

Serghey Gherdjikov

Sofia University

THE PHENOMENON OF COMMUNISM

© Сергей Герджиков (1994). *Феноменът комунизъм*
© Университетско издателство „Св. Кл. Охридски“
© Sergey Gerdjikov. The Phenomenon Communism
© The St. Kliment Ohridski University Press

English Contents & Abstract

Contents

Preface

Introduction

- A. Project for a life and a world
- B. A world in red
- C. Methodological reflection
- D. Phenomenological vocabulary

Part I. GENESIS

Chapter one. How a world is made?

- 1. Logos and the world
- 2. Plato, Christ and Fourier
- 3. Scientific communism
- 4. Mental forms and artifacts
- 5. Social engineering

Chapter two. The life world of communism

- 6. The Tower of Babel
- 7. Logic of change
- 8. Shoreless time
- 9. Camp space

Chapter three. Technology of freedom

- 10. “Critical theory”
- 11. The lost paradise
- 12. The spirit of law
- 13. The mental embryo

Chapter four. State property

- 14. Wealth and rationality
- 15. The right of property
- 16. The growth of wealth and “value”
- 17. State property

Part II. Expansion

Chapter five. Communist power

18. Revolution
19. Live utopia
20. Explanations of communist power
21. Phenomenological clarification

Chapter six. Central planning

22. Planning rationality
23. Programme
24. Feedback
25. Mist and bureaucratic explanations

Chapter seven. Mental expansion

26. Delayed future
27. Keeping silent about communism
28. A cascade of revisions
29. Proletarian ethics and the spirit of communism

Part III. Collapse

Chapter eight. Blocking

30. Waiting and marking
31. Amateurishness and corruption
32. The “comrade” and the “citizen”
33. Communist mortality

Chapter nine. Deficiency

34. The phenomenon of deficiency
35. Deficiency bears deficiency
36. “Pump”
37. Socialist poverty
38. Fragments from the picture

Chapter ten. Apathy

39. Fragmentation of logic
40. Reduced space
41. Slowing down of time
42. Loss of truth
43. Irresponsibility and weakening of personality

Conclusion. The explosion

- A. The protest-unrest
- B. Protest-pressure
- C. Explosion

Bibliography of cited literature

Introduction

In this book communism is studied phenomenologically, as the life world of a man living under communism. *The phenomenological paradigm of the social, as live network of meanings meant and found by people*, is adequate to an “understanding” social philosophy of communism – not a bare speculation, but *experience conceived by means of phenomenological concepts*, which are *boundary concepts* with respect to the multitude of unique social occurrences.

Communism is assessed as an economic and political system. Understanding the phenomenon of communism is a task still to be dealt with. Communism is not merely the power of a party, not merely a totalitarian system or a series of achievements and crimes. It is an *ethos and a life world*.

Phenomenological analysis is a search for the ultimate vital meanings of attitudes, ideas, actions and results. Phenomena are not something universal, holding good for any particular case. No such universality is present in social reality. And yet phenomena are not pure singularities. It is impossible to embrace and exhaust all singularities. The social phenomena I present in the book are “transcendental” in Edmund Husserl’s sense: “pure meanings”, which are valid as *interpretations and reasons for acting* pertaining to the people carrying them in their minds. They resemble “exemplars” for long chains of “social games” bound by family resemblance (cf. Wittgenstein). It is in much the same sense that Max Weber isolates “ideal types”.

Husserl’s phenomenology starts with a sharp differentiation of “pure logic” and “descriptive psychology”, proceeds by a distinction between the transcendental and the empirical, reaches a significant point in the postulation of phenomena as live units of consciousness corresponding to regional ontologies and is crowned by the understanding of phenomena as moments of life world. Alfred Schutz went on with this study of life world influenced also by “the philosophy of life” and Bergson. In his interpretation phenomenology is turned into dynamic ontology. In the 70-s the conception of the new phenomenologists in sociology (Walsh, Silverman) was formed. In Max Weber’s spirit they were looking for social reality as significance, meaning and interpretation. “Phenomena” are turned here into “ideal types”, live definitions in the social world as found and meant by people. They differ from psychological experiences in that they are *pure figures of thought and meaning* and not *empirical occurrences*.

The phenomenological paradigm brought me to a *working model* of social dynamics, which had to join together into one conceptual whole *forces and phenomena*, the energetics and structure of communism’s life world.

Phenomena carry life in themselves. They are dynamic. The energetics of this dynamic is the force of people’s lives. This dynamic is self-organization or entropy – expansion or collapse – according to what dominates in it: creation or spontaneous processes of destruction.

Social structure is a *field of force* created by the *vital forces* of people. These forces create their own *phenomenological structures* – attitudes, visions, meanings, significances значения, mentality, all of them objectified in *texts and actions* that are *changing those texts*. There are *unconditional, basic, enduring meanings* – *survival, security, right, wealth, power, dignity*. The micro-social (personal) field loaded with these meanings is inserted into the macro-social field and influences it. Personal meanings are inserted into social structure and dynamics.

Phenomena are *intentions* (Husserl) towards objects as power, wealth, right, life, etc. or, more concretely, towards language, traditions, rights, labour, money, nation, state, government, regime, property, laws ... These intentions are *strained* and create the configurations of the micro- and macro-social fields. In the classical social thought most important for the understanding of this strained reality is the concept of *interest*.

Social dynamics is the *change of texts* by actors, which is propelled by forces of intentions – attitudes, meanings, significances with respect to wealth, power and spirit. The social world is flowing in *the field of tension between the potential of intention* (attitude, meaning,

significance) *and the potential of reality* (external structure and force). Intention may be strong or weak in its success or failure to change reality. From an energetic point of view this is expansion or collapse, structuring or destruction, work or entropy. From the point of view of the mental this is rationality or irrationality. In this spirit are interpreted here communism and its phenomenological dynamics.

