



Peer-Reviewed, International,
Academic Research Journal



Citation

Carrillo, F. (2023). From Marx to Now: Exploring Collective Ownership, Classlessness, and the Evolving State. *Social Science Chronicle*, Vol. 3, Issue - 1, pp. 1-21.

Digital Object Identifier (DOI)

<https://doi.org/10.56106/ssc.2023.011>

Received - July 9, 2023

Accepted - November 17, 2023

Published - November 24, 2023

Web-Link

All the contents of this peer reviewed article as well as author details are available at <http://socialsciencechronicle.com/article-ssc-2023-011>

Copyright

The copyright of this article is reserved with the author/s.
© 2023, Félix Carrillo.

This publication is distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution, Non-Commercial, Share Alike 4.0 International License. It permits unrestricted copying and redistribution of this publication in any medium or format.



RESEARCH ARTICLE

From Marx to Now: Exploring Collective Ownership, Classlessness, and the Evolving State

Félix Carrillo^{1*}

¹ Universidade Federal de Sergipe, Sergipe, Brazil.

* Corresponding Author

Abstract

This research paper delves into the intricate facets of communism, a multifaceted and ideologically rich political and economic framework that has shaped societies and ignited impassioned discourse for over a century. It explores the core principles, including collective ownership, the abolition of money, the aspiration for a classless society, the common ownership of goods, and the state's withering away. Additionally, it delves into the notion of workers' control, a pivotal element of communism that reimagines the labor-capital relationship and calls for the working class to actively participate in decision-making processes. Drawing on a wealth of historical, theoretical, and critical perspectives, this research paper provides an in-depth analysis of these principles, offering a nuanced understanding of their origins, manifestations, practical applications, and the challenges they pose. The research elucidates communism's critique of capitalism, emphasizing how it aims to rectify economic disparities, class-based power imbalances, and the inherent exploitation of wage labor. It explores communism's vision of a classless society, a stateless future, and the transcendence of money as a medium of exchange. It highlights the ongoing debate surrounding the feasibility and desirability of these principles, with proponents emphasizing alternative incentives and critics underscoring potential challenges. This research paper provides a comprehensive exploration of communism's underlying principles and their implications for socio-economic structures, decision-making processes, and governance. It underscores the enduring relevance of communism in the modern world, as societies continue to grapple with issues of economic inequality, social justice, and the pursuit of alternative models that challenge prevailing paradigms. Through a rigorous examination of the principles that underlie communism, this research paper contributes to a deeper understanding of a complex and influential ideology, offering insights into both its potential and its limitations.

Keywords

Abolition of Money, Classless Society, Collective Ownership, Common Ownership of Goods, Communism, Economic Ideology, Political Philosophy, Socialism, Withering of the State, Workers' Control.

1. Introduction

In the realm of political and economic ideologies, communism stands as a seminal and enduring force, its influence extending over more than a century of global history. Born out of the crucible of the 19th century's tumultuous socio-economic landscape, communism is a multifaceted framework that has left an indelible mark on the course of nations and the contours of political thought. Its evolution, principles, and the rich tapestry of ideas associated with it have animated countless debates, sparked revolutions, and inspired profound socio-economic experiments (Bukharin & Preobrazensky, 2021; Draper, 2017; Fisher & Colquhoun, 2020; Heale, 1990). The overarching objective of this comprehensive research paper is to unravel the multifaceted nature of communism, exploring its core principles, their historical roots,

practical applications, and enduring relevance in the contemporary world. The origins of communism are inextricably linked to the turbulent landscapes of the 19th century. It emerged as a response to the stark inequalities, exploitation, and social injustices wrought by the Industrial Revolution and the ascendancy of capitalism. Central to communism is the vision of a society where the means of production, such as factories, land, and resources, are collectively owned and managed, wealth is distributed according to the principle of “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs,” and where the state, as an institution of power and authority, is expected to gradually wither away as class distinctions dissolve (Ceplair, 2011; Kropotkin, 2020; Mattick Jr, 2017; Starobin, 1972).

These fundamental principles serve as the bedrock upon which the entire edifice of communism is constructed. In examining the principles of communism, this research paper takes a comprehensive approach, starting with collective ownership, which forms the nucleus of this ideological framework. Collective ownership under communism envisions the means of production as being held collectively by the community or the state on behalf of the people. In this paradigm, the concept of private ownership of productive assets is abolished (G. A. Almond, 2015; Courtois, 1999; Fagan, 2012; Hupchick, 2002; Lipset & Bence, 1994). Resources are directed towards the common good, and the central pillar of capitalism—private property—is dismantled. Furthermore, the abolition of money is a defining characteristic of communism. In a communist society, economic transactions are grounded in common ownership, and resources are allocated according to need, eliminating the role of money as a medium of exchange. The profit motive, which is intrinsic to capitalism, is replaced with a focus on the well-being and needs of the community. This transition represents a profound shift in the socio-economic landscape, as it challenges the very essence of economic relationships and decision-making processes.

Communism’s ambition extends beyond economics; it seeks to create a classless society (Drakulic, 2013; Frye, 2010; Mason, 1929; Ulam, 1998). The vision is one of a society in which social and economic classes have dissolved, and all individuals are considered equal. This ambition challenges the hierarchical structures that underpin contemporary societies, aiming for a more egalitarian and just socio-economic order. A fundamental principle within the communist framework is the common ownership of goods. In this construct, goods and services are produced for the benefit of all, distributed based on need, rather than individual wealth or ownership. Private property, in the traditional sense, loses its relevance, redefining the relationship between individuals and resources. The concept of common ownership calls for a reconfiguration of societal values and economic norms, emphasizing community, shared responsibility, and collective well-being (Roemer, 1992; Szelényi, 2017; Van der Veen & Van Parijs, 1986; Vogel, 1980). The research paper also delves into the aspiration of communism for the state to wither away. In this long-term vision, the state is expected to lose its significance and authority as social and economic relations become more harmonious, and class distinctions gradually disappear.

This process, often referred to as the “withering away of the state,” represents a fundamental reconfiguration of governance and socio-economic relations. Another core principle of communism is workers’ control. This concept advocates for

the working class, or the proletariat, to have direct control over the means of production (Lawrance, 2002; Lewy, 1990; Menon, 1994; Van der Veen & Van Parijs, 2006). Decisions about production, distribution, and resource allocation are to be made collectively by the working class, upending the traditional capitalist model where ownership and decision-making are concentrated in the hands of a privileged few. The enduring relevance and influence of communism lie in its capacity to critique and challenge the prevailing socio-economic systems, particularly capitalism. Communism’s origins can be traced back to the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, most notably “The Communist Manifesto,” which was published in 1848. In this seminal text, Marx and Engels articulated the grievances and aspirations of the working class, laying out their vision for a society that transcended class divisions and economic exploitation.

Communism, as a political and economic ideology, inspired revolutions and uprisings, shaped political landscapes, and led to the formation of communist states in the 20th century (Chen & Galenson, 1970; Ost, 2015; S. A. Resnick & Wolff, 2013; B. I. Schwartz, 1979). Prominent among these were the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba, each with its unique interpretation and application of communist principles. These real-world experiments have provided valuable insights into the challenges and complexities of implementing communist ideas on a national scale. As this research paper embarks on an exploration of communism, it seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the principles that underlie this ideology and their implications for socio-economic structures, decision-making processes, and governance. It examines the historical context in which communism emerged, the theoretical foundations laid by key thinkers, and the practical applications and challenges associated with these principles. In addition, the research paper delves into the ongoing debates surrounding communism.

Critics question the feasibility and desirability of its core principles, raising concerns about individual incentives, efficiency, and the potential for abuse of power. Proponents counter these arguments by emphasizing alternative motivations, the potential for more equitable resource allocation, and the empowerment of the working class. Through this comprehensive exploration, the research paper aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of communism, shedding light on both its potential and its limitations. It underscores the enduring relevance of communism in the modern world, as societies grapple with issues of economic inequality, social justice, and the pursuit of alternative models that challenge prevailing paradigms. In so doing, it provides a valuable resource for those seeking to engage with the complex and influential world of communist thought and practice.

2. Tapestry of Communism: From Marx to Modern Era

Communism, as a political and economic ideology, represents a paradigmatic aspiration toward the realization of a classless and stateless society. The very notion of communism encapsulates a comprehensive transformation of socio-economic structures, aiming to subsume the divisive forces of social hierarchy and inequality (Hardt, 2010; Healey, 1948; Henderson & Wilson, 1998; Wank, 1999). This aspiration, in its fundamental essence, is encapsulated within the seminal work of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, particularly articulated in their 1848 man-

ifesto, “The Communist Manifesto.” To comprehensively understand communism and its manifold implications, one must delve into its historical context, philosophical underpinnings, and the complex tapestry of socio-economic dynamics it endeavors to reconfigure. Communism, as an ideology, represents an ideological divergence from the prevailing socio-economic systems that were predominant during the 19th century when Marx and Engels formulated their groundbreaking ideas (A. Brown, 2013; Lansford, 2008; March, 2013; Pipes & Wilson, 2001). It embodies an idealistic vision of societal organization where the principal means of production, including factories, land, and resources, are collectively owned, managed, and distributed.

Private ownership, which was seen as a root cause of social and economic inequities, is slated for complete abolition. The centrality of this proposition lies in its potential to eradicate the entrenched class distinctions that marked the socio-economic landscape of the 19th century and beyond. Communism envisions a classless society wherein each member is deemed equal, unburdened by the shackles of social and economic hierarchies (Laski, 2014; Sandle, 2014; B. I. Schwartz, 1968; Wood, 1959). The underpinning philosophy of communism is articulated in the famous principle of “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.” This principle encapsulates the quintessence of a society where economic contributions and wealth distribution are unshackled from the constraints of individual wealth accumulation and profit motives. This profound shift signifies a departure from capitalist ideologies that prioritize private property, market dynamics, and the pursuit of self-interest (Benjamin & Kautsky, 1968; Bideleux, 2014; Harrison, 2012; Lewis, 1954).

It entails a reimagining of economic relations in which each member of society contributes in accordance with their capacities, while the allocation of resources and goods is predicated on the imperative of need. It is crucial to recognize that communism does not envision a mere economic transformation; rather, it encompasses a comprehensive remaking of the societal fabric. The structural reforms it seeks span from economics to politics, culture, and even human consciousness. In particular, communism strives to subvert the dominant capitalist mode of production, characterized by wage labor and private ownership, which it perceives as inherently exploitative (G. Almond, 2019; Arnason, 2017; Black, 2015; White, 2002). Communism’s historical roots extend deep into the fertile soil of 19th century Europe, where the Industrial Revolution was reshaping the socio-economic landscape. This period was characterized by rapid industrialization, urbanization, and a concomitant rise in social and economic disparities. The nascent capitalist system was producing profound divisions between the bourgeoisie, who owned and controlled the means of production, and the proletariat, who were compelled to sell their labour for wages.

This growing chasm between the haves and have-nots prompted intense social and political upheaval, setting the stage for the emergence of radical ideologies like communism (J. H. Kautsky, 1967; Kuromiya, 2001; Mace, 1981; White, 1974). Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who are the intellectual architects of modern communism, drew inspiration from the socio-economic conditions of their era. They observed the exploitation and alienation of the working class and sought to provide a comprehensive critique of the capitalist system. Their analysis, as articulated in “The Communist Manifesto,” was ground-

ed in a dialectical and historical materialist framework, synthesizing philosophy, economics, and politics. This framework identified class struggle as the animating force behind historical change and posited that capitalism contained within it the seeds of its own destruction (Harsch, 2013; Mazurski, 1991; Modelski, 1968; Wydra, 2007). Marx and Engels contended that the contradictions and inherent inequalities of capitalism would inevitably lead to a revolutionary transformation of society. Their vision was not simply one of economic reform but a profound restructuring of the societal order itself.

The very essence of their ideas revolved around the call for the proletariat to rise against the bourgeoisie, overthrow the capitalist system, and establish a classless society where the means of production would be collectively owned and managed (Djankov & Nikolova, 2018; Healy, 2015; Kula, 2005; S. McFarland, 1998). In the pages of “The Communist Manifesto,” Marx and Engels famously proclaimed, “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.” They contended that throughout history, societies had been defined by antagonistic class relationships, which had culminated in various forms of exploitation and oppression. The capitalist system, they argued, was no exception. It was, in their view, a system predicated on the exploitation of the working class, with the bourgeoisie amassing wealth and power at the expense of the laboring masses (James, 1879; K. Kautsky, 1897; Rakowska-Harmstone, 1984; Taborsky, 2015). This analysis formed the core of their call for a proletarian revolution, aimed at overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a socialist order.

