the need to achieve social justice and equality through efficient economic management (including the nationalization of industry) and redistributive welfare policies (welfare state). The social democrats accepted the reality of the mixed economy, turning their backs on the Marxist analysis of capitalism and the idea of socialization of the main instruments of economic production, distribution and exchange.

---

<sup>16</sup> Adrian Cioroianu (coord.), *A fost odată ca niciodată Partidul Comunist Român (1921–2021)*, Bucharest, Polirom Publishing House, 2021, p. 155.

In the Western world, socialism entered a new phase of crisis and uncertainty in the 1980<sup>s</sup> and 1990<sup>s</sup> of the last century, as the welfare state found itself under increasing economic pressure, and the social democratic methods of Keynesian economic administration were challenged by alternative neoliberal theories of the new right. The collapse of Marxist socialism in the Soviet Union and Western Europe in the late 1980s, and the failures of many socialist regimes in the Third World, have given new weight to the view that socialism is now a doctrine in search of a new identity. Efforts to revise, modernize and adapt socialism to the new historical circumstances have led to a series of ideas and theories of the New Left in the last quarter of a century, some of them included in existing socialist movements and parties, others having a mobilizing and supporting effect in the arenas of new politics, post-materialism, feminism, environmentalism. It is also evident the reawakening of contemporary socialists' interest in the basic issues of radical democracy, including the change in the state-civil society relationship, the new dimensions of social pluralism, the need to promote the possibilities of political participation and the issue of citizenship rights<sup>17</sup>.

In the Soviet Union as well as in the countries that adopted socialism-communism as a political regime, the essence of the policies of the single party was given by the notion of state socialism. The term refers to that form of socialist organization of production and distribution that is characterized by the control of resources by state bodies. Lenin contributed to the creation of an extreme form of state socialism. This was due, in part, to the need to defend the revolutionary state against internal resistance, independent movements within the Soviet Union and external hostilities, and in part to Lenin's economic naivety. This ignorance led him to overreliance on large-scale industrial and agricultural economies as well as the belief that Western corporate management could provide the model for a centrally planned economy. The option remained open until Stalin removed Bukharin. The issue was dramatically reopened by Mao Zedong in 1958, but then, in both China and Russia, the power of the state economic apparatus prevented effective change. As a result of Mao's influence, however, subsequent economic reform in China by his successors included a broad, local, communal dimension of socialist development. Since 1971, China's local communal enterprises have been and continue to be the fastest growing sector of the economy, while laying the foundations for a renewal of civil society.

Marx and Engels launched in 1848 the slogan *Workers of all countries, unite!*. This meant the vision according to which socialism had to be established following an international revolution. In this sense, the illusion of *international socialism* was created, materialized in the International Workers' Association (the First International) founded in 1864 and dissolved in 1876, then the Second International founded in 1889 and dismantled in 1914, which included both

---

<sup>17</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 198.

socialist-Marxists and non-Marxists and finally the Third Communist International founded in 1919 and dissolved in 1943<sup>18</sup>.

The official doctrine of the Soviet Union promoted, in accordance with the current needs of the Kremlin leader, sometimes *international socialism*, and sometimes the theory of *socialism in a single country*.

The theory developed by Bukharin and Stalin, with the intention of giving a reply to Trotsky's model of permanent revolution, was socialism in one country. Despite the failure of the European revolutions, Russia had managed to build socialism, through the control exercised over the command levers of the economy and under the political leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Trotsky had founded an International (IV), a rival to the Communist III International. This grouped all the movements that called themselves "international socialism" or "Trotskyist movements".

In essence both doctrines referred to a left-wing totalitarian political regime that had a monolithic party excluding pluralism and that promoted state socialism<sup>19</sup>.