Communism starts from “the head” in order to solve imaginary and real social problems and to expand into socially significant texts – social philosophy and social project, legislation and social macro-actions in conformity with the project. This dynamics proceeds according to the following regularity:

On the macro-social plane society expands or collapses depending on the positive or negative – creative or destructive – relations and interactions in the field of tension between the dominating visions (macro-social field) and the current human intentions (micro-social fields). This tension depends on the degree of interference of micro- and macro-fields. The better the social customs adapted to the basic life meanings (strategies) of persons, the more stable the macro-social form.

When one yields to compulsion, it is not the weapon of the oppressor that moves him, but his own will to survive. When one is devoted to an idea, it is not the idea that moves him, but his own vision in the light of which he interprets the idea as survival, security, wealth, power, dignity, etc. basic life meanings. People *choose* communism being attracted by it, interpreting it in the significances of the basic meanings, or they are *compelled to accept* communism pushed by the same basic meanings. In these two cases *the degree of congruence* between the micro-social and macro-social field is different. In the latter case there is a tension that weakens social organization and causes entropy insofar as forces are accumulated into static tension or contribute to the inner destabilization and destruction of the system. Thus it comes to a social explosion.

GENESIS

Communism's life world

Phenomenologically, communism is rooted in the intention towards the world as logos presented in ideas, words, concepts and liable to rational control, i.e. technology. In its extreme form this trend is demiurgic.

In Ancient Greece and Christianity the world is conceived as logos, in the beginning is the Word. Conceiving reality through the logos is a precondition for conceiving reality as *making according to the logos* – according to projective ideas and visions. This is not the case in Eastern cultures, whose spirit is spontaneity, non-doing, the mystery of the real. The world escapes explanation and control and this challenges Western reason to create a rational image and technology. Life is unfair. People are unequal. Communism is an extreme manifestation of the West's expansion aiming at mastering man, life and the world.

Communism is not so much infringement of rationality's norms, as contemporary philosophers like [Friedrich Hayek](#) and Karl Popper held. Rather the contrary, in communism these norms are brought to an (absurd) extreme. The communist project and movement are not a foreign element in the West's mentality and body despite of the fundamental transformation of “bourgeois” society intended by the classics of Marxism. They remain fateful to reason as it is conceived by Modernity, to science as such, as practiced by Galileo and Darwin, to freedom, as perceived at root as an ideal, and even to democracy. Communism is an heir to Christianity's idea of equality.

Communism and related projects are expression of *crossing the unconscious human boundary by the demiurgic mentality of the West* and above all of Greek Antiquity. Not only in technology, in science, art and social affairs too, Greeks were searching for a closed picture and perspective fit for controlling the world in its totality in the spirit of the Logos, the word, the idea, of reason. In this respect Christianity is a restraining ethos. It acknowledges the *un-*

Comment [H&K1]: Мисля, че е Фридрих, а не Аугуст. Провери, моля те.

attainability of God and the world He has created and the impossibility for man to put himself into the role of creator of the human world, order and justice. It is for this reason that the genuine forms of communism in the spirit of rational control and making of history are non-Christian and atheistic in general.

Communism is a form of demiurgic attitude: Let's make a new man, a new life, a new world. If cities and states, tools and machines, theories and poems are made, why making a new world for man should be impossible? Is here something impermissible?

In this respect Far East: Chinese and Japanese Taoism and Buddhism show limits of the scope of words and logic, descriptions and explanations. Brahma, Tao, Buddha, Nirvana are beyond any dualistic categories, beyond the grasp of logic, it is indescribable and unexplainable. There is no point to speculate about total control and rational making of a human world, about a world-wide arrangement in the name of happiness for all by means of a social project founded on reason, logic and words.

Communism belongs to the West, but "not entirely". It is *scientistic, but not scientifically-rational*. This is seen in the delay of scientific development under real socialism, in its toleration of pseudo-sciences, in the harassing of real sciences, in unrealistic trust in "scientific progress". Communism is *technocratic (especially in its later period), but lacks technological culture*. Communism is geared to follow the basic values of the West, taking them as universal, but does not follow them well.

This phenomenon of following an attitude, which is not vitally and rationally assimilated, is characteristic for the periphery of great civilization. The marginality of communism is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the closer its versions to Western people's mentality the more reformist, the more "revisionist" its nature. The further in the "West" (not in a strictly geographical sense) in Europe a country lies, the harder to impose communism on it.

In the 20-th century communism expanded on global scale and took a considerable area of the weaker sectors of the West, as well as of its Asian, African and American periphery. Communism as ethos and system adapts to purely Eastern, Asian cultures as well, but carries a Western germ again. Communism is born from the spirit of the West but is made possible by its deformation or follows blindly a spirit, positive in its own way, but beyond reasonable limit. In both cases communism comes up on the surface by inner insufficiency and/or lack of mastery of profound cultural processes.

This is a genesis, expansion and collapse of communist phenomenological structure – mentality, intention, attitude, meanings, ideas and texts. This is dynamics of a life world moved by a demiurgic intention towards the world as a field of making, "construction site" where freedom, welfare and a new man are to be accomplished.

This meaning is projected into interpretations of social realities like state, property, power, personality, action. Property is "public", power is "unified", people are "united", actions are "converting decisions into deeds". The secret of this totalitarianism is in the communist project and not in the self-justifying power for the sake of power of George Orwell's Oceania.

There is a limit here, and it is gradually taken awareness of. It is one thing to make tea, to build cities, to write poems and to create philosophy. It is rather different to breathe, to laugh, to be in pain, to enjoy the sun and to love. One cannot make love, joy, breathing and life in the same way as one makes tea, roads, cities and philosophy. The limit lies between what *cannot be created by man (nature, spirit) and culture created by man*. One can apply reason and control to things he has created, at least within limits (on a global scale, often on national, even on private scale, things slip out of control). However it is absurd to control the Universe, the Sun, life, human freedom, happiness, laugh, joy and fate.

This attitude is a phenomenon, bearing "family resemblance" to the attempts for creating a perpetual motion machine of the first or the second kind, despite of the laws of thermodynamics. It is irresistible, like gambling. Every failure stimulates new attempts, but, in contrast to perpetual motion, made on living people.