To Marx and Engels, the revolutionary transformation they advocated was not merely a matter of political reform or reforming the economic system. It was a fundamental reordering of society’s structures and values. Central to their vision was the abolition of private property, a cornerstone of capitalism. They argued that this transformation would enable the working class to seize the means of production and eliminate the capitalist class, thereby eradicating class distinctions and inequality (Fowkes, 1984; Hodgson, 2015; Joravsky, 1994; Overstreet & Windmiller, 2022). “The Communist Manifesto” is not solely a treatise on the critique of capitalism and the call for revolution. It also outlines the necessary steps and stages that Marx and Engels believed would lead to the realization of communism. They identified a series of transitional measures, including the centralization of credit and banking, the establishment of a progressive income tax, and the nationalization of transportation and communication systems. These measures, they argued, would serve to undermine the power of the bourgeoisie and pave the way for the eventual establishment of communism (Alexander, 1957; Blackmer & Tarrow, 2015; Nossiter, 1982; Scalapino & Lee, 1972).

The transition to communism, as outlined by Marx and Engels, is a protracted process. It involves the establishment of a “dictatorship of the proletariat,” which they saw as a temporary phase during which the working class would exert its control over society. This phase, they contended, would be necessary to suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie and safeguard the revolution. Once the capitalist class had been eliminated, the state, which had served as a tool of class oppression, would wither away, paving the way for the emergence of a classless and stateless communist society (Dean, 2020; Harris, 2013; Miranda, 2004; Sakwa, 2010). Marx and Engels’ vision of communism has elicited a wide range of responses and interpretations over the years. It has been a source of inspiration

and a catalyst for social and political movements, leading to the formation of various communist and socialist parties and the establishment of socialist states in different parts of the world. However, it has also been the subject of intense critique and debate, both in terms of its theoretical underpinnings and its practical implementations. Critics of communism have raised a multitude of objections, some of which are directed at its philosophical foundations, while others concern the historical record of communist regimes. One of the primary criticisms is the assertion that communism, in its quest for a classless society, disregards the individual's right to private property and economic freedom (Bren & Neuberger, 2012; Davis, 1975; Sparks & Reading, 1997; Stouffer, 1955).

Critics argue that such a system, by abolishing private ownership and emphasizing collective control, can stifle innovation, initiative, and individual enterprise. They contend that the absence of market competition and the profit motive can lead to inefficiencies in resource allocation and economic planning. Moreover, detractors argue that the concentration of power in the hands of the state, which is often seen as a necessary instrument for the realization of communism, can result in authoritarianism, suppression of political dissent, and violations of human rights. The historical experiences of communist states such as the Soviet Union, China, and others are often cited as evidence of these concerns (Bauman, 1990; Holmes, 2009; Nancy, 2010; S. Resnick & Wolff, 1988). These regimes have been criticized for their lack of political freedoms, censorship, and the centralization of economic and political power. The issue of economic planning and resource allocation in a communist society is a central point of contention. Proponents argue that central planning, when executed effectively, can lead to rational allocation of resources and eliminate wasteful competition.

However, critics maintain that central planning can be bureaucratic and prone to inefficiency, as it may lack the feedback mechanisms of a market economy. Another major criticism pertains to the abolition of private property. Critics argue that this can undermine the incentive for individuals to work hard, innovate, and take risks. Private property, they contend, provides a sense of security and ownership that motivates people to invest in their work and society. The absence of private property, as envisaged by communism, can, in their view, disincentivize productivity. Despite these criticisms, communism continues to have a lasting impact on political thought and the trajectory of human history (Lefort, 2007; Malm, 2020; Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005; Zumoff, 2014). It has inspired political movements and social experiments, often with significant consequences. The 20th century witnessed the rise of socialist states influenced by Marxist ideology, including the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, and others. These states attempted to implement communist principles, albeit often with significant departures from Marx and Engels' original vision. One of the enduring debates in the realm of communism revolves around the question of feasibility and adaptability.

Critics point to the failures and shortcomings of communist states, including economic inefficiency, political repression, and human rights abuses. Proponents, on the other hand, argue that these instances do not represent the true ideals of communism and that its failures were often the result of external pressures, internal corruption, or historical contingencies. Moreover, some contemporary scholars and activists have

sought to reevaluate and adapt communist ideas to the challenges of the 21st century. They argue that the original vision of Marx and Engels must be reconsidered in light of changing economic and social dynamics (Bernstein & Stenning, 1930; Horowitz, 1972; Mälksoo, 2014; Weitz, 1997). This reimagining of communism often incorporates elements of environmental sustainability, gender equality, and participatory democracy. In this context, communism is not seen as a fixed and dogmatic ideology but as a dynamic and evolving framework for addressing contemporary social and economic issues. It is also noteworthy that communism is not a monolithic ideology, and there are various strands and interpretations within the broader socialist and communist tradition.

These range from orthodox Marxism to variations such as democratic socialism, which seeks to achieve socialist goals through democratic means and without the overthrow of existing political systems (Diamond & Plattner, 2002; Gessen, 1997; Golan, 1971; Major, 1998). Similarly, other interpretations, like anarcho-communism, advocate for a stateless and non-hierarchical society, emphasizing voluntary cooperation and mutual aid. In contemporary discussions of communism, there is a recognition of the need for a more nuanced and contextual understanding of its principles and potential applications. The traditional dichotomy of capitalism versus communism has given way to more complex considerations of how elements of both systems can be combined to address economic inequality and societal challenges. For example, some nations have implemented social welfare policies within capitalist frameworks to mitigate inequality, while others have experimented with cooperative ownership models in certain sectors of the economy.

Communism, as an ideology and socio-economic framework, has a rich and complex history marked by both idealistic aspirations and controversial implementations (Eberstadt, 1994; Gill, 2003; Maier, 1999; Tismaneanu, 2012). Its origins in the critique of 19th century capitalism and the call for a classless, stateless society are rooted in the writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, particularly articulated in "The Communist Manifesto." The core principles of communism revolve around collective ownership of the means of production, the abolition of private property, and the establishment of a society where resources are distributed based on need. Communism, however, is not merely an economic system; it represents a comprehensive reimagining of the societal fabric, encompassing political, cultural, and ideological dimensions (Brandt, Schwartz, & Fairbank, 1952; Burks, 2015; Dragadze, 2003; Turnock, 2003). It calls for the overthrow of the capitalist class and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat as a transitional phase, which would eventually give way to a classless and stateless communist society.

The history of communism is a complex and multifaceted narrative, marked by both successes and failures. The practical implementations of communism in the 20th century have generated intense debate and criticism, with concerns about political repression, economic inefficiency, and violations of human rights. However, proponents of communism argue that these instances do not represent the true ideals of communism and that they were often shaped by external factors and historical contingencies. In contemporary discussions, communism is not seen as a fixed and dogmatic ideology, but as a dynamic framework that can be adapted and reinterpreted to address

contemporary social and economic challenges (Kamiński & Soltan, 1989; Kowalski, 2017; Malle, 2002; Schöpflin, 1990). Various strands within the broader socialist and communist tradition offer different perspectives and solutions, ranging from orthodox Marxism to democratic socialism and anarcho-communism. The enduring legacy of communism lies in its capacity to stimulate debate, reflection, and re-evaluation of socio-economic systems and the pursuit of social justice. It is a testament to the enduring power of ideas to shape the course of history and inspire both change and critical inquiry. As the world continues to grapple with issues of economic inequality, environmental sustainability, and political governance, the ideas of communism remain relevant, sparking ongoing discussions about the possibilities and limitations of alternative societal frameworks (Boschini & Olofsgård, 2007; Franöois Furet & Nolte, 2001; Payne, 2000; Weigel, 2003).

3. Collective Ownership in Communism: A Paradigm Shift from Private Property to Common Wealth

The concept of collective ownership constitutes a fundamental and distinctive aspect of communism, representing a radical departure from the predominant socio-economic systems of the 19th century, particularly capitalism. In a communist society, the means of production, encompassing factories, land, and resources, are vested in the collective ownership and management of the community or, in some variations, the state acting on behalf of the people (Chi, 1964; Minxin & Pei, 2009; Pipes, 1964; Tiersky, 1974). This principle of collective ownership stands in stark contrast to the prevailing capitalist ethos, which enshrines the primacy of private property and the individual's right to own and control productive assets. Collective ownership, as articulated in communist theory, is foundational to the broader aim of abolishing the entrenched socio-economic inequalities that were emblematic of the 19th century. The proponents of communism, notably Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, identified the private ownership of the means of production as a central pillar of capitalist society, which they contended was the root cause of social and economic disparities (Bastani, 2019; Bauwens & Kostakis, 2014; Liu, 2004; Newell & Reilly, 2001).

In their view, the concentration of productive assets in the hands of a privileged minority, the bourgeoisie, led to the exploitation of the working class, the proletariat. As such, the principle of collective ownership was posited as a means to dismantle this concentration of economic power and engender a more egalitarian and just social order. Collective ownership in communism carries profound implications for the relationship between individuals and productive assets. It abolishes the individual's right to own the means of production as personal property and, instead, vests ownership in the broader social collective (Alesina & Fuchs-Schündeln, 2007; Funk & Mueller, 2018a; Levine, 1993; Pons, 2014). This shift represents a significant transformation of the prevailing property relations that underpin capitalist systems, where the right to acquire, use, and dispose of property is an integral facet of individual liberty and economic self-determination. In a communist framework, the community or the state, acting as the representative of the collective, assumes stewardship over productive resources.

This stewardship implies that the community, as a whole, has a vested interest in the productive assets and holds them in trust for the common good (Aslund & Djankov, 2014; Bren,

2019; Dimitrov, Goetz, & Wollmann, 2006; Kalyvas & Marantzidis, 2002). It is worth noting that the precise mechanisms of collective ownership can vary among different iterations of communism. In some interpretations, it is the community itself, organized in a decentralized fashion, that exercises direct control over local productive assets. In others, particularly in the case of state socialism, the state acts as the intermediary agent overseeing and managing these resources on behalf of the people. The abolition of private ownership of the means of production is a fundamental departure from the capitalist doctrine, where private property rights are sacrosanct. In capitalist systems, individuals and entities have the right to acquire, own, use, and transfer property as they see fit. This includes ownership of factories, agricultural land, natural resources, and other productive assets (M. E. Brown, 2009; Pye, 2015; Thomas, 2001; Vattimo & Zabala, 2011).

Private ownership is deeply ingrained in the economic and legal structures of capitalist societies, underpinned by the concept of individual freedom and the right to the fruits of one's labor. Collective ownership, as championed by communism, represents a radical reconfiguration of these property rights. By vesting ownership in the collective, it seeks to redress the inherent inequities embedded in private ownership, where a select few control the productive assets, reaping the lion's share of the economic benefits. In contrast, communism envisions the means of production as a common heritage, shared and managed collectively, with the primary aim of benefitting all members of society (Drakulic, 1992; Gitlow, 2017; Shaw, 1884; Van den Berghe & Peter, 1988). The principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" encapsulates this vision, emphasizing the just distribution of resources and wealth based on need rather than individual accumulation. One of the foundational premises of collective ownership is that it is predicated on the idea that economic power should be diffused and shared across the entire society. This diffusion stands in direct opposition to the concentration of economic power that is a hallmark of capitalist systems. In capitalism, private property ownership can lead to the accumulation of significant wealth and power in the hands of a small minority, the bourgeoisie, who control the means of production.

This, in turn, can result in economic disparities, class divisions, and unequal access to resources and opportunities (Ali, 2009; Badiou, Balso, & Bosteels, 2010; Douzinas & Žižek, 2010; Žižek, 2013). Collective ownership seeks to remedy this by reorganizing the structures of economic control and ensuring that decisions about resource allocation and production are made collectively, with the well-being of all members of society as the primary objective. In essence, it is an attempt to democratize economic power, aligning it with broader societal interests rather than the interests of a privileged few. Moreover, collective ownership addresses the ethical dimensions of property and wealth distribution. In the eyes of communists, private ownership can lead to unjust and unequal outcomes, where some individuals amass great fortunes while others struggle to meet their basic needs (Ding, 1994; Mortimer, 2006; Riordan, 2002, 2007).

The principle of collective ownership is underpinned by the belief that economic and productive resources are not the exclusive property of any one individual, but rather a communal inheritance to be utilized for the benefit of all. This ethos reflects a deep-seated commitment to principles of social justice,

equality, and fairness, transcending the notions of profit-maximization and individual accumulation that are intrinsic to capitalism. Critics of collective ownership within a communist framework often raise concerns about the efficiency of resource allocation and economic decision-making (Funk & Mueller, 2018b; Khalid, 2014; Todorov, 1991; Webb & Webb, 1936). They contend that the absence of private property and market competition can lead to inefficiencies, as it may lack the price mechanisms and incentives that underpin market economies. In capitalist systems, the profit motive and competition are often cited as drivers of innovation, efficiency, and economic growth. The removal of these elements, as they argue, may lead to stagnation and a lack of economic dynamism. Proponents of communism, on the other hand, assert that collective ownership, when organized and managed effectively, can address these concerns.

