

COMMUNIST LEGACIES AND NOSTALGIC MEMORY FROM CENTRAL EUROPEAN STATES

Flavius-Cristian MĂRCĂU
Assistant of Scientific Research,
Institute for Public Policy, Administration and Educational Sciences
University "Constantin Brancusi" of Targu-Jiu

Abstract:

In this article we consider the treatment of subjects from politics and psychosocial sphere. We believe that the last field must answer questions regarding the trajectory of the states in the democratization process, because the scope of psychosocial covering topics like communist legacy, which were felt in the psychology of crowds in the early years after the collapse of regimes totalitarian in Central and Eastern Europe. We want to show how four decades of dictatorship have destroyed any idea of freedom, but as with obtaining it, part of the population viewed it with some fear. Thus, post-communist regime was supposed to be a reaction to the previous regime. If the states in Central and Eastern Europe, we understand that a necessity of democratization was a demand made by this reaction. It wanted a building an opposite of the former communist[1] regime, but the difficulty of building democracy was caused by the presence legacies of the old regime.

Keywords: communist, postcommunism, democratization, nostalgic memory, communist legacies

Negative legacies that were felt in post-communism led to the construction of politics and economics in the early years of freedom. Any economic or political approach taken was viewed with skepticism by the public. Population, almost all politicians were thieves, new police represented the former communist Security with another name - but the same *militiamen* - and some politicians were considered former activists of the former communist party[2].

We said that in view of part of the population, most have reached the leadership were corrupt. This was strongly rooted in the collective mentality and due to the former communist party. In the early 90s, has experienced widespread corruption in all countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Now, more than 26 years, we see that things have changed completely. Yet there is an *"easy shadow"* of corruption among government officials. We also note that various corrupt practices and found themselves among the population. An example of this is met in the economy. Immediately after 1990, some citizens elude the payment of taxes and vague legislation allowing such loopholes, making the state a true tax haven[3]. I gave examples of small acts of tax evasion by simply bypassing the law, but unfortunately true *sins* of corruption undercurrents at the highest level.

Regarding the transition to democracy, former Soviet bloc, with the collapse of the communist regime could resemble, according to Jowitt, with a historical chalkboard . The comparison is aiming blackboard at school which was written the same thing for four decades, with a *communist chalk* and as we try to clean it, it still will distinguish different words that have left written - in the form of scratches (permanent) on the board In the present states have been put in front of a *tabula rasa* to be filled with letters that democracy. However, our analysis in this article is for treating chances of building democracy in Central and Eastern Europe, based on understanding Analytical all communist legacy (social, economic, political) to observe if they have shaped in any way successors.[4]

Communist legacies made their presence felt not only in the economic but also the political structure. If the Soviet bloc can not discuss an extension of the formal existence of the communist party, but a creation of new parties in a multiparty structure.

Who should be part of the new parties? The old elites? That is debatable given that only part of the elite were discredited after the collapse of communism. They were replaced by new elites emerged on the political scene in 1989 and 1990. Anna Grzymala-Busse describes the change as one unbalanced, with the assumption that elites can be classified as medium level, and that *"their chances of? and apply the ideas were directly proportional to their ability to advance and consolidate his power, quickly and decisively "[5].* The problem had to be dealt with in other terms, taking into account the experience and their ability to have broken with the past. The break was an advantage in consolidating and streamlining new parties. Using new terms which had developed new political structure need not be taken from the former regime. *"Three organizational practices of the communist regime led political elites resources and the subsequent regeneration strategies of parties since 1989. To some extent, each party has cultivated advance a particular type of elite, societal opposition to communist regimes"[6].*

MENTALITY. COMMUNIST LEGACY AND THEIR NEGATIVE IMPACT

Treatment legacies of the old regime is a key point when discussing the democratization of a country. *What is the communist legacy which hampered democratic construction?* Our view targeting several different aspects of the functionality of institutions in the early 90s: the rule of law and civil institutions. We can say that system failures are due to actions of the former regime who have proven able to develop among the population, a strong distrust of major institutions of post-communist state[7].

For four decades the communist parties, according to Kenneth Jowitt, defined constant as an alternative superior and dominant nation-state, and the experience Leninist merely reinforce, in terms of negative image policy area because of the separation its private sector. We want to mention that this *separation* should be seen in one sense: the party to society and not the other way or both ways. We can not talk about a separation in the true sense of the word because this would mean that both areas to operate independently of each other, but if the communist regime, the separation must be understood as a lack of involvement of the private domain in the political, but not and vice versa - political sector has absolute control in the state and directs, through its mechanisms (mainly repressive) privacy. First the political monopoly of the communist regime led to a political culture of the *ghetto*, as he calls Jowitt, matter proceeded to a deployment psychological population, manifested by charging policy area as one dangerous and to be avoided - any involvement political risks in the population meant that lead to various problems

with repressive apparatus of the regime[8]. Thus, we can say that was reinforced a shortage of shared public identity as citizens, look who developed the impossibility of those driven equalization and rulers. The consequences were found in the absence of debate at the civil society, but also by developing the rumor that covered political discourse[9].