Communism accomplishes a historical and phenomenological dynamics marked by three phases: *genesis-expansion-collapse*. This is a typical dynamics of a living thing. Contemporary communism was born in the middle of the 19-th century out of very ancient atti-

tudes and ideas; it progressed vigorously in Europe's and Russia's intentions on the turn of the 20-th century; it broke through the horizon of the bourgeois society and triumphed as a social system in Russia in 1917; it expanded in East Europe as a result of the World War II and then into various points on the globe. A global socialist system was formed. Real socialism succeeded in industrialization, in consolidation of agriculture and in other important respects. Employment for the whole population fit for work was secured. And after a stage of slow-down, instead of accelerating its pace towards communism in the proper sense, it declined and ever more irreparably lagged behind capitalism. Communism fell down in the end of the 1980-s in East Europe and Russia and remained weakly affected by this wave far from Europe: in China, Korea and Cuba.

The phenomenon of communism became a social reality when communist vision and project spread over a significant human community – the communist movement. It required *self-denial without any clear limit*, since the cause of communism had no clear limit in space and time. Thus a “doomed” world perception was produced. What followed was *drawing the others* into a global action with an unpredictable outcome. The cause of communism expanded over mankind as a whole. Only with the assistance of all was world-making possible. The ideas “captured the masses”.

The world “in red”, the life world created by the communist phenomenological structure had, as a world, its logic, its space and time, its knowledge, morality and personality.

Logic. The communist world is in a process of origination. It is permanently dynamic. It is outlined by a logic of change. This world is not merely arising: it is made by people. As logic of change, dialectics can bring under its figures any historical dynamics whatever. But to define a thing is to get rid of its change. If everything is change no definite thing exists. And then we don't know anything about the world and cannot undertake anything in a rational way.

A world, which is constantly being made, is strained between what is real and what is intended in the project. The forces of communism strive to interpret the real in terms of the projected and to confirm vision in reality. Within a logic of change this gives rise to ambivalences, to contradictions between words and things, to paralogsms and paradoxes.

Time. “Red” time is defined from the future: it is inverted as ideal time – today is determined by tomorrow. Tomorrow's goals determine today's actions. It is a transparent time. All history is understood in terms of a scheme. Real time slips out of the scope of vision and becomes opaque, unknown. This *unknown, shoreless time* repeatedly brought surprises. As an answer a network of texts was built, in which time was retailored – cut into new phases, stages. In the great “transparent” time *phenomenology of personal time is also “transparent”*. The biography of a socialist man is describing the parcelled time of a Builder: *acceptance-appointment-inclusion-promotion-exclusion-award-penalty*.

Space. U-topia means a non-existent place. Communism starts from an un-spatial idea, from “nowhere”. However, a project can be accomplished only in a delimited space, “somewhere”: a city-state, “city of the Sun”, an island amidst the ocean, an estate (Owen), a group of states, “one single country”, and, of course, “world revolution”. Communism is to be made by a circle, conspiracy, party, a “people”. It expanded from USSR to the socialist camp. Communism's space was closed although it was expanding with the prospect to spread all over the world. It was closed because it was an embodied ideal project, because it was socialist construction, because it was forced to fence off itself from the hostile rest of the world, against which it was going. Here isolation, and thus the decline from civilization, became unavoidable. Of course, closed systems undergo spontaneous disintegration. The explosion of the system tired apart the space of construction. Communism was merely converted again to an “idea”, returning where it had come from.

Vision and revisions. In order to survive in front of resisting basic attitudes, *the communist idea was being modified*. It followed a constant course of corrections. The urge was gradually weakened by construction being blocked. Vision was being revised in order to remain realistic. But it weakened with each revision. Promises became more and more sparing. Energy, intention and fate were weakening – until they completely faded away. Vision and construction *were being stretched into a future, which was being delayed forever*. The first

grand revision was Lenin's New Economic Policy. A permanent "innovative" and "reformist" activity followed, which couldn't retain the communist life world; it was the activity of a pilot launched in a ballistic missile with the parameters of flight assigned beforehand. This was the trap of "socialist choice".

An unique project

Communism is a doctrine-project about a new world. Historical materialism serves not only to explain the world, but to change it. In Marxist theory practice is a criterion for truth, and in Marxist practice theory is such a criterion. Thus a sort of theory is created that isn't subject to testing but rather to following.

A free and open society, however, is not based on a theory. It isn't an integral organism or mechanism. It cannot be a project or construction. It is a medium containing many potentialities where an "official view", a privileged explanation of society, an universally accepted vision of the world, life and man is absent (Karl Popper). Here order is spontaneous and uncontrollable (Friedrich Hayek). Laws are only limitations for the sake of warranting human rights (Charles Montesquieu).

The original project-theory was strictly followed in the USSR, East Europe, China, Vietnam, North Korea. There is no reason to blame for the failure of communism some distortion of the project or theory. Moreover, at each stage of real socialism a reassessment and modernization of classical theory was made. But its unique rationality does not allow deeming it refuted as theories in physics are refuted by experience.

The idea of making a happy society is stronger in Modernity than in the spirit of Antiquity. The Encyclopedists, Fourier, Saint-Simon envisaged a designed world. British empiricists and evolutionists, respecting nature and evolution, God and the mystery of life, regarded *society as a fruit of evolution and convention, of God and Reason*. Experience had proven that progress was achieved by small steps (Edmund Burke). The French-English dilemma was dramatically solved in the history of the West.

What pattern of the state mechanism was best for the realization of freedom? Later Marx was going to state the question in a different way: How is the free human being to be constructed? The technology of liberal democracy addresses the state mechanism – the three powers (the state is a means, the person is an end) – whereas the technology of communism addresses the person (a person is means, material and end as element of society as a whole).

The West was split because of an inner ambivalence. This society engendered tensions and conflicts, the basic one being *inequality*, and hence the unfair relationship between labour and capital. Wealth was ever more unequally distributed along the trajectories of the market. In the period of expansion of classical capitalism the idea of communism became ever *more urgent*. Here the opponents – Christians (Fyodor Dostoyevsky) and liberals (Alexis de Tocqueville) – reminded of the fundamental mainstay of morality and freedom. A deep bifurcation in the heart of the West ripened, and the dispute could be solved only by a *historical experiment*.