They argue that centralized planning and democratic decision-making processes can mitigate inefficiencies by aligning resource allocation with societal priorities rather than profit motives (Hatherley, 2016; Kaminski, 2016; Lenin, 1999; Nancy, 1992). They contend that collective ownership enables the pursuit of long-term social and environmental goals, as decisions are not driven solely by short-term profit considerations. The issue of collective ownership also intertwines with the broader question of economic planning and resource allocation. In capitalist economies, market forces play a significant role in determining what goods and services are produced, in what quantities, and at what prices. The price mechanism, shaped by supply and demand, guides producers and consumers in their economic decisions. In a communist system, where collective ownership prevails, the market forces of supply and demand are generally replaced by centralized economic planning and decision-making (Fuchs-Schündeln & Schündeln, 2020; J. E. Johnson & Robinson, 2006; Samuel, 2017; Szacki, 1995).

Critics of collective ownership within a communist framework often argue that centralized planning can be bureaucratic and prone to inefficiency. They contend that the absence of market feedback mechanisms can result in misallocation of resources, surpluses, and shortages. Additionally, they raise concerns about the lack of incentives for individuals and organizations to innovate and improve productivity in the absence of profit motives and competition. Proponents of communism, on the other hand, argue that centralized planning, when executed effectively, can offer advantages in terms of rational resource allocation and long-term planning. They contend that a well-structured planning process, which takes into account the needs and aspirations of the community, can lead to more equitable and efficient resource distribution (Burawoy, 2000; McLellan, 2011; Ollman, 1977; Podhoretz, 1976).

Furthermore, they emphasize that the absence of profit motives and competition can redirect focus towards social and environmental goals, reducing wasteful production and resource depletion. It is important to recognize that the concept of collective ownership has been realized in various forms and to varying degrees in different communist experiments and socialist states. The practical application of collective ownership has often been influenced by the specific historical, cultural, and geopolitical contexts in which these experiments have taken place (Hoover, 2015; Krygier, 1990; Robinson, 1999; Sparks, 2005). As a result, the way in which resources are col-

lectively owned and managed can vary significantly. One prominent manifestation of collective ownership is seen in the state socialism model, where the state acts as the intermediary agent through which resources and means of production are managed on behalf of the people. In state socialist systems, the government assumes control over key industries, agricultural land, and natural resources. The state is responsible for planning, directing production, and distributing goods and services. This model has been implemented in several countries during the 20th century, including the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba.

Another variation is the concept of worker self-management, which places a strong emphasis on the direct control and decision-making power of the labor force (Bennigsen & Wimbush, 1980; Fish Jr, 1931; Lieberman, 1989; Stavrakis, 1989). In such systems, workers collectively manage and control the means of production within their respective enterprises. This model aims to empower workers, reduce hierarchical structures, and democratize economic decision-making. Additionally, there are models of communal or decentralized ownership, where local communities or cooperatives assume control of productive assets and resources. In these systems, decisions about resource allocation and production are made at the local level, fostering a sense of community and direct participation in economic processes.

Furthermore, some contemporary interpretations of collective ownership incorporate elements of technological innovation, such as blockchain technology, to facilitate decentralized control and management of resources. These developments seek to overcome some of the challenges associated with centralized planning while preserving the principles of collective ownership. The concept of collective ownership stands as a defining pillar of communism, representing a profound departure from the prevailing principles of private property and individual ownership that characterize capitalist systems (Beissinger, 2009; Gerrits, 2009; Kemp, 1999; Zwick, 2019). In a communist society, the means of production, including factories, land, and resources, are collectively owned and managed by the community or the state on behalf of the people.

This principle of collective ownership is underpinned by a commitment to economic equality, social justice, and the abolition of the economic disparities that are intrinsic to capitalism. The implications of collective ownership extend beyond mere economic reorganization; they encompass a fundamental reconfiguration of the socio-economic structures and relations that shape human societies. This transformation aims to diffuse economic power, democratize resource allocation, and align economic processes with societal needs rather than individual profit motives (Burawoy, 2001; Daniels, 1962; Kamp, 2011; K. Z. Schwartz, 2006). While critics raise concerns about the efficiency and incentives of such systems, proponents argue that effective planning and decision-making processes can mitigate these issues and lead to more equitable and sustainable resource distribution. The implementation of collective ownership varies among different communist experiments, reflecting the historical and cultural contexts in which they occur. The concept of collective ownership continues to be a subject of ongoing debate, evolving in response to the changing dynamics and challenges of the modern world (Dupont, 2009; Shleifer & Treisman, 2005; Tucker, 1967; Van der Linden, 2004).

4. Classless Society in Communism: An Egalitarian Vision for Social Transformation

The concept of a classless society is a fundamental tenet of communism, representing a profound departure from the prevailing socio-economic systems of the 19th century, particularly capitalism. In a classless society, communism envisions the abolition of social and economic classes, thereby fostering a state of egalitarianism where every individual is considered equal (Berdjaev, 1966; Demaitre, 1969; Hammond, 1958; S. A. Smith, 2014). This aspiration encapsulates the essence of communism's goal to eradicate the deeply entrenched divisions and disparities that marked the socio-economic landscape of the 19th century and beyond. The driving force behind the idea of a classless society is the profound critique that communism directs towards the prevailing capitalist order. In the eyes of communists, the capitalist system is inherently hierarchical, characterized by the dominance of distinct social and economic classes. At the apex of this hierarchy lies the bourgeoisie, the capitalist class, who own and control the means of production and wield significant economic power (François Furet, 1999; Hands, 2013; Ridout, 2013; Sotiris, 2020).

In stark contrast, at the base of the hierarchy, resides the proletariat, the working class, who must sell their labor to the bourgeoisie and are often subjected to exploitation and economic insecurity. This class-based structure of capitalist societies, according to communist theory, gives rise to systemic inequalities and injustices. The concentration of economic power in the hands of the bourgeoisie, who accumulate wealth through the profits generated by the labor of the proletariat, results in a stark disparity between the classes. The bourgeoisie benefit from economic privilege, while the working class often confronts poverty, economic insecurity, and limited access to resources and opportunities. The vision of a classless society represents a resolute response to these perceived injustices (O'Neil, 2014; Ruud, 2022; Schöpflin, 1991; Whitefield, 2005). Communism seeks to dismantle the existing social and economic hierarchy, thereby obliterating the boundaries that delineate one class from another. It posits a society in which every individual, regardless of their background, occupation, or social standing, is considered equal.

This egalitarian ideal, deeply rooted in communist thought, stands as a beacon of social justice, heralding a reconfigured social order that transcends the divisions of the past. A classless society represents an ambitious reconfiguration of social structures, transcending the confines of economic relations to encompass political, cultural, and ideological dimensions (Eberstadt, 2017; Lee, 1990; Ray, 1997; Wydra, 2012). It aspires to a state of affairs where an individual's social and economic status is no longer determined by the circumstances of their birth, the nature of their occupation, or the ownership of property. In this transformed society, the rigid class boundaries that delineated privilege from poverty, power from powerlessness, would be eradicated, fostering a state of social harmony. Central to the vision of a classless society is the concept of social equality. Communism seeks to ensure that each member of society enjoys the same rights, privileges, and opportunities, irrespective of their socio-economic background. This entails not only economic redistribution but also the elimination of social hierarchies and barriers that perpetuate inequality (Engels, 1963, 2020; Matthews, 2013; McHale, 2008). As a result, individuals in a classless society would have equal access

to education, healthcare, employment opportunities, and other essential services, ensuring a level playing field for all. A critical component of this vision is the abolition of private property and the means of production becoming collectively owned, as discussed in the previous section.

In capitalist societies, private ownership allows for the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a select few, contributing to class divisions. In a classless society, the abolition of private property ensures that resources are managed collectively, and wealth and resources are distributed based on the principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." This eliminates the stark disparities in living standards that often result from the unequal distribution of wealth (Grzymala-Busse & Luong, 2002; Mevius, 2009; Storch, 2007; Yeh, 2023). The principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" represents an embodiment of the commitment to social equality within communism. It signifies that each individual's contributions to society should be valued based on their capacities and efforts, while the allocation of resources and goods should be based on the imperative of need rather than individual accumulation. This principle reflects a profound shift from the capitalist ethos, which emphasizes self-interest, competition, and individual accumulation.

Furthermore, the vision of a classless society carries significant political implications. The eradication of social and economic classes necessitates a profound reconfiguration of political structures and systems. In a classless society, the traditional power structures, often perceived as serving the interests of the bourgeoisie, would be transformed to ensure that political decisions are made for the common good rather than the benefit of a privileged few (Miliband & Lieberman, 1984; Priestland, 2009, 2016; Weigand, 2002). This could involve the transition from representative democracy to more direct and participatory forms of governance, where every individual has a say in the decision-making process. Cultural and ideological transformations are also integral to the establishment of a classless society. Communism seeks to challenge and reshape the dominant cultural narratives and ideologies that perpetuate class divisions. This may involve the re-evaluation of societal values, the promotion of a sense of community and solidarity, and the eradication of cultural norms and practices that contribute to inequality.

In essence, the construction of a classless society extends beyond the economic realm, encompassing a comprehensive remaking of the societal fabric (Czarnota, Krygier, & Sadurski, 2005; Palmer, 2003; Rév, 2005; Todorova, 2010). Despite the profound appeal of the classless society concept within communism, it has not been without its share of critiques and challenges. Critics often raise concerns about the feasibility and practicality of achieving such a utopian vision. They argue that human nature is inherently self-interested, and that the elimination of social and economic classes may lead to a lack of incentive for individuals to work hard, innovate, or take on challenging tasks. This, they contend, could result in economic stagnation and inefficiency. Moreover, critics question the potential for the centralized planning and decision-making that often accompanies the transition to a classless society.

They argue that such systems can be bureaucratic and prone to inefficiency, as they may lack the feedback mechanisms inherent in market economies. The absence of competi-

tion and the profit motive, according to these critics, can deter innovation and economic dynamism (Botman, 1988; Daniels, 2008; Fowkes, 1993; McVey, 2019). Proponents of communism, on the other hand, maintain that the challenges of achieving a classless society do not invalidate the ideals and aspirations that underpin the concept. They argue that, while practical challenges exist, the pursuit of social equality, justice, and the abolition of class distinctions is a worthy endeavor that can be facilitated through sound planning and decision-making processes. They emphasize that the transition to a classless society represents a long-term and dynamic process, necessitating adaptability and continuous improvement. It is crucial to acknowledge that the concept of a classless society is not solely a theoretical or abstract ideal. It has been a driving force behind political and social movements, as well as the formation of communist and socialist states in the 20th century (Gornick, 2020; Holmes, 2006; S. Smith, 2018; Turner, 2018).

Several countries, notably the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba, claimed to be implementing communist principles, although their interpretations and implementations varied. These experiences have been a subject of intense debate and criticism. Critics argue that, in practice, communist states often exhibited significant departures from the ideals of a classless society, with issues such as centralized control, authoritarianism, and violations of human rights. These regimes have faced significant challenges in achieving the complex transformations and adjustments required to establish a classless society (Boswell, 1998; P. J. Duncan, 2002; Elster, 1996; S. G. McFarland, Ageyev, & Djintcharadze, 1996). In the wake of the challenges and shortcomings associated with historical attempts at communism, contemporary discussions often seek to reevaluate and adapt the ideals of a classless society to the changing dynamics of the 21st century. These discussions emphasize the need for a more nuanced and flexible approach, recognizing that the pursuit of social equality and the elimination of class distinctions are enduring aspirations that remain relevant in addressing contemporary challenges such as economic inequality and social injustice. The concept of a classless society lies at the heart of communism, representing a profound reimagining of socio-economic and political structures (Glazer, 1961; Knox, 2004; Millar & Wolchik, 1994; Vladisavljevic, 2008).

It embodies the aspiration to eliminate social and economic classes, fostering a state of egalitarianism where every individual is considered equal. This vision extends beyond economic redistribution and encompasses a reconfiguration of political, cultural, and ideological dimensions. It seeks to redress the inequalities inherent in the capitalist system and foster a society where privilege and power are not determined by socio-economic background. Critics raise concerns about the feasibility and incentives of such a system, arguing that the elimination of class distinctions may deter individual initiative and economic dynamism. However, proponents contend that the pursuit of social equality and the elimination of class distinctions are ideals that remain relevant, despite practical challenges. The concept of a classless society has been a source of inspiration and a catalyst for social and political movements, as well as a subject of intense debate and critique, shaping discussions about the possibilities and limitations of alternative societal frameworks (Janos, 1991; Kornai, 1992; Pierson, 1995; Županov, 1996). As the world continues to grapple with issues of economic inequality and social injustice, the ideals of a classless society endure as a beacon of social justice and equity.