Jowitt, one of the few who argued that the legacies of the communist regime will be responsible for hindering the transition process by the former Soviet bloc, insisted that Member decommunized probably will target Western liberal capitalism, but had and their view is unlikely to achieve this target[10]. Now more than two decades we see that states have reached decomunizate capitalism, but we can not support that this happened at the same time. Legacy that communism has left Central and Eastern Europe was strongly felt in most sectors (the early years of transition), from the economic to the political.

NOSTALGIC MEMORY

As part of the communist legacy, nostalgic memory is present in the lives of many citizens who lived under communism. Many who then shouted "*Down with communism!*" We now regrets or nostalgia look at him. The fact is that, with the passage of time, memory has been developed positive earnings tends to select and highlight important moments of the recent past. This cult, as he calls Soulet includes various personnel who have nostalgia for the past in the context of communism. It is about those who regret the totalitarian ideological reasons, political or because of the benefits they had at the time, whether it's a home that had received from the state or about the jobs they lost with the new liberal state guidelines. These people mourn the old regime and considers that its achievements are due. It is a regret that has different ways of manifestation: it is certainly possible for a worker in a company, regardless of its profile, which was passed in unemployment due to privatization programs (which led to the closure of part of production) support that "*we lived better under Ceausescu!*" or a citizen to remember that the state was the one who gave him a job, and after entry into democracy son was forced to seek one service. Such examples are found in every state decomunizat in Central and Eastern Europe, and nostalgia has grown with the passing years, but they are low-level person. Another example that highlights nostalgia for communism is found in the assembly of thousands of supporters in front of the mausoleum of Tito to commemorate his death, or opening an online platform in 2005 called "*Republic Titoslavia*", which aims gathering all those who share his ideas of Tito[11].

A similar phenomenon was observed in the former GDR, during which created the neologism "ostalgie". This describes very well the phenomenon of nostalgia for the past. In the former communist Germany exhibitions were organized on the last novels were written and performed various movies. This type of actions express, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the interest that you have German citizens to the life lived under communism. "*More exhibitions of paintings in Weimar, Nuremburg and especially in Berlin in autumn 2003 showed that despite the canons artistic very restrictive communist system and harassment of many creators, there were current artistic quality that were not necessarily different to the west. Similarly, some writers (Claudia Rusch, Jana Hensel, etc.) have gained a wide audience today telling sincerely hopes and disappointments of their youth in the communist world.*" [12].

This phenomenon should not be treated as a mere state of melancholy because gradations - downright positive - the former communist regime and that this *ostalgie* not found only at a former political activist, but also among part of the population he had no connection with the

camera system. Following surveys in Poland in 1994 and 1998, the results were downright shocking given that only a few years after the fall of communism some 40% of respondents (in 1994) appreciated the positive government of former Communist Party, and 1998 42% better appreciated that lived during the former regime than democracy. Another signal was that the Bulgarian Socialist Party (former Communist Party) has seen victory in elections in 1994 or winning presidential elections in Poland (1995) by Aleksander Kwaśniewski who was minister during the communist period. This nostalgia is due to the transition process and was inevitable as long as the unemployment rate rose were faced economic difficulties and as a consequence of post-communist governments failure to improve living standards. Are some underlying issues of nostalgia to the Communist regime[13].

SOCIALISM VS. CAPITALISM

Petrakov and Yassine, in *Economic Methods of Planned Centralized Management*, addressed a question aimed capability systems socialist and capitalist to feed everyone, namely: "*can it be socialism or capitalism be reformed partially, enough to be able to feed all the people?*". It is a pertinent question if we look to socialism and understand that the state was responsible for the distribution of labor, but we can say that it was able to *feed them all?* Although the socialist system involved a full employment of labor is fair to say that there was a single person to be starved to death? There are no credible statistics to prove this?

To ask whether socialism could be reformed, and what types of policies are required for this action to be carried out. In the type centralized socialism practiced that reforms can be executed in two directions: 1) the first type of reform envisages improving the existing order, and 2) introduction of markets. For example, in the 60s-70 reforms in East Germany were focused on the first type, while Hungary after 1968 was the introduction of markets.

Another example of reform of socialism is to be found in the Soviet Union which, with the last effort, to business financial autonomy and a number of responsibilities, but under no circumstances have taken steps that would lead to free markets, a sign that we wanted to preserve basic features of the socialist system (in general) and a command economy (in particular).

Leonid Abalkin, one of the originators of the *socialist reform* USSR considered as unacceptable any system that led to competitiveness, stressing very clearly rejects any mechanism outside the socialist system that proves to be capable of producing crisis, unemployment and the division of society classes. He vehemently rejected capitalism. Thus, one of the arguments that aimed pricing started from the fact that it becomes an instrument of planned economic management mechanism[14].