In conclusion, the social and economic arrangement, which bears the name of communism, is defined by the fact that no member of it possesses more than any other, either because all property is held in common, or because the institution of property does not exist, either because ownership is limited to the means of consumption and is excluded as regards the means of production and exchange. According to Marxist theory, socialism is a stage of development leading to communism, hence Marx and Lenin's special care to distinguish between them. Any movement that tends to achieve a classless and stateless society has communism as its political ideal. In history there have been many movements of this kind, but the main one started with the European revolutions of 1848. Now *the Communist Manifesto*, written by Marx and Engels, was published. The word *communism* appears frequently in their writings, but for a long time the word socialism was preferred as the name of the ideal, the main Marxist parties calling themselves *social democrats*. Their political organization began with the First International. The preference for the word communism was shown by the Third International established in Moscow in 1919. The word communism was adopted by Lenin and Trotsky in order to distinguish their ideals from the less pure intentions, as they saw them, of the *socialists* and European social democrats and also in order to emphasize the affinity with the Paris Commune (1870), which, according to Marx, implied an authentic attitude in the direction supported by them. The Comintern, mainly during Stalin's dictatorship, gave a strong impetus to the use of the concept of *communism* throughout the world and, from here on, it was often used as a synonym for the form of government whose main author was

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 240.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 25.

Lenin. This system of government had a single ruling party that did not allow a legal opposition. The communist regime was established by *importing revolution* in a number of countries from Asia, Latin America, Africa. Unlike fascism, the result of terror was not and is not known. In the USSR alone, the figure of about 30 million human victims is circulated. The Stalinist version of socialism with major modifications will give the extreme form of communism. Stalin managed to consolidate his control over the party and the state and become the absolute master of the Soviet Union until his death. Moreover he will implement and coordinate *the Great Terror*, which began specifically with the members and leaders of the Bolshevik party then extended to the military cadres and then to the civilian population. *The Great Terror* will also be adopted by some countries that joined the Stalinist regime. Here was a demonstration of the leader wanting to become self-reliant. Fear, lack of trust, invoking unconditional non-support of the regime, independent thinking as the ultimate accusation etc., were abused<sup>20</sup>. In Romania, the regime established by the Soviet tanks meant, among other things, camps, prisons, canals, abuses, demolished churches, falsified elections, fictitious reports, perverse propaganda, etc.

Communism meant censorship, collectivism, centralist and centralizing politics, an all-powerful leader, a single party and the non-existence of individual and collective freedoms, even though they were enshrined in the fundamental law. The universal character of the doctrine will play an important role in its capacity for destruction and in embodying the utopia that “class struggle is the engine of society”. The ideology was to be implemented in an intransigent manner by the Stalinist regime by the Maoists, by the Khmer Rouge and unfortunately also by the Romanian People’s Republic between the years 1948-1963 in particular.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avram, Cezar; Radu, Roxana, *Comparative political regimes*, Craiova, Aius Publishing House, 2008.
- Cioroianu, Adrian, *A fost odata ca niciodata Partidul Comunist Român (1921-2021)*, Bucharest, Polirom Publishing House, 2021.
- Dănișor, Gheorghe, *Filosofia Dreptului*, Craiova, University Publishing House, 2003.
- Establishing Communism between Resistance and Repression. Communication presented at the Sighetul Marmații Symposium* (June 9-11, 1995), Civic Academic Foundation, 1995.
- Legget, George, *CEKA: Lenin’s Political Police*, Bucharest, 2000.
- Marx, Karl; Engels, Friedrich, *Writings from my youth*, Bucharest, Political Publishing, 1968.
- Stamatescu, Mihai; Grosescu, Raluca; Dobrin, Dobrin; Muraru, Andrei; Pleșa, Liviu; Andreescu, Sorin, *A history of communism in Romania*, Iași, Polirom Publishing House, 2008.
- Werth, Nicolas, *History of the Soviet Union from Lenin to Stalin*, Bucharest, Corint Publishing House.
- Wolton, Thierry, *A world history of communism*, vol. II, Bucharest, Humanitas Publishing House, 2015.

---

<sup>20</sup> See in detail Cezar Avram, Roxana Radu, *Comparative political regimes*, Craiova, Aius Publishing House, 2008, pp. 170–183.