A metaphysical basis for this line of development is provided by conceiving of man as identical with society or as directly determined in his essence by a given society (Karl Marx). There is no nature of man. Man is what society is. But how, then, does man come to the rejection of his society and a vision of a better one? *The germ of this vision is contradictory in itself and allows for both a "critical" and a "positive" attitude*, though one related to the future. The intention is critical and positive, creative, constructive. Making history presupposes somehow the notion that man is not "pre-given", that he has to emerge. But if *man and freedom are alien "by nature" how can anybody envisage making freedom for man?*

Revolution has its heroics, aesthetics and mystic. It is rooted in the sense of a Great Salutory Mission. Despite of all, the phenomenon of communist heroism does exist and carries a positive meaning insofar as it is an attitude and action endowed with sublime moral meanings, that were present before and outside communist reality. This reality would refute them. Without violence it would be impossible to struggle against law and parliamentary order. Communist revolution is a desperate social risk, which tears out all supports and expects

revolution to provide the new supports of social life. Henceforth “the laws of history” are given free hand. Violence is to be justified by wellbeing. Casualties are to be justified by freedom.

After Revolution comes Construction. Totalitarianism is unavoidable if a society is being constructed after a plan – whether based on the idea of “communism” or “socialism”, or else on the idea of “fascism” or the “Millenary Reich” and the conception of man-society. Totality of social space-time is unavoidable in a total social technology. Without political unity there is no unified line, no integral plan, neither is there any construction. Hence the unavoidability of the one-party system. Economic unity is warranted by the adoption of unified state property. Spiritual unity is a unified point of view and line. Thus the unity in wealth, power and spirit, which is vital to construction, is accomplished.

Totalitarianism isn’t brought about by an arbitrary evil will, but by the phenomenology of Construction in the communist project. Communism must be understood independently of its unmasking. Avtorkhanov, Solzhenitsyn, Voslensky and Geller-Nekrich consistently unmasked Soviet communism, emphasizing the “original evil” of Bolsheviks. This psychological explanation-accusation is not sufficient for philosophy. “Nomenclature” is not the class of communists having got their hands on power and property, but the personal skeleton of Construction. Industrialization is not the fruit of the “new class” (Djilas), but the natural basis for the accomplishment of the social project. State property is a still deeper foundation of the communist project. Only the state can control and materialize a total, centrally planned economy. Only the state can represent in a unified manner the people, the alleged owner and ruler.

The modality of Construction is ambivalent. At its root this is ambivalence of the Doctrine as theory and project, ambivalence of the doctrine’s anthropology dealing with man-society and man-critic-of-society. Here everything is somehow *unavoidable* – it is “historically necessary”, “scientifically grounded”, planned and due; and somehow *arbitrary* – it is the will of specific persons in the Center and the result of their subjective estimate. This estimate underlies imposing enterprises concerning nature, social structure and spiritual life: rivers are turned upstream, entire classes are destroyed, religions are abolished.

The energetics of super-technology does not allow for local perturbations. These would move the whole system out of its state of meta-stability and it would soon return to a state of thermodynamic equilibrium, i.e. total chaos. This explains the suppression of all attempts at a more radical reform in the spirit of human rights or even social democracy.

Real man accepts socialism and seeks in it a projection of his basic meanings: survival, security, right, dignity, freedom. Not finding them, he no more wants this utopia in life. For it is not projection of this man’s freedom, which is ingrained in his individual essence as its attribute. *Construction is ruined by the Constructor because he has been deformed by Construction.*

Property and Freedom

The communist idea is inconceivable without the abolition of private property. State property is “transitional”, but turns out to be the only one adequate to the Project. Managing state property is marked by a *mentality of indifference, lack of interest, inclination to spend, not to accumulate.*

Different configurations of economic space and different rules of the game are *adequate, appropriate, successful to a different degree* and develop *different rational trajectories for the growth of wealth.* The rational behaviour of a private owner is one thing; another is that of a husband; a third – that of a person managing state property; a fourth – of a wage labourer working in conditions of state property. History has refuted the contention about state property being more rational than private property. *The attitude to what-is-not-mine and no one’s in state property sets negative trajectories for rational actions.*

The multifaceted objectification of man in the world is “replaced” by one-dimensional fixation in *religion* (Feuerbach) through faith and in *private property* (Marx) through ownership. In the communist state, like in Eden before original sin, things are not disposed of,

owned or used – they are *lived*. This vision assimilates communism to the natural state. According to *Lafargue* public property is the historically original form of property.

The alienation found in private property is more clearly manifested in total state property. This is an impersonal form of ownership in which rational economic action is directed to the diminution of the “publicly owned” wealth. What belongs to no one is equally alien to all. The envisaged “integrity” and “indivisibility” of “nation-wide” property expressed itself in disunity and nullity. The economic non-liberty of the impersonal “state property” is economic irresponsibility (Frederic Prior). State property de-subjectifies economics and diminishes the relative wealth, which people could create.

According to Friedrich Hayek planning rationality is untenable on the scale of an entire state economy because of fundamental constraints on human knowledge. Spontaneous market order rests on rules, which are not intentionally stipulated, but a product of slow evolution, no single individual being able to oversee them. Their improvement requires understanding the links between spontaneous forces and rules (Hayek).

However, the fundamental error of planned economy, which conforms to the philosophy of “the social essence of man” and collective ethos, is in *the failure to understand the difference between the natural and the artificial*. A human being is taken to be a creation, an artefact of “society”. Planned economy is untenable in the same sense as “planned” functioning of a population consisting of many organisms.

Since *wealth is a creation* it has its author and agent – the owner – and cannot “spill” along social space, satisfying unsatisfied needs. It fills only areas of market “vacuum”. Thus wealth is incompatible with “justice”. In the course of this phenomenological chain of meanings the idea of socialism is reached.