5. Common Ownership in Communism: Re-imagining Resources and Re-defining Society

The principle of common ownership of goods constitutes a fundamental pillar of communism, embodying a paradigmatic shift away from the prevailing socio-economic systems, particularly capitalism. In a communist framework, goods and services are produced for the collective benefit of all members of society and distributed based on the principle of need, rather than individual wealth or ownership. This principle of common ownership fundamentally challenges the concept of private property as it is traditionally understood, seeking to redefine the relationship between individuals and the resources they require for their well-being (Berlin, 2004; Klehr, Haynes, & Anderson, 2008; Penn, 2005; Schwartzman, 2021). The driving force behind the concept of common ownership is the deep-rooted critique that communism directs towards capitalism. In the eyes of communists, the capitalist system is predicated on the private ownership of productive assets, which often leads to stark inequalities.

Capitalist economies are characterized by private property rights, allowing individuals and entities to own, control, and profit from resources such as land, factories, and natural resources. The distribution of goods and services is largely determined by market mechanisms, including the principles of supply and demand, as well as the ability to pay. The concept of common ownership emerges as a response to the inequalities inherent in the capitalist order. Communism seeks to eliminate the entrenched division between those who own and control productive assets (the bourgeoisie) and those who must work for wages (the proletariat). Common ownership implies that resources are held collectively, and the production and distribution of goods and services are driven by considerations of collective need and social priorities (Arnaud & Riordan, 2013; Hammen, 1953; Payne, 2008; Riordan, 1991). In a classless society as envisaged by communism, the distinctions between private property and personal property undergo a profound re-evaluation.

Personal property, which consists of items and possessions for individual use, is typically distinguished from private property, which encompasses productive assets and resources used for profit. Common ownership entails the abolition of private property in the traditional sense, where a select few control and profit from productive resources. Instead, the means of production are collectively owned, and wealth accumulation as a result of this ownership is discouraged. Under common ownership, the production of goods and services is undertaken with the well-being of the entire community in mind (Abrams, 2004; Fischer, 2017; Nunberg, 1999; Tismaneanu, 2003). This stands in stark contrast to capitalist systems, where the pursuit of profit is often the primary driver of economic activity. In communism, economic planning is oriented towards satisfying the needs of the populace, as determined collectively.

This focus on collective well-being is encapsulated in the principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," where individual contributions to society are valued based on their capacities, and the distribution of resources is predicated on the imperative of need rather than individual accumulation. The practical implications of common ownership extend beyond mere economic relations. They en-

compass a comprehensive reconfiguration of socio-economic structures, as well as political, cultural, and ideological dimensions (Budenz, 2018; Darlington, 2013; De Haan et al., 2016; Osgood, 1959). The transition to common ownership is not confined to the economic realm; it involves a profound transformation of the societal fabric, reshaping not only how goods and services are produced and distributed but also how resources and opportunities are accessed. The elimination of private property has significant implications for the relationship between individuals and productive assets. It marks a departure from the capitalist ethos, which upholds private property rights as fundamental to individual liberty and economic self-determination. Under common ownership, the ownership of productive resources is vested in the collective, thereby diffusing economic power and diminishing the potential for a privileged minority to accumulate wealth at the expense of the broader society (Gallagher, 2005; Goldman, 1960; K. Kautsky & Kerridge, 2012; Surtz, 1949).

In practical terms, the transition to common ownership involves the centralization of control over productive assets, such as factories, land, and natural resources. These resources are managed collectively, typically by the community or the state acting on behalf of the people. The stewardship of resources implies that the community, as a whole, has a vested interest in these assets, and they are held in trust for the common good rather than being subject to private control and profit motives. The principle of common ownership has been widely discussed and debated within the context of communism, not only for its potential advantages but also for the challenges it presents (Brada, 1993; Merrill, 2006; Tismaneanu, 2020; Weinberg, 2018). Critics often raise concerns about the efficiency and incentives of a system based on common ownership. They argue that the abolition of private property and the traditional profit motive may deter individual initiative and innovation. Without the prospect of personal wealth accumulation, they contend, individuals may lack the incentive to work hard, take on challenging tasks, or engage in entrepreneurial ventures.

Moreover, critics question the ability of centralized planning and decision-making, often associated with systems based on common ownership, to allocate resources efficiently. They argue that the absence of market feedback mechanisms can result in misallocation of resources, surpluses, and shortages. The lack of competition and the profit motive, as they maintain, may lead to stagnation and a lack of economic dynamism (Bernhard & Kubik, 2016; Bunce & Csanadi, 1993; J. Roberts, 2013; Ulam, 2019). Proponents of communism counter these arguments by emphasizing the potential for alternative incentives within a system based on common ownership. They argue that the pursuit of societal and collective well-being, rather than individual accumulation, can be a powerful motivator for innovation and productivity. In a classless society, they contend, individuals are driven by a sense of community, shared responsibility, and a commitment to social and environmental goals, rather than the pursuit of individual wealth. Furthermore, proponents assert that the potential inefficiencies associated with centralized planning can be mitigated through careful decision-making processes.

They argue that a well-structured planning system, which takes into account the needs and aspirations of the community, can lead to more equitable and efficient resource allocation. In essence, they posit that centralization can be a powerful tool

for achieving the common good and long-term societal objectives. It is crucial to acknowledge that the concept of common ownership has been implemented in various forms and to varying degrees in different iterations of communism. The practical application of common ownership is often influenced by specific historical, cultural, and geopolitical contexts (L. Duncan, 2017; Huynh, 1986; P. C. Roberts, 1970; Van Canh, 2017). Different countries and regions have adopted various models, which can range from state ownership of key industries to communal or decentralized ownership, including worker self-management and cooperative ownership.

One prominent manifestation of common ownership is seen in the state socialism model, where the state acts as the intermediary agent through which resources and means of production are managed on behalf of the people. In such systems, the government assumes control over key industries, agricultural land, and natural resources. The state is responsible for planning, directing production, and distributing goods and services. State socialism has been implemented in several countries during the 20th century, including the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba. Another variation is the concept of worker self-management, where workers collectively manage and control the means of production within their respective enterprises (Browder, 1936; Goldfarb, 1997; Janos, 1996; S. Johnson, Kaufmann, McMillan, & Woodruff, 2000). This model aims to empower workers, reduce hierarchical structures, and democratize economic decision-making. In these systems, the ownership of productive assets is not held by the state but by the workers themselves, ensuring direct input into the decision-making process.

Furthermore, some contemporary interpretations of common ownership incorporate elements of technological innovation, such as blockchain technology, to facilitate decentralized control and management of resources. These developments seek to overcome some of the challenges associated with centralized planning while preserving the principles of common ownership. The concept of common ownership is a foundational principle of communism, representing a profound reimagining of socio-economic structures (Beinin & Lockman, 1998; Fidelis, 2010; Olson, 1995; Wright, 1986). It embodies the aspiration to eliminate social and economic classes, foster a state of egalitarianism where every individual is considered equal, and reconfigure the relationship between individuals and productive assets. The abolition of private property, in the traditional sense, is central to this vision, ensuring that resources are managed collectively and that wealth accumulation is discouraged.

Critics raise concerns about the feasibility and incentives of such a system, arguing that the elimination of private property may deter individual initiative and innovation. Proponents counter these arguments by emphasizing the potential for alternative incentives based on a sense of community, shared responsibility, and a commitment to social and environmental goals. The practical application of common ownership varies among different communist experiments and iterations, influenced by historical and cultural contexts. These experiences have been a subject of intense debate and criticism, shaping discussions about the possibilities and limitations of alternative societal frameworks. As the world grapples with issues of economic inequality and social justice, the ideals of common ownership remain relevant, inspiring ongoing reflections on the possibilities and challenges of alternative economic and social

models (Arnason, 2017; Burawoy, 2000; Hoffman & Neal, 1962; J. H. Kautsky, 1967; Korolczuk & Graff, 2017).

6. Beyond Currency: The Radical Vision of Abolishing Money in Communism

The abolition of money stands as a profound and distinctive feature of communism, representing a radical departure from the prevailing economic systems, notably capitalism. In a communist society, the objective is to eradicate the use of money as the medium of exchange, as economic transactions are restructured around the principles of common ownership and allocation according to need. This departure from the established monetary systems signals a comprehensive reconfiguration of the economic landscape and the foundational principles that underpin economic activity. The driving force behind the abolition of money within communism is the profound critique directed towards capitalist economic structures. Communists contend that capitalism inherently engenders economic disparities and inequities, primarily due to the private ownership of the means of production and the associated profit motive. In capitalist systems, the circulation of money is the lifeblood of the economy, enabling individuals and entities to engage in buying and selling, thereby accumulating wealth and power. Communism posits that this monetary system fosters social divisions and economic hierarchies (Arnason, 2017; Healy, 2015; Mace, 1981; Modelski, 1968; Sandle, 2014).

In capitalist economies, individuals' access to goods and services is often determined by their capacity to pay, which, in turn, is closely linked to their economic standing. Those with significant financial resources have greater purchasing power and can secure access to better quality goods, services, and opportunities, leading to stark inequalities. The abolition of money, as envisioned in communism, represents a response to these perceived injustices and disparities. It aims to reconstruct the economic landscape and reframe the relationship between individuals and economic transactions. Under this system, common ownership of the means of production and the allocation of resources according to need take precedence over market-driven transactions. In a classless society, as envisaged by communism, money becomes obsolete as a medium of exchange. Economic transactions are conducted in a manner that ensures the satisfaction of individual and societal needs without regard for monetary exchange. The principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" encapsulates this vision, highlighting that individuals contribute to society based on their capacities, and the distribution of resources is grounded in the imperative of need rather than individual accumulation.

The abolition of money carries profound implications for the nature of economic transactions and the principles that underlie them. It extends beyond the sphere of monetary policy to encompass the very essence of the economic relationships that shape societies. In such a system, the means of production are collectively owned and managed, with individuals participating in economic activities not as consumers driven by purchasing power but as contributors to the broader social good. One of the central tenets of communism is the transcendence of the profit motive that is intrinsic to capitalism. In a society without money, the acquisition of wealth and the pursuit of self-interest lose their primary roles in guiding economic be-

haviour. Instead, the focus shifts towards the satisfaction of collective needs and the well-being of all members of society (Hardt, 2010; Lansford, 2008; Lawrance, 2002; Pipes & Wilson, 2001). Economic activities are driven by a sense of community and shared responsibility rather than by the pursuit of individual gain. Furthermore, the abolition of money entails a reconfiguration of resource allocation and distribution. In capitalist systems, resources are typically allocated according to the price mechanism, which is determined by supply and demand dynamics. Individuals and entities allocate resources based on their capacity to pay, with higher prices often leading to increased access to resources.

In a moneyless system, the allocation of resources is based on societal needs and priorities, rather than on market forces. In practical terms, this reconfiguration means that goods and services are produced and distributed based on the imperative of need rather than individual wealth. Those goods and services that are vital for human well-being, such as food, housing, healthcare, and education, are provided without cost and in accordance with need. This transformation seeks to ensure that every member of society has equal access to the essentials of life, irrespective of their economic standing. The elimination of money, however, is not merely a matter of economic policy; it extends to the realms of politics, culture, and ideology. In such a society, the prevalent values and norms that underpin the capitalist ethos are reevaluated and reshaped. The emphasis shifts from the pursuit of individual accumulation and self-interest to the promotion of community, shared responsibility, and social well-being.

The reconfiguration of cultural narratives and ideologies is integral to the construction of a society that operates without the guiding principles of money. It is essential to recognize that the concept of the abolition of money is not just an abstract or theoretical idea. It has been the driving force behind political and social movements, as well as the formation of communist and socialist states in the 20th century. Several countries, such as the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba, claimed to be implementing communist principles, although their interpretations and implementations varied. These practical attempts to abolish money and transition to moneyless systems have been the subject of intense debate and criticism (Healy, 2015; Lipset & Bence, 1994; S. A. Resnick & Wolff, 2013; Wydra, 2007). Critics often raise concerns about the feasibility and practicality of such a transformation, arguing that the elimination of money may deter individual initiative and innovation. They contend that monetary exchange, in its capacity to incentivize economic activity, provides a mechanism for individuals to work hard, take on challenging tasks, and engage in entrepreneurial ventures.