Expansion

Social forces are directed, freely or by compulsion, by centralized power, towards the construction work of socialism and communism. This is communism’s expansion. It consists in configuring social space and time according to communist vision. *The expansion of the communist phenomenon* is a process of *structuring* the communist world in political, economic and spiritual space. It is, simultaneously, a process of *destroying* bourgeois world. The result of this twofold process would be either *historical entropy*, if communism turns out to be more languid and ineffective, or *historical self-organization*, if communism is bound to be a higher stage in the development of civilization.

In fact, however, the tension between the micro- and macro-sphere increases. Vital meanings are projected upon real socialism with considerable deviations, especially as rights, well-being and dignity are concerned.

The project has fixed trajectories of action for society, organizations, classes, groups, professions, industry branches, enterprises, leaving out only the most intimate sphere. Those trajectories prove untenable because, instead of being followed and instead of strengthening society, they are being spontaneously frustrated, thus weakening the whole society. Despite of their elasticity, micro-spheres resist the forms of real socialism. People find their own versions of “following” socialism behind which versions the intended free actions are situated. Totalitarian socialism gradually turns out to be organically “insupportable” and not because it is culturally alien (Brzezinski).

Communist power

Communism creates an unique form of power and understanding communism is impossible without understanding this sort of power. The classical self-definition of this power is Lenin’s apology: “The proletarian democracy is *million* times more democratic than any bourgeois’ democracy; the Soviet power is million times more democratic than most democratic bourgeois’ republic” (Lenin).

Communist power is totalitarian. This definition is so common today that its specific sense has gone lost. *Hannah Arendt* joins the theory of communism to that of fascism. In her view totalitarianism is the reference to a Law of Nature or History of which mankind becomes the embodiment. *Communists, as contrasted with fascists, take the side not of a Law, but of a Project.* The Bolsheviks had entirely forgotten about Marx's law of "the age of social revolution". They profited from the idea of constructing a classless society, in order to trample upon democracy they could not assimilate.

Abdurrahman Avtorkhanov called the total power of the Communist Party "*partocracy*", distinguishing it from fascist totalitarianism by the fact that it abolished private property and exercised absolute control on social life. *Avtorkhanov was a historian-critic of communism.* He didn't look for an explanation of "partocracy", but described it in detail suggesting that it has been created by Bolsheviks in order to perpetuate their power.

Milovan Djilas' theory of the "New Class", as well as its development by Mikhail Voslenski is to the same effect. This Marxist, to a considerable degree, critique is a fruit of the same organic rejection that engendered Avtorkhanov's indignant unravelling. The new "class" – if the privileged communist Establishment may be called this way at all – Voslenski's "nomenclature", did not arise because of a perversion of Marxism Lenin did not suspect of (Djilas). The reasons are more pedestrian and more fundamental. Nomenclature was the human skeleton of the pyramid under construction.

Totalitarianism did not arise by the arbitrary will of Communist Party, as is Avtorkhanov's and Zhelev's view, it did not arise by the arbitrary will of Stalin and the other leaders who distorted the doctrine, neither did it arise because of the greediness of careerists among Lenin's guard, as Voslenski thought. The totalitarian character of communism is not grounded by "the laws of history", as Arendt maintained. *The character of communist power is determined by the communist phenomenon's character of a total social technology dealing with man, life and the world.* This is inevitable. It is part and parcel of the communist project itself. *Without total power the construction of society according to a project is impossible.*

History has shown that the phenomenon of communist power is neither power for the sake of power itself (Nietzsche), nor violence for the sake of violence (Orwell), nor is it the people's unity in the state (Mussolini). Its aim is *people's unity for communism.* *The psychology of total power involves power and violence as an aim in itself.* Thus the communist, ruling "in the name of the idea", can become a violator for the sake of violence. But this he does "in the dark", satisfying a personal passion, and not "in daylight", demonstrating a principle.

Communist power is a *guiding force for the construction of communism.* Communist rule is not one of Weber's three "pure types". It is, nevertheless, rational, Western type in form: it creates laws and maintains rational institutions traditional for the West – parliament, government, judicial power. Here laws can function to the degree, to which no interests of power are impaired. Communist power is *ideological* and therefore it is one party power – *mono-partocracy.* Hence the principle of the *unity of power* stated in communist constitutions. Communist power weakens in the degree, in which Construction weakens; in the degree, in which it is being frustrated, blocked by people.

The form of communist power can be depicted as a spherical field of force with radial lines of force from the Centre outwards. Locally, in several points of the circle, secondary centres of power shape local power fields with the same radial structure. On the top power can change only after a political concussion. The same scenario is played out in different socialist states.

The phenomenon of blocking

Totalitarian society is inhabited by the same human beings as everywhere and at any time. These are autonomous human beings, persons. They do not inevitably carry within themselves certain totalitarian essence.

It turns out that socialist man *does not accept* communism or *is not able* to accept it as an organic medium for his basic meanings. A blocking force is accumulated. This accumulation in the totalitarian system brings social tension to a critical phase, and thanks to a weak

push from outside or a little inner instability, totalitarian system explodes. Therefore *totalitarian systems are not lasting*. Their expansion raises the probability of a collapse.

Blocking forces misshape the trajectory of action. Active phenomena of blocking are *waiting, marking, amateurishness, corruption*. “*I must be able to wait, and I shall wait, in order to survive.*” Waiting is an “objective” result from the blocking of the System, which functions badly enough to force one to wait where one “should” not have to wait. In the mutual blocking and its increasing accumulation everyone is waiting for everyone and all are waiting for something that is not coming. Waiting becomes an aspect of socialist ethos. *The queue* becomes a symbol of socialism. Waiting is an accumulation of tension. Waiting is the non-being of action. Waiting is time torn apart and killed.

Marking is masked inaction replacing what is due in Construction where everyone has his role. Marking is *concealment by means of signs of an action with a different significance* defined by the person in illegal trajectories of power dependences. *In marking the expenditure of energy is decreased to a minimum in order to free energy for a personal rational action*. Thus behind the façade of communism a social chaos arises.

Communism is a medium for the diffusion of *amateurishness*. All experts in planned economy are, in certain moments and to a certain degree, under pressure to depart from professional standards. Payment is fixed, responsibility is collective, selection is political, knowledge is ideological. *Corruption* under real socialism develops on the basis of state property, of no one’s property.

Total social technology is incompatible with warranting the most significant human rights: private property; free public speech; freedom of conscience, of confession and conviction; freedom to protest; right of moving and inhabiting, of travelling and citizenship outside the country, of association; basic judicial rights; and, sometimes, right of life.

Violence is a natural thing under totalitarian power. It rests on it and is permeated by its spirit. Without violence it is impossible to move micro-social fields in conformity to macro-social forces.

The phenomenon of deficiency

Deficiency is the second diagnosis of the unfolding of the communist phenomenon. Blocking in economic action brings to a stop the economic system based on state property. The economic system is reproduced by the actions of actors on different functional posts. At each post in this super-complex system deviations from what has been planned occur, and this entails deviations in all subsequent phases. Thus *economic blocking reinforces itself and brings forth a self-reinforcing deficiency* in the production of wealth.

Wealth increases or decreases depending on the rationality or non-rationality of action in economic space. In the first case *local entropy decreases and the readiness for accumulation grows*; in the second case *entropy increases* and an inclination towards deficiency arises. A third attitude is *personal acquisition at the expense of sucking out public resources*. This decreases entropy in one’s own point at the expense of its growth in a macro-area (state economy). This kind of attitude is rejection of socialist construction and acceptance of the situation of no one’s property.

The market is the economic space. In each of its points it has the same properties with respect to wealth. In each point of the market increase or decrease of wealth is possible. *The dynamics of economy is a dynamics of life structures against entropy. The growth of wealth is someone’s rational action* (Tisdell). The economic behaviour of the managing officer is less rational than the behaviour of the businessman. An economy moved by officers, not by businessmen, is bound to be non-rational.

State economy tends to spend more than it produces. It expands vigorously in the first decades. Then the well-known *disproportions* ensue, growing because of the lack of self-regulating market mechanisms. Industrialisation’s price is the exhaustion of human and material resources. Growth is extensive and swallows many resources. The upward acceleration has created an immense, initially invisible, deficiency and strengthens the inclination towards deficiency. Thus the curve of economic growth turns downwards. The trap of external depth

is a manifestation of deep crisis estimated by socialist governments to be fateful for the existence of socialism.

Actions at each point of this economy are constantly being *negated* till it comes to disruption. Personal strategies for survival, security and wealth are being implemented in the illegal space at the expense of common wealth. Working in a state enterprise does not make for one's personal wellbeing. One's material life does not depend on it to a considerable degree. One knows nothing about the paths of the wealth one produces. One does not see its fruits. All around one sees irresponsible and incompetent actions, nearby, above or below, and nevertheless goods are distributed in the same way. One is perfectly able not to work genuinely and to save one's efforts for his personal illegal game.

Economy is a peculiar "machine" built from *a conception, texts, laws and rules*. *Human decisions, actions* and forces stand behind them. According to Janos Kornai deficiency is a *basic variable* and *explanatory category* of centrally planned economy. Deficiency accumulates and increases along the chain of production. But *at this point it is not clear how the user takes part in the creation of shortage*. *No initial point in the system is to be found* where deficiency arises in order to subsequently increase. The whole system is "deficient". *The reason lies deeper than the parameters of the system themselves*. It lies in socialist property. *State property* is what makes communist economy chronically deficient.

The "pump" is a general phenomenon of the action of various social actors put in the situation of state property. At each level of the system, in each point of deficiency a motivation for pumping out is present. Thus the economy of deficiency exhausts itself. The pump is an autocatalytic mechanism of deficiency's self-strengthening.

The result is poverty. Poverty is inevitable when the citizen is put in the position of executor without property and personal choice of economic course of action. For the poor poverty means narrowing of her/his life horizon, the more palpable the more one knows about the life of wealthier people.

Communist man living in conditions of deficiency is *a human being with impaired wholeness*. *He is seeking what is urgent* and what is urgent is for him a concern covering the entire horizon. The man of real socialism is a deficient man. Deficient is his entire life space. And this amounts to deficiency of meaning.

The phenomenon of apathy

Apathy is the inner equivalent of deficiency and blocking. *Not having, not being able and not wanting* are three degrees of communist phenomenology corresponding to wealth, power and spirit. Apathy results from the incommensurability between personal attitude, orientation, choice and responsibility, on the one hand, and the social system, on the other. Apathy is *resignation before an overwhelming external force* imposing an unacceptable attitude. *Apathy is deficiency of meaning*. Apathy is an immense, plastic and durable consequence of dictatorship.

One can endure the diffuseness of all definitions only in the attitude of apathy. Socialist man accepts the lack of definite and clear meaning as a norm of everyday life and incorporates it organically in it. Without the anaesthesia of apathy it is impossible to take the enormous strain of redoubling one's life.

The illegal world, however, sets apart its clear and orderly rationality, which brings forth the decline of socialism. Mastering this rationality is imperative. This is not a simple game. It is a matter of life and death, wealth or misery, power or lack of rights. *Rationality in this irrational world rests entirely on the principle of transience*. The world fixed in socialist paralogisms is *a dying world*.

Socialist spirit is objectified into a *reduced life space*. This space has collapsed because of the inevitable *isolation* of a *compact* space: the space of Construction. Every citizen is put in a definite *point* and is pushed along definite *trajectories*. The actual placing differs from the ideal one in the degree to which personal strategies – survival, adaptation, freedom, success and expansion – are incongruous with the strategies required by society. The dichotomy of Here – in the Camp – and There – in the World – develops.

In the eyes of those stepping into the space of socialism armed with reason this space resembles a maze: a network of checks and power dependencies. In this maze people follow the curves of survival, security, right, dignity. To this unconditional principle are indebted the successes of socialist *technology and spiritual culture*.