Moreover, critics question the potential for centralized planning and decision-making, often associated with systems that abolish money, to allocate resources efficiently. They argue that the absence of market feedback mechanisms can result in resource misallocation, surpluses, and shortages. The lack of competition and the profit motive, they argue, may lead to stagnation and a lack of economic dynamism. Proponents of communism, however, counter these criticisms by emphasizing the potential for alternative incentives within a moneyless system. They argue that the pursuit of societal and collective well-being, rather than individual accumulation, can be a powerful motivator for innovation and productivity. In a classless socie-

ty, they contend, individuals are driven by a sense of community, shared responsibility, and a commitment to social and environmental goals, rather than the pursuit of individual wealth (Chen & Galenson, 1970; Fagan, 2012; Frye, 2010; Pipes & Wilson, 2001). Furthermore, proponents assert that the potential inefficiencies associated with centralized planning can be mitigated through careful decision-making processes. They argue that a well-structured planning system, which takes into account the needs and aspirations of the community, can lead to more equitable and efficient resource allocation. In essence, they posit that centralization can be a powerful tool for achieving the common good and long-term societal objectives.

The practical implementation of the abolition of money varies among different communist experiments and iterations, reflecting the historical and cultural contexts in which they occur. Different models have emerged, including state socialism, worker self-management, and communal or decentralized ownership. One prominent manifestation of the abolition of money is observed in state socialism, where the state acts as the intermediary agent through which resources and means of production are managed on behalf of the people. In these systems, the government assumes control over key industries, agricultural land, and natural resources. The state is responsible for planning, directing production, and distributing goods and services, which are provided to individuals without monetary exchange. Worker self-management represents another variation, emphasizing the direct control and decision-making power of the labor force. In such systems, workers collectively manage and control the means of production within their respective enterprises. This model aims to empower workers, reduce hierarchical structures, and democratize economic decision-making, fostering a sense of community and shared responsibility.

Additionally, some contemporary interpretations of the abolition of money incorporate elements of technological innovation, such as blockchain technology, to facilitate decentralized control and management of resources. These developments seek to overcome some of the challenges associated with centralized planning while preserving the principles of common ownership. The concept of the abolition of money represents a fundamental departure from prevailing economic systems and embodies a comprehensive reconfiguration of socio-economic relations (Bideleux, 2014; A. Brown, 2013; S. A. Resnick & Wolff, 2013; Szelényi, 2017). It seeks to eliminate the use of money as a medium of exchange, replacing it with economic transactions grounded in common ownership and allocation according to need. The abolition of money reflects a profound re-evaluation of the guiding principles that shape economic relationships, emphasizing the eradication of the profit motive, the reconfiguration of resource allocation, and a shift in cultural narratives and ideologies. Critics raise concerns about the feasibility and incentives of such a transformation, contending that the elimination of money may deter individual initiative and innovation.

Proponents counter these arguments by emphasizing the potential for alternative incentives rooted in a sense of community, shared responsibility, and a commitment to social and environmental goals. The practical application of the abolition of money varies among different communist experiments and iterations, influenced by historical and cultural contexts. These experiences have been a subject of intense debate and criticism, shaping discussions about the possibilities and limitations of

alternative societal frameworks. As the world grapples with issues of economic inequality and social justice, the ideals of the abolition of money endure as a beacon of social justice and equity, inspiring ongoing reflections on the possibilities and challenges of alternative economic and social models.

7. Withering Away of the State: Communism's Vision for Stateless Society

The concept of the “withering away of the state” is a foundational tenet of communist theory, representing a visionary and utopian ideal for the long-term evolution of society. In the communist framework, it is envisaged that the state, as an institution that wields authority and power, will gradually diminish in significance and eventually cease to exist as social and economic relations become more harmonious and class distinctions disappear. This idea has profound implications for how communism perceives the role of the state, the nature of governance, and the path to achieving a classless society. The notion of the state withering away is deeply rooted in the critical analysis that communism directs towards existing socio-economic systems, particularly capitalism. Communists argue that the state, in capitalist societies, plays a pivotal role in upholding the status quo, perpetuating class divisions, and safeguarding the interests of the capitalist class (A. Brown, 2013; March, 2013; B. I. Schwartz, 1968, 1979).

They contend that the state, in its various forms, such as government, law enforcement, and the military, functions to protect the property rights and economic privilege of the bourgeoisie at the expense of the proletariat. To understand the concept of the “withering away of the state,” it is essential to delve into the Marxist perspective, which forms the foundation of much communist thought. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, in their writings, notably “The Communist Manifesto” (1848) and “Critique of the Gotha Program” (1875), envisioned a historical process that would lead to the transcendence of class divisions and the establishment of a classless society. In their view, this transformation would culminate in the state losing its necessity and fading into irrelevance. Marx and Engels argued that the state was a product of class struggle, emerging as a tool of the ruling class to maintain its dominance and protect its property rights. The state apparatus, including the government, legal system, and military, was seen as an instrument of coercion and control.

It served to mediate conflicts between classes and, more often than not, upheld the interests of the bourgeoisie. According to Marx, as class struggle intensified and the contradictions of capitalism became more apparent, a revolutionary transformation would occur. In this transitional phase, often referred to as the “dictatorship of the proletariat,” the working class would seize control of the state apparatus to safeguard its interests, abolish private property, and initiate the transition to a classless society. However, this transitional phase was not meant to be permanent. The ultimate goal, as outlined in the communist vision, was the creation of a society where class distinctions and the need for a state had disappeared. In the absence of classes and property as sources of conflict, the state would progressively become irrelevant and gradually wither away.

This transition from the dictatorship of the proletariat to a stateless society represented a fundamental reconfiguration of

governance and socio-economic relations. The concept of the “withering away of the state” hinges on several key premises. Firstly, it assumes that the state’s primary function is to manage and mediate conflicts that arise from class divisions and economic disparities. In a classless society, these divisions are expected to dissolve as the means of production become collectively owned, and the distribution of resources is predicated on need rather than individual accumulation. Secondly, it presupposes that the state derives its power and authority from the existence of social and economic classes. The state, in Marxist theory, is seen as an instrument of class rule, reflecting the interests of the dominant class. As class distinctions erode and the interests of the proletariat become the dominant societal concern, the rationale for the existence of a state designed to protect the bourgeoisie diminishes.

Thirdly, the “withering away of the state” assumes that with the decline of class divisions and the establishment of a classless society, the repressive and coercive functions of the state will lose their relevance. The need for policing, enforcement of property rights, and the suppression of dissent, which are hallmarks of a state that upholds class distinctions, would become increasingly obsolete. In essence, the concept of the “withering away of the state” signifies a vision of society in which social and economic relations evolve to such an extent that the state, as a coercive and hierarchical institution, is no longer required. Instead of relying on state authority to regulate human interactions and resolve conflicts, society would be characterized by a high degree of self-governance, cooperation, and collective decision-making. The “withering away of the state” presents several compelling implications for the nature of governance and the ideal of a stateless society. It envisions a society in which individuals and communities take on a more active role in shaping and managing their own affairs (Arnason, 2017; Benjamin & Kautsky, 1968; Harsch, 2013; S. A. Resnick & Wolff, 2013).

Rather than relying on a centralized state apparatus, people would engage in direct participation and decision-making at the local and communal levels. Moreover, the dissolution of the state is linked to the aspiration for the eradication of authoritarianism and hierarchy. In a society where the state has withered away, decision-making processes would become more decentralized and participatory, leading to a flattening of hierarchical structures. This vision aligns with the broader communist objective of achieving a more egalitarian and just society. The concept of the “withering away of the state” is integral to the vision of a stateless society where coercion, domination, and inequality are minimized. In this context, the state’s monopoly on the legitimate use of force and authority is expected to give way to alternative modes of conflict resolution and collective organization. It is essential to acknowledge that the practical application of the “withering away of the state” varies among different iterations of communism. Historical attempts to establish communist states have been marked by significant variations in the interpretation and implementation of this concept.

Some communist regimes have maintained strong centralized states, while others have embraced more decentralized and participatory models. The practical challenges of realizing the “withering away of the state” have been a subject of intense debate and critique. Critics argue that achieving a stateless society is fraught with difficulties, as it necessitates profound trans-

formations in socio-economic and political structures. They contend that the historical attempts at communism, which often involved strong state control and central planning, have deviated from the vision of a stateless society. Furthermore, critics question the feasibility of achieving a society where the state is no longer necessary. They argue that human nature is inherently prone to conflicts and that the state, in some form, is required to manage and resolve these conflicts. The potential for the abuse of power in the absence of a centralized state is also a concern raised by skeptics. Proponents of communism, on the other hand, argue that while achieving a stateless society is a complex and long-term endeavor, it remains an aspirational ideal.

They maintain that the challenges of transitioning to a stateless society do not invalidate the vision of a society where the state’s coercive functions have been replaced by decentralized, participatory decision-making and conflict resolution mechanisms. They emphasize that the state’s role should evolve from one of centralized authority and coercion to one that fosters cooperation, self-governance, and social well-being. The concept of the “withering away of the state” is a central tenet of communism, representing a visionary ideal for the long-term evolution of society. It envisions a society in which social and economic relations become more harmonious, and class distinctions disappear, ultimately rendering the state obsolete. This concept is rooted in the critical analysis of capitalism and the state’s role in upholding class divisions and perpetuating inequality. The “withering away of the state” carries profound implications for the nature of governance, emphasizing the transition from hierarchical and coercive authority to decentralized, participatory decision-making. The realization of a stateless society is a complex and contentious endeavor, with critics and proponents debating the feasibility and desirability of such a transformation. Nonetheless, the vision of a society where the state’s coercive functions have been replaced by collective self-governance and cooperation remains a cornerstone of communist ideology, inspiring ongoing discussions about the possibilities and challenges of alternative societal frameworks.

8. Empowering the Proletariat: The Concept of Workers’ Control in Communist Theory

The concept of workers’ control is a pivotal aspect of communist theory and a fundamental departure from the prevailing socio-economic systems, particularly capitalism. In the communist framework, it is advocated that the working class, or proletariat, should have direct control over the means of production, marking a profound shift from the capitalist model where ownership and decision-making are concentrated in the hands of a privileged few. Workers’ control is grounded in the principles of collective decision-making, egalitarianism, and the empowerment of laborers, ultimately aiming to reconfigure the relationship between labor and capital (Arnason, 2017; A. Brown, 2013; Holmes, 2009; Kula, 2005). The central tenet of workers’ control is rooted in the critical analysis that communism directs towards capitalism. Communists argue that capitalism is characterized by a fundamental imbalance of power and wealth, with the bourgeoisie, or capitalist class, controlling the means of production and exploiting the labour of the working class. This exploitation takes the form of wage labour, where workers exchange their labour for a wage, while the

surplus value generated by their labor is appropriated by the capitalists. Workers' control is seen as a means to rectify this imbalance by providing the working class with a direct role in shaping the economic processes that govern their lives. In the capitalist system, decisions about production, distribution, resource allocation, and the organization of work are typically made by capitalist owners and managers, who prioritize profit maximization. Workers, in contrast, are often excluded from these decision-making processes, relegated to executing tasks determined by those in positions of power. Under the principles of workers' control, the working class is empowered to collectively manage and make decisions about the means of production. The core idea is that those who directly engage in the production process should have a say in how it is organized, what is produced, and how resources are allocated. This shift represents a transformation in the power dynamics of the workplace, from one where capital dictates terms to one where labour plays a central role in shaping economic decisions (Dean, 2020; James, 1879; J. H. Kautsky, 1967; Pipes & Wilson, 2001).

Workers' control extends beyond a mere redistribution of decision-making power; it also entails a reconfiguration of ownership. In the traditional capitalist system, the means of production, such as factories, land, and natural resources, are privately owned and controlled by capitalist owners. Workers' control challenges this model by advocating for collective ownership and management of these productive assets. The ownership and control of productive resources under workers' control can take various forms. In some cases, it involves the establishment of worker cooperatives, where the workers themselves collectively own and manage the enterprise. In this model, decisions about production, distribution, and resource allocation are made democratically by the worker-owners, ensuring that the interests of labour are paramount. Another manifestation of workers' control can be observed in state socialism, where the state acts as the intermediary agent through which resources and means of production are managed on behalf of the people, particularly the working class.

In such systems, the government assumes control over key industries, agricultural land, and natural resources. The state is responsible for planning, directing production, and distributing goods and services in accordance with societal needs and priorities. The practical implications of workers' control are extensive and encompass economic, political, and social dimensions. Economically, it implies a shift from profit-oriented production to production driven by considerations of societal well-being and equity. The allocation of resources and the organization of work are oriented towards satisfying the needs of the populace, rather than maximizing the profits of a select few. Politically, workers' control challenges the prevailing systems of governance, which often prioritize the interests of capital (Bideleux, 2014; Harsch, 2013; White, 1974, 2002). It calls for a more participatory and democratic approach to decision-making in economic matters. The concentration of economic power in the hands of the bourgeoisie is questioned, and the need for a more egalitarian and just distribution of decision-making power is emphasized.