When life is free the problem with time is to wrest out of monotonous cosmic time a maximum of vital time. Unfree time is not an opportunity to be seized upon; it is a fate to be endured. The diagnosis of retarded biographical time is boredom, annoyance. Waiting is the strain and pain of stopped time. It is born by a detained impulse. In order to be able to wait one has to arm oneself with indifference. One learns to let time flow past oneself.

“Time doesn’t cost money!” It is not valued because it is empty of meaning. “Don’t leave your today’s work for tomorrow if you can do it the day after tomorrow!” Postponing is typical. Working time does not belong to me since my work is not mine. “Free time” is time for release, for physiological needs, for killing time and for actual activity in the space of illegal “connections”.

The recognized untruth is not rejected; it is lived with. The adaptation of lie to life is nevertheless inevitable. The massive portions of untruth can be swallowed at the cost of insensitivity and apathy. Truth sinks into several degrees of oblivion because it loses its sense. People are thinking one thing and talking another thing knowing that others have the same thoughts. *In different degrees they stop being interested in truth.*

Evil grows as an avalanche when people have no force to answer with good. Demoralization is one of the diagnoses of totalitarianism along with ecocide and economic ruin. Socialism and communism came into the world with justice as their moral mission. But who does justice? Not free human will in a moral community, but instead the Apparatus of the state, which is taking away and giving. The pain of waiting and blocking, humiliation and powerlessness are unconditional evil. People endure and reproduce it. This brings them to *moral apathy*.

Communist man is aware of himself as morally responsible only in the order of exception. Fault is always with the partner, the superior, the subordinate, the colleague. Indeed, *in absence of an author, social action* (a mere function in Construction) is *unchargeable. Where no free person exists there is no responsibility.*

In one’s private life everyone retains one’s indestructible I. *I have stolen, I adapted, I arranged, I won, I love, I hate, I promise and even I choose.* But in “socialism”’s coordinate system the *They* is spread. Never mind what is in question – Head of State, Government, Central Committee, Politburo, Municipality or Regional Committee – it is all *They*. *They put sunflower oil on the market, They gave him a flat, They removed X, They ruined the nation, They elected me, They awarded me, They punished me, They promised me, They sent me, They called me back.*

COLLAPSE

Phenomenology of collapse

The fall of communism in East Europe and the Soviet Union in 1989, however understandable, is not predestined. It is a historical wave, which is phenomenologically understandable as a spontaneous displacement of the communist vision discredited by life and of the system resulting from it.

The fall of communism is possible only when are toppling down the basic meanings in the life world of socialist man: survival, adaptation, security, right, wealth, dignity. Then the buffer of apathy becomes fragile and organic rejection grows.

Communism remained for a long time an ostensibly peaceful society while accumulating tension. The energetic barrier protects the system against explosion. The system cannot deny itself without the threat of downfall. The release of human energy in protest is possible only in exceptional concurrence of circumstances. When this happens disintegration resem-

bles a growing avalanche (1956 in Hungary, 1968 in Czechoslovakia, 1980 in Poland, 1989 in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Bulgaria and Romania). Post-communism is energetically determined by this explosion. As happens after any explosion, the wave brings more chaos than order. Spontaneous changes are more destructive than creative.

Although post-communism, in as far as it is controlled, is a democratic market reform, phenomenology teaches that its outcome is something new, unique and almost unpredictable. But it is obvious that post-communism is going to end with the establishment of Western kind liberal democracy.

Phenomenologically, post-communism can be conceived as a *series of interfering waves* – of economic, political and psychological kind. Post-communist reality is altogether new for history. It is dynamic, flowing, indefinite. It is chaotic. It is the way out of communism and, by presumption, the entry into capitalism and democracy. This tempts one to understand it through communism or capitalism, through totalitarianism or democracy.

Explosion and dismantling

Communism is exceptionally dynamic, despite of its seeming petrification. It went through a tumultuous birth, a strained development, a painful decay and an explosive collapse. This dynamics is incomparable with the evolutionary dynamics of bourgeois society. This is a *dynamics of accumulation of tension and of pushes reducing it*. This energetic dynamics amounts, essentially, to a growth of social entropy, of social disorder. Therefore post-communism is chaotic.

Inertia. Social forces and attitudes tend to preserve themselves in the same size and configuration, in which they existed before the reform. Institutions may function well or poorly. This depends on the restoration of democratic mentality: putting into and finding in the institutions significances in accordance with the sense of democracy. In condition of chaos the transition to order demands exceptionally high energy and rationality. Reanimation of liberal society is a process inverse to entropy.

The movement of real socialism is sooner constrained than spontaneous. It creates *plastic and elastic deformations*. Plastic deformations of attitude grow perceptible and gradually dangerous in the period of transition. This is the inertia of billions of routinely marked actions and inactions, of operations of the nature of black economy, corruption and personal dependencies, of apathy maintained by the disappointment of hopes, disorientation and the struggle for survival.

Communism becomes cracked through unrest. Totalitarian system is doomed if it doesn't rest on (imaginary) ideal marionettes. Straining of attitudes and kindling of unrest, initially faint, then stronger and stronger, are inevitable. The failure of the system, dimly taken awareness of, is being discussed.

Pressure. The pressure of protest is an effect of social forces canalizing the accumulated social tension. *The sense of break-through and licence for safe protestation* grows. Pressure, in the form of actual and effective force of protest, compels the authorities to make concessions and destabilizes them. Meaningful is the pressure that knows its ends. A measure for its effectiveness is *the weakening of the regime* or *the intensity of its reformist activity*.

When communism is falling down waves, fluxes and forces are released, which move the attitudes, ideas, actions and events towards a new state of equilibrium, a "meta-stable" state. This new equilibrium lies on a higher level of organization where the forces of reform dominate the forces of chaos or *vice versa*. Future equilibrium is on the level on which entropy stops increasing. Forces have been regrouped and the macro-social field is stationary. And this amounts to a new historical situation.

There are three theoretical models, which are topical for a conscious post-communist movement: open society (Popper), liberalism (Hayek) and social democracy. The first seems to stand above ideology and not to privilege even liberal democracy as ideology. People are attracted by truths whose denial they know from bitter experience although the winds of post-communism may blow them to another place. It is perfectly possible that East Europe acquires a social-democratic shape, but hardly in its classical form.

In post-communist dynamics *attitudes “are drifting” around stationary equilibrium or evolve, pushed by macro-economic and macro-political events*. The dynamics of political attitudes in the post-communist flux is marked by ebb of confrontation and emphasis on the results of reforms. Thus the prospective strength of political formations is not seen in some ideas they carry, but in their capacities for governing society. The attitudes of transition bring forth a static and dynamic of disequilibrium. Political attitudes shift from the extreme left to the right. This shift, of course, is combined with tides and ebbs of the right and left wave.

Reforms are not impersonal objective events; rather they are a kind of *interpretational transformation*. They are acts of expansion of post-communist waves against entropy. Phenomenology is aware of the following. *People themselves make change as they understand it*. A law, e.g., is such, as people are inclined to invent, interpret and frame. Behind the meanings fixed in social *texts* – laws, documents, works of culture – *forces* are operating, which express personal wills, interests. In order to arrive at a *new text* about social order a *force* has to be exercised.

Free fall and reform

The phenomenon of “free fall” in economy arises in the moment when economic control on a national scale is no longer possible. People have been already grasped by catastrophic attitude – a complex of meanings found in and attributed to social reality. The phase of *free fall* ends the ballistic curve of socialist economy’s historical development.

Planning and market implement two kinds of organization: programme and feedback. These two types are well distinguished in nature and technology.

Planning rationality. Programming is possible *to the degree to which one is able to fully interpret* the object of programming. The programming of something new is *phenomenological genesis of a new artefact*. Outside the programme the never entirely interpreted world remains. The programme is applied to what is known and controlled, and this is the artefact. Nature, life, spirit are realities uncontrolled by us and not yielding to algorithmic command in their basic definitions. *Central planning confuses the rationality of production, which is an artefact, with the rationality of the market game, which is life*.

Market is an instance of feedback. As contrasted to programming, feedback is destined to react on unforeseen processes and restore the equilibrium state despite of disturbances. Feedback maintains equilibrium in unforeseeable systems and media through unique reactions. In a wide sense, human actions developing through trial and error present a case of “feedback”. *An action results from a plan but is liable to “editing” if mistaken*. And whether there is a mistake, only the live, unique situation decides.

Market reform. Planning and market are not separate states of one and the same system. They are different systems. There is no way for the planning economy to transform smoothly into market economy by just adding something and taking something out of it. There is no parameter of centrally planned economy whose variation could yield market economy. In this sense, whether monetarist, or not, market reform is abrupt, hard, “shocking”. A decisive step has been done when state enterprises are put into the situation of free market.

Privatization. Therefore the second decisive step is *privatization*. The super-rule of the economic game – property – must be changed. With state property dominating no market is to be made. It is impossible to combine organically a no-one’s or state officer’s production with free market prices.

According to *Karl Marx* value increases not in the market space, but in production, thanks to labour. The market is only medium for the capital. The market is not a sphere of rational action: it does not engender new value. Marx radicalizes the actual opposition of labour and capital. He mistakenly asserts that value increases only in productive labour. He is not able to assume that values equal before exchange may increase subsequently. But a transaction, which is advantageous for both sides, increases the wealth of both of them. Thus economic space is organized by itself and expands against entropy. The growth of wealth is *a life process of expansion, of structuring inverse to entropy*.

Coming to a dead-end is both a cause and an outcome of a new range of attitudes, which are to a great degree only continuation and intensification of the old communist attitudes: apathy concerning the fate of the state and state economy, weakness, corruption, anarchic attitude, moral irresponsibility to the future of the nation. The mentality of illegality, conspiracy, using of men of straw, behind-the-scene machinations, anonymity is a mutant of communist attitude now coinciding with the criminal attitude of all-permissiveness and conscious destructivity.

Post-communist spirit

Apathy is inert. It is a gravitational pull, which detains social spirit and impedes its convalescence. Breaking away from chaos is accomplished thanks to *free spirit*. No system can destroy this principle. It can be cultivated through putting the person *in the authentic risk situation* of survival by means of *rational economic action*. The permanent strategies of life – survival, adaptation, independence, security, success, wealth – are projected into adequate social forms: warranted rights, free initiative, freedom of speech, multi-party system and political choice. Everyone who has lived in the totalitarian world has *a hard and unknown path to climb*.

There is no more authentic and engaging situation than the situation of boundary existence in front of destruction. If people from a nation run asunder, each in one's personal world, and give up common action for the establishment of national order and wealth those people have given up their nation and condemn it to death.

A person recovers along with community. The I has absolute character for phenomenological examination. There is nothing found in the analysis of consciousness that would dissolve the I into a super-personal instance.

Communism significantly declined a group of European countries from the path of Western civilization and left them far behind the average Western level of development. This inequality between East and West Europe gives rise to a tension, which may lead to a Cold Peace or lasting unrest, protest and ripening of a Cold War between the poor and the wealthy. This unlimited technologism may bring forth again some form of utopia about the arrangement of social life, about construction of a new man, life and world.

It is very much probable that the demiurgic spirit will find a new form. The pressure of global confrontation and technological progress may again tempt or compel the West to offer a total social technology, and that technology, on a scenario similar to communism, may establish itself in weak nations with marginal culture. We ought to make sense of technology and to learn maintaining it within limits.

Conclusion. Limits of creation

After an idea, after a project and spontaneously is made only what is artificial – *the non-living, which is not the fruit of natural processes*. World, life and man are realities without a visible bottom. They are opaque and boundless. They are above any technological capacities. People must remember this and never allow again deadly experiments on earth. Human happiness is not made according to a plan. Freedom is not constructed. Man is not “shaped” under control by power or the Idea. Ideas do not make history. History is a boundlessly complex living reality where things are unpredictable and irreversible. It is the freedom of human beings put within time. It is also the chaos of human beings' cohabitation of the earth. People live solving local problems without any control on the global whole. Such a control would be possible if humans were not free beings and could be treated as automata, domestic animals or slaves.

The world, life and man cannot be artefacts.