Socially, workers' control fosters a sense of empowerment and engagement among the labor force. It encourages active participation in the workplace, promoting a sense of ownership and responsibility for the outcomes of production. This can lead to a more cohesive and engaged workforce, with a strong-

er sense of collective identity and solidarity. One of the core premises of workers' control is the idea that the working class is best positioned to understand the needs and priorities of the production process. Workers, through their direct engagement with the tasks and challenges of production, possess valuable knowledge and insights that can inform decision-making. This contrasts with the capitalist model, where decisions are often made by owners and managers who may have limited understanding of the day-to-day realities of work. Workers' control is rooted in the belief that workers should be active participants in shaping the economic processes that govern their lives. It is seen as a means of breaking free from the exploitative dynamics of wage labour, where laborers are alienated from the products of their work and from the decision-making processes that govern their labour.

The concept of workers' control has been a source of inspiration and a catalyst for social and political movements. Throughout history, workers' movements, labour unions, and socialist organizations have advocated for increased control over the workplace. The struggles for workers' control have been integral to the broader labor movement and the fight for workers' rights (Alexander, 1957; Black, 2015; Healy, 2015; S. McFarland, 1998). However, the practical implementation of workers' control has varied across different historical and cultural contexts. The extent to which workers have been able to assert control over the means of production has depended on a multitude of factors, including the political climate, the strength of labour movements, and the specific goals and strategies of workers' organizations. Workers' control has also been a subject of debate and critique. Critics argue that collective decision-making in the workplace may lead to inefficiencies and challenges in resource allocation. They question whether workers, in their role as decision-makers, would be equipped to make rational economic choices. Additionally, they raise concerns about the potential for power struggles and conflicts in decision-making processes, which may impede productivity and effectiveness. Proponents, on the other hand, argue that the challenges associated with workers' control can be addressed through proper organizational structures and mechanisms.

They contend that democratic decision-making processes can lead to more equitable and efficient resource allocation. Furthermore, they emphasize the potential for workers' control to foster a sense of ownership, engagement, and responsibility in the workplace, which can enhance productivity and worker satisfaction. The concept of workers' control is also closely linked to the broader idea of self-management, where individuals and communities take on a more active role in shaping and managing their own affairs. Self-management extends beyond the workplace and encompasses the principles of collective decision-making and self-governance in various aspects of life. It is considered a central tenet of socialism and communism, emphasizing the need for a more participatory and egalitarian society. Workers' control is a fundamental aspect of communist theory, representing a visionary departure from the prevailing capitalist model. It advocates for the working class's direct control over the means of production, challenging the concentration of economic power in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Workers' control emphasizes collective decision-making, egalitarianism, and the empowerment of laborers, ultimately reconfiguring the relationship between labour and capital (James, 1879; Nancy, 2010; Overstreet & Windmiller, 2022;

Rakowska-Harmstone, 1984; Sakwa, 2010). This concept is deeply rooted in the critique of capitalism and the exploitation of wage labor, emphasizing the need for a more equitable and just distribution of decision-making power in economic matters. Workers' control carries implications for economic, political, and social dimensions, fostering a shift towards production driven by societal well-being and a more participatory and democratic approach to decision-making. The practical implementation of workers' control has varied across different historical and cultural contexts, with challenges and critiques related to resource allocation and decision-making processes. Proponents argue that these challenges can be addressed through proper organizational structures and mechanisms, highlighting the potential for workers' control to empower laborers and enhance their engagement and responsibility in the workplace. Workers' control represents a vision of a society where the working class plays a central role in shaping economic decisions, leading to a more equitable and just socio-economic system. It remains an aspirational ideal that continues to inspire discussions about alternative societal frameworks and the possibilities for a more egalitarian and participatory future (A. Brown, 2013; Lansford, 2008; March, 2013; Pipes & Wilson, 2001; Sandle, 2014).

9. Conclusion

Communism, as explored comprehensively throughout this research paper, stands as a complex and multifaceted ideology that has left an indelible mark on the course of human history. Rooted in a critical analysis of capitalism and its inherent injustices, communism has offered an alternative vision of socio-economic organization and governance that has inspired countless debates, movements, and revolutions. From its foundational principles of collective ownership, the abolition of money, the aspiration for a classless society, common ownership of goods, the state's withering away, and workers' control, communism presents a reimagining of society, politics, and economics that challenges conventional norms and systems. Collective ownership, a core principle of communism, envisions the means of production held collectively by the community or the state, abolishing the concept of private property.

This departure from capitalist norms represents a profound shift in the ownership and control of productive assets, with resources directed toward the common good. The abolition of money, another hallmark of communism, reconfigures economic relationships by eliminating the role of money as a medium of exchange and profit as a central motivator. Instead, economic transactions are grounded in common ownership and allocation according to need, challenging the very essence of economic systems. Communism's ambition extends beyond economics to its quest for a classless society, where social and economic divisions have dissolved, and all individuals are considered equal. This aspiration challenges hierarchical structures and seeks a more egalitarian and just socio-economic order. Furthermore, the principle of common ownership of goods redefines the relationship between individuals and resources, emphasizing community, shared responsibility, and collective well-being. The "withering away of the state" represents a long-term vision within communism where the state gradually loses

significance and authority as social and economic relations become more harmonious, and class distinctions gradually disappear. This vision represents a fundamental reconfiguration of governance and socio-economic relations, moving away from centralized authority. Workers' control, a pivotal principle of communism, advocates for the working class to have direct control over the means of production. Under this framework, decisions about production, distribution, and resource allocation are made collectively by the working class. This shift reconfigures the traditional capitalist model, where ownership and decision-making are concentrated in the hands of a privileged few.

While the principles of communism provide a visionary blueprint for socio-economic organization, their practical application has varied across different historical and cultural contexts. Real-world experiments with communism have led to diverse interpretations and implementations, from state socialism to worker self-management and the incorporation of technological innovations like blockchain technology. Throughout history, communism has inspired social and political movements, challenging existing systems and advocating for workers' rights, collective ownership, and social justice. Its enduring relevance lies in its critique of capitalism and the inequalities it generates, as well as its ambition to create more just and equitable societies. Despite its enduring appeal, communism is not without its critics and challenges. Detractors raise concerns about the feasibility and desirability of the principles espoused by communism. Questions about individual incentives, resource allocation, and the potential for abuse of power have been central to these critiques. Proponents, in turn, argue that communism offers alternative motivations, the potential for more equitable resource allocation, and the empowerment of the working class. Communism remains a dynamic and influential ideology that has shaped the course of history and continues to provoke discussions about alternative socio-economic models. Its principles challenge the status quo, advocating for more equitable resource distribution, social justice, and the empowerment of the working class. The ideals of communism resonate with those seeking solutions to issues of economic inequality, social injustice, and environmental sustainability.

This research paper has provided a comprehensive exploration of the principles that underlie communism, offering insights into their historical roots, manifestations, practical applications, and the ongoing debates surrounding their feasibility and desirability. While communism has faced challenges and variations in its implementation, it remains a powerful force in shaping socio-economic thought and political action. As societies grapple with issues of inequality, climate change, and social justice, the ideals of communism endure as a beacon of social justice and equity, inspiring ongoing reflections on the possibilities and challenges of alternative economic and social models. In a world marked by persistent disparities, the principles of communism continue to offer a vision of a more just and equitable future, where collective well-being takes precedence over individual accumulation, and the rights of the working class are affirmed. The enduring relevance of communism lies in its ability to spark discourse, inspire movements, and challenge established norms, making it a dynamic and ever-evolving force in the political and economic landscape.

Funding Information:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Disclosure Statement:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Competing Interest:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Data Availability Statement:

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

References

- Abrams, B. F. (2004). *The struggle for the soul of the nation: Czech culture and the rise of communism*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Alesina, A., & Fuchs-Schündeln, N. (2007). Good-bye Lenin (or not?): The effect of communism on people's preferences. *American Economic Review*, 97(4), 1507-1528.
- Alexander, R. J. (1957). *Communism in Latin America*. Rutgers University Press.
- Ali, T. (2009). The Idea of Communism.
- Almond, G. (2019). Communism and political culture theory. In *Constitutional Democracy* (pp. 217-231): Routledge.
- Almond, G. A. (2015). *Appeals of communism* (Vol. 2109): Princeton University Press.
- Arnason, J. P. (2017). Communism and modernity. In *Multiple modernities* (pp. 61-90): Routledge.
- Arnaud, P., & Riordan, J. (2013). *Sport and international politics: impact of fascism and communism on Sport*: Routledge.
- Aslund, A., & Djankov, S. (2014). *The great rebirth: lessons from the victory of capitalism over communism*. Peterson Institute for International Economics.
- Badiou, A., Balso, J., & Bosteels, B. (2010). *The idea of communism*. Verso Books.
- Bastani, A. (2019). *Fully automated luxury communism*. Verso Books.
- Bauman, Z. (1990). Communism: a post-mortem. *Praxis international*, 10(3+ 4), 185-192.
- Bauwens, M., & Kostakis, V. (2014). From the communism of capital to capital for the commons: Towards an open co-operativism. *tripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society*, 12(1), 356-361.
- Beinín, J., & Lockman, Z. (1998). *Workers on the Nile: nationalism, communism, Islam, and the Egyptian working class, 1882-1954*: American Univ in Cairo Press.
- Beissinger, M. R. (2009). Nationalism and the collapse of Soviet communism. *Contemporary European History*, 18(3), 331-347.
- Benjamin, R. W., & Kautsky, J. H. (1968). Communism and economic development. *American Political Science Review*, 62(1), 110-123.
- Bennigsen, A. A., & Wimbush, S. E. (1980). *Muslim national communism in the Soviet Union: a revolutionary strategy for the colonial world*: University of Chicago Press.
- Berdjaev, N. A. (1966). *The origin of Russian communism*. University of Michigan Press.
- Berlin, I. (2004). *The Soviet mind: Russian culture under communism*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bernhard, M. H., & Kubik, J. (2016). *Twenty years after communism: The politics of memory and commemoration*: Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Bernstein, E., & Stenning, H. (1930). *Cromwell and Communism*: George Allen & Unwin London.
- Bideleux, R. (2014). *Communism and Development (Routledge Revivals)*: Routledge.
- Black, C. E. (2015). *Communism and revolution: the strategic uses of political violence*: Princeton University Press.
- Blackmer, D. L., & Tarrow, S. (2015). *Communism in Italy and France* (Vol. 1405): Princeton University Press.
- Boschini, A., & Olofsgård, A. (2007). Foreign aid: An instrument for fighting communism? *The Journal of Development Studies*, 43(4), 622-648.
- Boswell, L. (1998). *Rural communism in France, 1920-1939*: Cornell University Press.
- Botman, S. (1988). *Rise of Egyptian Communism, 1939-1970*: Syracuse University Press.
- Brada, J. C. (1993). The transformation from Communism to capitalism: how far? how fast? *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 9(2), 87-110.
- Brandt, C., Schwartz, B. I., & Fairbank, J. K. (1952). *A documentary history of Chinese communism*. Harvard University Press.
- Bren, P. (2019). *The greengrocer and his TV: The culture of communism after the 1968 Prague Spring*: Cornell University Press.

- Bren, P., & Neuburger, M. (2012). *Communism unwrapped: Consumption in cold war Eastern Europe*: Oxford University Press.
- Browder, E. (1936). *What is communism?*: Vanguard Press New York.
- Brown, A. (2013). *Communism*.
- Brown, M. E. (2009). *The historiography of communism*: Temple University Press.
- Budenz, L. F. (2018). *The techniques of communism*: Pickle Partners Publishing.
- Bukharin, N., & Preobrazensky, E. (2021). *The ABC of communism* (Vol. 41): Pattern Books.
- Bunce, V., & Csanadi, M. (1993). Uncertainty in the transition: Post-communism in Hungary. *East European Politics and Societies*, 7(2), 240-275.
- Burawoy, M. (2000). Marxism after communism. *Theory and Society*, 29(2), 151-174.
- Burawoy, M. (2001). Neoclassical sociology: from the end of communism to the end of classes. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(4), 1099-1120.
- Burks, R. V. (2015). *Dynamics of Communism in Eastern Europe* (Vol. 2159): Princeton University Press.
- Ceplair, L. (2011). *Anti-communism in twentieth-century America: a critical history*: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Chen, N.-R., & Galenson, W. (1970). The Chinese economy under communism. *The Chinese economy under communism*.
- Chi, H. V. (1964). From Colonialism to Communism. *Cities of God: Politics, Theology & Ethics*, 88.
- Courtois, S. (1999). *The black book of communism: Crimes, terror, repression*: Harvard University Press.
- Czarnota, A., Krygier, M., & Sadurski, W. (2005). *Rethinking the rule of law after communism*: Central European University Press.
- Daniels, R. V. (1962). The nature of communism. *Naval War College Review*, 15(6), 10.
- Daniels, R. V. (2008). *The rise and fall of communism in Russia*: Yale University Press.
- Darlington, R. (2013). *Syndicalism and the transition to communism: An international comparative analysis*: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Davis, J. A. (1975). Communism, conformity, cohorts, and categories: American tolerance in 1954 and 1972-73. *American Journal of Sociology*, 81(3), 491-513.
- De Haan, F., Ghodsee, K., Daskalova, K., Grabowska, M., Lukić, J., Bonfiglioli, C., . . . Ghit, A. (2016). Ten years after: Communism and Feminism revisited. *Aspasia*, 10(1), 102-168.
- Dean, J. (2020). Communism or Neo-feudalism? *New Political Science*, 42(1), 1-17.
- Demaitre, E. (1969). The origins of national communism. *Studies in comparative communism*, 2(1), 1-20.
- Diamond, L., & Plattner, M. F. (2002). *Democracy after communism*: Taylor & Francis.
- Dimitrov, V., Goetz, K. H., & Wollmann, H. (2006). *Governing after communism: Institutions and policymaking*: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ding, X. L. (1994). Institutional amphibiousness and the transition from communism: The case of China. *British Journal of Political Science*, 24(3), 293-318.
- Djankov, S., & Nikolova, E. (2018). Communism as the unhappy coming. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 46(3), 708-721.
- Douzinas, C., & Žižek, S. (2010). The idea of communism.
- Dragadze, T. (2003). The domestication of religion under Soviet communism. In *Socialism* (pp. 188-198): Routledge.
- Drakulic, S. (1992). How we survived communism and even laughed. *Publishers Weekly*, 239(3), 39-40.
- Drakulic, S. (2013). *Café Europa: life after communism*: Hachette UK.
- Draper, T. (2017). *American Communism and Soviet Russia*: Routledge.
- Duncan, L. (2017). An unwanted past: Contemporary tourism and the heritage of communism in Romania. In *The Political Nature of Cultural Heritage and Tourism* (pp. 253-268): Routledge.
- Duncan, P. J. (2002). *Russian messianism: third Rome, revolution, communism and after* (Vol. 1): Routledge.
- Dupont, M. (2009). *Nibilist Communism*: Ardent Press.
- Eberstadt, N. (1994). Demographic shocks after communism: Eastern Germany, 1989-93. *Population and Development Review*, 137-152.
- Eberstadt, N. (2017). *The poverty of communism*: Routledge.
- Elster, J. (1996). *The roundtable talks and the breakdown of communism*: University of Chicago Press.
- Engels, F. (1963). *Principles of Communism*: Monthly Review.
- Engels, F. (2020). *Principles of communism* (Vol. 27): Pattern Books.
- Fagan, G. (2012). *Believing in Russia-religious policy after communism*: Routledge.
- Fidelis, M. (2010). *Women, communism, and industrialization in postwar Poland*: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, R. (2017). *Stalin and German Communism: A Study in the Origins of the State Party*: Routledge.
- Fish Jr, H. (1931). The Menace of Communism. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 156(1), 54-61.
- Fisher, M., & Colquhoun, M. (2020). *Acid communism* (Vol. 13): Pattern Books.
- Fowkes, B. (1984). *Communism in Germany under the Weimar Republic*: Springer.
- Fowkes, B. (1993). *The rise and fall of communism in Eastern Europe*: Springer.
- Frye, T. (2010). *Building states and markets after communism: The perils of polarized democracy*: Cambridge University Press.

- Fuchs-Schündeln, N., & Schündeln, M. (2020). The long-term effects of communism in Eastern Europe. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(2), 172-191.
- Funk, N., & Mueller, M. (2018a). *Gender politics and post-communism: Reflections from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*: Routledge.
- Funk, N., & Mueller, M. (2018b). Introduction: Women and post-communism. In *Gender politics and post-communism* (pp. 1-14): Routledge.
- Furet, F. (1999). *The passing of an illusion: The idea of communism in the twentieth century*: University of Chicago Press.
- Furet, F., & Nolte, E. (2001). *Fascism and communism*: U of Nebraska Press.
- Gallagher, T. G. (2005). *Theft of a nation: Romania since communism*.
- Gerrits, A. (2009). *The myth of Jewish communism: A historical interpretation* (Vol. 16): Peter Lang.
- Gessen, M. (1997). *Dead again: The Russian intelligentsia after communism*: Verso.
- Gill, G. (2003). *Democracy and post-communism: Political change in the post-communist world*: Routledge.
- Gitlow, B. (2017). *I Confess: The Truth About American Communism*: Pickle Partners Publishing.
- Glazer, N. (1961). The social basis of American Communism. *Naval War College Review*, 14(9), 5.
- Golan, G. (1971). *The Czechoslovak Reform Movement: Communism in Crisis 1962-1968* (Vol. 6): CUP Archive.
- Goldfarb, J. C. (1997). Why is there no feminism after communism? *Social Research*, 235-257.
- Goldman, E. (1960). *There is no communism in Russia*: Chadwyck-Healey Incorporated.
- Gornick, V. (2020). *The romance of American communism*: Verso Books.
- Grzymala-Busse, A., & Luong, P. J. (2002). Reconceptualizing the state: lessons from post-communism. *Politics & society*, 30(4), 529-554.
- Hammen, O. J. (1953). The Spectre of Communism in the 1840's. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 404-420.
- Hammond, T. T. (1958). The Origins of National Communism. *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, 34(2), 277-291.
- Hands, J. (2013). Platform communism. *Culture machine*, 14.
- Hardt, M. (2010). The common in communism. *Rethinking Marxism*, 22(3), 346-356.
- Harris, S. E. (2013). *Communism on Tomorrow Street*: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harrison, M. (2012). Communism and economic modernization. *Available at SSRN 2099517*.
- Harsch, D. (2013). Communism and women.
- Hatherley, O. (2016). *Landscapes of communism: A history through buildings*: New Press, The.
- Heale, M. J. (1990). *American anti-communism: combating the enemy within, 1830-1970*: JHU Press.
- Healey, D. (1948). The Cominform and world communism. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 24(3), 339-349.
- Healy, S. (2015). Communism as a mode of life. *Rethinking Marxism*, 27(3), 343-356.
- Henderson, B., & Wilson, M. (1998). Commensal communism and the oral cavity. *Journal of dental research*, 77(9), 1674-1683.
- Hodgson, J. H. (2015). *Communism in Finland: a history and interpretation* (Vol. 2069): Princeton University Press.
- Hoffman, G. W., & Neal, F. W. (1962). *Yugoslavia and the new communism*: Twentieth Century Fund New York.
- Holmes, L. (2006). *Rotten states?: corruption, post-communism, and neoliberalism*: Duke University Press.
- Holmes, L. (2009). *Communism: A very short introduction*: OUP Oxford.
- Hoover, J. E. (2015). *Masters of Deceit: The Story of Communism in America and how to Fight it*: Pickle Partners Publishing.
- Horowitz, I. L. (1972). *Cuban communism*: Transaction Publishers.
- Hupchick, D. (2002). *The Balkans: from Constantinople to communism*: Springer.
- Huỳnh, K. K. (1986). *Vietnamese Communism, 1925-1945*: Cornell University Press.
- James, H. A. (1879). *Communism in America*: H. Holt.
- Janos, A. C. (1991). Social science, communism, and the dynamics of political change. *World Politics*, 44(1), 81-112.
- Janos, A. C. (1996). What was communism: A retrospective in comparative analysis. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 29(1), 1-24.
- Johnson, J. E., & Robinson, J. C. (2006). *Living gender after communism*: Indiana University Press.
- Johnson, S., Kaufmann, D., McMillan, J., & Woodruff, C. (2000). Why do firms hide? Bribes and unofficial activity after communism. *Journal of public economics*, 76(3), 495-520.
- Joravsky, D. (1994). Communism in historical perspective. In: JSTOR.
- Kalyvas, S. N., & Marantzidis, N. (2002). Greek Communism, 1968-2001. *East European Politics and Societies*, 16(3), 665-690.
- Kaminski, B. (2016). The legacy of communism. In *East-Central European economies in transition* (pp. 9-24): Routledge.
- Kamiński, B., & Soltan, K. (1989). The evolution of communism. *International political science review*, 10(4), 371-391.
- Kamp, M. (2011). *The new woman in Uzbekistan: Islam, modernity, and unveiling under communism*: University of Washington Press.
- Kautsky, J. H. (1967). Communism and the Comparative Study of Development. *Slavic Review*, 26(1), 13-17.
- Kautsky, K. (1897). *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*: TF Unwin.

- Kautsky, K., & Kerridge, W. (2012). *Terrorism and communism: A contribution to the natural history of revolution*: Routledge.
- Kemp, W. (1999). *Nationalism and communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union: A basic contradiction*: Springer.
- Khalid, A. (2014). *Islam after communism: religion and politics in Central Asia*: Univ of California Press.
- Klehr, H., Haynes, J. E., & Anderson, K. M. (2008). *The Soviet world of American communism*: Yale University Press.
- Knox, Z. (2004). *Russian society and the Orthodox church: Religion in Russia after communism*: Routledge.
- Kornai, J. (1992). *The socialist system: The political economy of communism*: Princeton University Press.
- Korolczuk, E., & Graff, A. (2017). "Worse than communism and Nazism put together": War on gender in Poland.
- Kowalski, R. (2017). *European Communism: 1848-1991*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Kropotkin, P. (2020). *Anarchist communism*: Penguin UK.
- Krygier, M. (1990). Marxism and the Rule of Law: Reflections after the Collapse of Communism. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 15(4), 633-663.
- Kula, M. (2005). Communism as religion. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 6(3), 371-381.
- Kuromiya, H. (2001). communism and Terror. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 36(1), 191-201.
- Lansford, T. (2008). *Communism*: Marshall Cavendish.
- Laski, H. J. (2014). *Communism (Works of Harold J. Laski)*: Routledge.
- Lawrance, A. (2002). *China under communism*: Routledge.
- Lee, R. B. (1990). Primitive communism and the origin of social inequality. In: Cambridge University Press.
- Lefort, C. (2007). *Complications: communism and the dilemmas of democracy*: Columbia University Press.
- Lenin, V. I. i. (1999). "Left-wing" communism: an infantile disorder. Resistance Books.
- Levine, A. (1993). *The general will: Rousseau, Marx, communism*: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, B. (1954). Communism and Islam. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 30(1), 1-12.
- Lewy, G. (1990). *The cause that failed: Communism in American political life*: Oxford University Press.
- Lieberman, R. (1989). *My song is my weapon: people's songs, American Communism, and the politics of culture, 1930-1950*: University of Illinois Press.
- Lipset, S. M., & Bence, G. (1994). Anticipations of the Failure of Communism. *Theory and Society*, 169-210.
- Liu, X. (2004). *Frontier Passages: Ethnopolitics and the Rise of Chinese Communism, 1921-1945*: Stanford University Press.
- Mace, J. E. (1981). *Communism and the Dilemmas of National Liberation: National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918-1933*: University of Michigan.
- Maier, C. S. (1999). *Dissolution: The crisis of communism and the end of East Germany*: Princeton University Press.
- Major, P. (1998). *The Death of the KPD: Communism and Anti-Communism in West Germany, 1945-1956*: Clarendon Press.
- Mälksoo, M. (2014). Criminalizing communism: Transnational mnemopolitics in Europe. *International political sociology*, 8(1), 82-99.
- Malle, S. (2002). *The economic organization of War Communism 1918-1921*: Cambridge University Press.
- Malm, A. (2020). *Corona, climate, chronic emergency: War communism in the twenty-first century*: Verso Books.
- March, L. (2013). Communism. In *Routledge handbook of Russian politics and society* (pp. 129-139): Routledge.
- Mason, E. S. (1929). Blanqui and Communism. *Political Science Quarterly*, 44(4), 498-527.
- Matthews, M. (2013). *Privilege in the Soviet Union (Routledge Revivals): A Study of Elite Life-Styles under Communism*: Routledge.
- Mattick Jr, P. (2017). *Anti-Bolshevik Communism*: Routledge.
- Mazurski, K. R. (1991). *Communism and the Environment*. Paper presented at the Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy.
- McFarland, S. (1998). Communism as religion. *The international journal for the psychology of religion*, 8(1), 33-48.
- McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V. S., & Djintcharadze, N. (1996). Russian authoritarianism two years after communism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(2), 210-217.
- McHale, S. F. (2008). *Print and power: Confucianism, Communism, and Buddhism in the making of modern Vietnam*: University of Hawaii Press.
- McLellan, J. (2011). *Love in the Time of Communism: Intimacy and Sexuality in the GDR*: Cambridge University Press.
- McVey, R. T. (2019). *The rise of Indonesian communism*: Cornell University Press.
- Menon, D. (1994). Caste, nationalism and communism in South India. *Cambridge: Cambridge UP*.
- Merrill, D. (2006). The Truman doctrine: containing communism and modernity. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36(1), 27-37.
- Mevius, M. (2009). Reappraising communism and nationalism. *Nationalities Papers*, 37(4), 377-400.
- Miliband, R., & Liebman, M. (1984). Reflections on anti-communism. *Socialist register*, 21.
- Millar, J. R., & Wolchik, S. L. (1994). *The social legacy of communism*: Cambridge University Press.
- Minxin, P., & Pei, M. (2009). *From reform to revolution: The demise of communism in China and the Soviet Union*: Harvard University Press.
- Miranda, J. P. (2004). *Communism in the Bible*: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Modelski, G. (1968). Communism and the Globalization of Politics. *International Studies Quarterly*, 12(4), 380-393.

- Mortimer, R. (2006). *Indonesian communism under Sukarno: Ideology and politics, 1959-1965*: Equinox Publishing.
- Nancy, J.-L. (1992). La comparution/le compearance: from the existence of “Communism” to the community of “Existence”. *Political theory*, 20(3), 371-398.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2010). *Communism, the word*: na.
- Newell, A., & Reilly, B. (2001). The gender pay gap in the transition from communism: some empirical evidence. *Economic Systems*, 25(4), 287-304.
- Nossiter, T. J. (1982). *Communism in Kerala: A study in political adaptation*: Univ of California Press.
- Nunberg, B. (1999). *The state after communism: administrative transitions in Central and Eastern Europe*: World Bank Publications.
- O’Neil, P. H. (2014). *Post-communism and the Media in Eastern Europe*: Routledge.
- Ollman, B. (1977). Marx's Vision of communism a reconstruction. *Critique: Journal of Socialist Theory*, 8(1), 4-41.
- Olson, M. (1995). Why the transition from communism is so difficult. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 21(4), 437-461.
- Osgood, C. E. (1959). Suggestions for winning the real war with communism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3(4), 295-325.
- Ost, D. (2015). Class after communism: Introduction to the special issue. In (Vol. 29, pp. 543-564): SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- Overstreet, G. D., & Windmiller, M. (2022). *Communism in India*: Univ of California Press.
- Palmer, B. D. (2003). Rethinking the historiography of United States communism. *American Communist History*, 2(2), 139-173.
- Payne, S. G. (2000). Fascism and communism. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 1(3), 1-15.
- Payne, S. G. (2008). *the Spanish civil War, the Soviet Union, and communism*: Yale University Press.
- Penn, S. (2005). *Solidarity's secret: the women who defeated communism in Poland*: University of Michigan Press.
- Pierson, C. (1995). *Socialism after communism: The new market socialism*: Penn State Press.
- Pipes, R. (1964). *The formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and nationalism, 1917–1923* (Vol. 13): Harvard University Press.
- Pipes, R., & Wilson, G. (2001). *Communism*: Phoenix.
- Podhoretz, N. (1976). Making the world safe for communism. *Quadrant*, 20(7), 40-50.
- Pons, S. (2014). *The global revolution: A history of international communism 1917-1991*: OUP Oxford.
- Priestland, D. (2009). *The Red Flag: Communism and the making of the modern world*: Penguin UK.
- Priestland, D. (2016). *The red flag: A history of communism*: Open Road+ Grove/Atlantic.
- Pye, L. W. (2015). *Guerilla Communism in Malaya* (Vol. 2218): Princeton University Press.
- Rakowska-Harmstone, T. (1984). *Communism in eastern Europe* (Vol. 328): Indiana University Press.
- Ray, L. (1997). Post-Communism: postmodernity or modernity revisited? *British Journal of Sociology*, 543-560.
- Resnick, S., & Wolff, R. (1988). Communism: Between class and classless. *Rethinking Marxism*, 1(1), 14-42.
- Resnick, S. A., & Wolff, R. D. (2013). *Class theory and history: Capitalism and communism in the USSR*: Routledge.
- Rév, I. (2005). *Retroactive justice: prehistory of post-communism*: Stanford University Press.
- Ridout, N. (2013). *Passionate amateurs: Theatre, communism and love*: University of Michigan Press.
- Riordan, J. (1991). *Sport, politics, and communism*: Manchester University Press.
- Riordan, J. (2002). The impact of communism on sport. In *The international politics of sport in the twentieth century* (pp. 58-76): Routledge.
- Riordan, J. (2007). The impact of communism on sport. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 110-115.
- Roberts, J. (2013). The two names of communism. *Radical Philosophy*, 177, 9-19.
- Roberts, P. C. (1970). “War communism”: a re-examination. *Slavic Review*, 29(2), 238-261.
- Robinson, N. (1999). Marxism, Communism and Post-Communism. *Marxism and Social Science*, 302-319.
- Roemer, J. E. (1992). Can there be Socialism after Communism? *Politics & society*, 20(3), 261-276.
- Ruud, A. E. (2022). *Poetics of village politics: The making of West Bengal's rural communism*: Taylor & Francis.
- Sakwa, R. (2010). Communism in Russia. In *Communism in Russia* (pp. 124-146): Springer.
- Samuel, R. (2017). *The lost world of British communism*: Verso Books.
- Sandholtz, W., & Taagepera, R. (2005). Corruption, culture, and communism. *International Review of Sociology*, 15(1), 109-131.
- Sandle, M. (2014). *Communism*: Routledge.
- Scalapino, R. A., & Lee, C.-S. (1972). *Communism in Korea: The Society* (Vol. 2): Univ of California Press.
- Schöpflin, G. (1990). The end of communism in Eastern Europe. *International Affairs*, 66(1), 3-16.
- Schöpflin, G. (1991). Post-communism: constructing new democracies in Central Europe. *International Affairs*, 67(2), 235-250.
- Schwartz, B. I. (1968). *Communism and China: ideology in flux*: Harvard University Press.
- Schwartz, B. I. (1979). *Chinese communism and the rise of Mao*: Harvard University Press.
- Schwartz, K. Z. (2006). *Nature and national identity after communism: Globalizing the ethnoscape*: University of Pittsburgh Pre.
- Schwartzman, D. (2021). Solar communism. In *The Routledge Handbook on Ecosocialism* (pp. 280-289): Routledge.
- Shaw, A. (1884). *Icaria, a Chapter in the History of Communism*: GP Putnam's sons.

- Shleifer, A., & Treisman, D. (2005). A normal country: Russia after communism. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(1), 151-174.
- Smith, S. (2018). *A Road is Made: Communism in Shanghai 1920-1927*: Routledge.
- Smith, S. A. (2014). *The Oxford handbook of the history of communism*: OUP Oxford.
- Sotiris, P. (2020). *A philosophy for communism: Rethinking Althusser* (Vol. 211): Brill.
- Sparks, C. (2005). Media theory after the fall of European communism: Why the old models from East and West won't do any more. In *De-Westernizing media studies* (pp. 29-42): Routledge.
- Sparks, C., & Reading, A. (1997). *Communism, capitalism and the mass media*: Sage.
- Starobin, J. R. (1972). *American Communism in Crisis, 1943-1957*: Harvard University Press.
- Stavrakis, P. J. (1989). *Moscow and Greek communism, 1944-1949*: Cornell University Press.
- Storch, R. (2007). *Red Chicago: American communism at its grassroots, 1928-35* (Vol. 331): University of Illinois Press.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1955). *Communism, conformity, and civil liberties: A cross-section of the nation speaks its mind*: Transaction Publishers.
- Surtz, E. L. (1949). Thomas More and Communism. *PMLA*, 64(3), 549-564.
- Szacki, J. (1995). *Liberalism After Communism: The Implications of the 1993 Elections to the Federal Assembly*: Central European University Press.
- Szelényi, I. (2017). Capitalism after communism. In *Twenty-five sides of a post-communist mafia state* (pp. 637-649): Central European University Press.
- Taborsky, E. (2015). *Communism in Czechoslovakia, 1948-1960* (Vol. 2158): Princeton University Press.
- Thomas, D. C. (2001). *The Helsinki effect: International norms, human rights, and the demise of communism*: Princeton University Press.
- Tiersky, R. (1974). *French Communism, 1920-1972*: Columbia University Press.
- Tismaneanu, V. (2003). *Stalinism for all seasons: a political history of Romanian communism* (Vol. 11): Univ of California Press.
- Tismaneanu, V. (2012). *The devil in history: Communism, fascism, and some lessons of the twentieth century*: Univ of California Press.
- Tismaneanu, V. (2020). The tragicomedy of Romanian communism. In *Crisis and Reform in Eastern Europe* (pp. 121-174): Routledge.
- Todorov, V. (1991). Introduction to the political aesthetics of communism.
- Todorova, M. (2010). Remembering Communism. *Genres of Representation*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Tucker, R. C. (1967). On the comparative study of communism. *World Politics*, 19(2), 242-257.
- Turner, V. W. (2018). *The roots of American communism*: Routledge.
- Turnock, D. (2003). *The East European economy in context: communism and transition*: Routledge.
- Ulam, A. B. (1998). *The Bolsheviks: The Intellectual and Political History of the Triumph of Communism in Russia, With a New Preface by the Author*: Harvard University Press.
- Ulam, A. B. (2019). *The Unfinished Revolution: Marxism And Communism In The Modern World--revised Edition*: Routledge.
- Van Canh, N. (2017). *Vietnam under communism, 1975-1982*: Hoover Press.
- Van den Berghe, P. L., & Peter, K. (1988). Hutterites and kibbutzniks: A tale of nepotistic communism. *Man*, 522-539.
- Van der Linden, M. (2004). On Council Communism. *Historical Materialism: research in critical Marxist theory*, 12(4), 27-50.
- Van der Veen, R. J., & Van Parijs, P. (1986). A capitalist road to communism. *Theory and Society*, 635-655.
- Van der Veen, R. J., & Van Parijs, P. (2006). A capitalist road to communism. *Basic Income Studies*, 1(1).
- Vattimo, G., & Zabala, S. (2011). *Hermeneutic communism: from Heidegger to Marx*: Columbia University Press.
- Vladislavjevic, N. (2008). *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*: Springer.
- Vogel, E. F. (1980). *Canton under communism: Programs and politics in a provincial capital, 1949-1968*: Harvard University Press.
- Wank, D. L. (1999). *Commodifying communism: Business, trust, and politics in a Chinese city* (Vol. 14): Cambridge University Press.
- Webb, S., & Webb, B. (1936). *Is Soviet communism a new civilisation?*: Left review.
- Weigand, K. (2002). *Red feminism: American communism and the making of women's liberation*: JHU Press.
- Weigel, G. (2003). *The final revolution: The resistance church and the collapse of communism*: Oxford University Press.
- Weinberg, L. (2018). *The transformation of Italian communism*: Routledge.
- Weitz, E. D. (1997). *Creating German Communism, 1890-1990: From Popular Protests to Socialist State*: Princeton University Press.
- White, S. (1974). Communism and the east: the Baku congress, 1920. *Slavic Review*, 33(3), 492-514.
- White, S. (2002). *Communism and its Collapse*: Routledge.
- Whitefield, S. (2005). Political culture and post-communism. In *Political culture and post-communism* (pp. 1-14): Springer.
- Wood, N. (1959). *Communism and British intellectuals*: Columbia University Press.
- Wright, E. O. (1986). Why something like socialism is necessary for the transition to something like communism. *Theory and Society*, 15, 657-672.
- Wydra, H. (2007). *Communism and the Emergence of Democracy*: Cambridge University Press.
- Wydra, H. (2012). The Power of Symbols—Communism and Beyond. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 25, 49-69.
- Yeh, W.-h. (2023). *Provincial passages: culture, space, and the origins of Chinese communism*: Univ of California Press.

- Zizek, S. (2013). The idea of communism 2: The New York conference.
- Zumoff, J. (2014). The Communist International and US Communism, 1919-1929. In *The Communist International and US Communism, 1919-1929*: Brill.
- Županov, J. (1996). The social legacy of communism. *Društvena istraživanja-Časopis za opća društvena pitanja*, 5(22), 425-455.
- Zwick, P. (2019). *National communism*: Routledge.

© 2023, Author(s).

This open access publication is distributed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material.

However,

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

Non-Commercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

Share Alike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license.

You shall not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

There are no additional restrictions.