Until this moment I understood that socialism can not work with a free market. *But there is a potential market socialism?* Adam Przeworski[15] believes that trying to shape a definition in touch with market socialism would lead to the conclusion that the definition offered would be identical to that of the capitalist market. Why? Market socialism, firstly, can be considered a system that recognizes the legal point of view, only a few forms of ownership, and in the second, he is responsible for sharing resources, using the markets.

Defining market socialism makes it resemble a capitalist market. Using as examples of states with a democratic regime understand that all these reserves ownership, total or partial (either majority or minority) of undertakings. As an example we give the public sector in Sweden which holds 6% and the public sector in Austria receiving more than 50%. [16]

"If market socialism must be a distinct system, he must be legally differentiated in favor of the workers as cooperatives as properties in Nove's model on socialism feasible. In many capitalist countries, centralized state corporations distribute correspondence, public enterprises produce cars, small private companies have restaurants and individual installers remedy faults. The difference between market capitalism and socialism is that under capitalism there are private companies that distribute large size correspondence, producing cars. Nove would prohibit such activities would reserve the right cooperatives ".[17]

Socialism reform is a delicate issue since it can not operate in a democratic state. Whether or not able to feed them all. We believe that such an ambition is utopian. If socialism is questionable if we consider that benefited from a strong propaganda regarding the possibility of feed everyone, but having reliable statistics to prove this, we believe that there was at least one person who lived socialism and starve.

CONCLUSIONS

26 years after the fall of communist regimes - those countries that were in the Soviet sphere of influence - there is a question whose answer should be favorably fully democratic regime: *nostalgia for communism is a fact or just an illusion ?*

No matter how I say ostalgie or nostalgia, memory of the past creates a state of melancholy among people affected by the onset of capitalism. Also, it should provide an answer to the question: *is possible return to totalitarianism?*

We will address this question from the perspective of citizen *insecurity*. This is the term to be treated carefully because they can conceive at the level of mentality, two possibilities. The first one leads to the exploration of novelty and accepting the new rules of the game imposed by a democratic regime, while the second gives rise to the desire to return to the old rules. Why do we believe that it is possible a return to the old regime? Firstly do not believe that a return to communism as possible. These issues of insecurity born all kinds of questions and fears turned into reality. For example, making an exercise of imagination, to put ourselves in the place of a Russian citizen who, with the collapse of the USSR, enjoyed the freedom that could not have during the totalitarian regime - this freedom that lived them create uncertainty . It is hard to believe how democratic freedom may create uncertainty, but if it is to appeal to the mentality of the citizens of a state post-communist will understand that the uncertainty they felt consider increasing poverty (linked to poor quality of life) due to loss of work; lack of a house that previously was receiving from the state; need to seek a job and not held for distribution (state) by one. This estimate, according to a simple citizen, it may come in the red with the entry into capitalism.[18]

Turning to the possibility of a return to totalitarianism, this was impossible. Sudden collapse of the Soviet Union and has led many to ask themselves *now what will it be?* A natural question that has emerged following the revolutions that followed the *daze* anti-totalitarian of the six communist states, and once the democratization process has been outlined, everything started to be balanced (democracy vs. communism). But often it tended to tilt the balance in favor of the totalitarian regime, sparking natural reactions, like: *in the days of communism does not happen or communist times had a stable job.*

More than two decades after the fall of communism we can say that strengthening democracy, the return to a totalitarian regime is theoretically impossible, but it is possible that

some democratic government in different sectors to react in an authoritative manner. Such situations were encountered where some governments have abused the emergency decree to prevent any opposition to parliament on various bills, issue that has sparked discontent part of the population that was materialized in various protests[19].

REFERENCES

- [1]. See Michael Shafir, "What Comes after Communism?", In Stone, Dan (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of European Postwar History*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 526-545;
- [2]. Tismaneanu, Morjim Marc Howar, Rudra Sil (Eds.), *The world order after Leninism*, Curtea Veche, Bucharest, 2009, p. 69;
- [3]. See Ibid, p. 73;
- [4]. Ken Jowitt, *New world disorder. Leninist extinction*, Curtea Veche, Bucharest, 2012, p. 344;
- [5]. Anna Grzymala-Busse, "Pointing past: ex-Communist parties after 1989" in Grzegorz Ekiert, Stephen E. Hanson (eds.), *Capitalism and Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe*, Polirom, Iași, 2010, p. 207;
- [6]. Ibid
- [7]. See Richard Rose, William Mishler, Christian Haerpfer, *Democracy and its Alternatives*, European Institute, Iasi, 2003, p. 87;
- [8]. Ken Jowitt, *Op. Cit*, p. 346;
- [9]. Ibid , p. 347;
- [10]. Pop George Eleches, "Transition to what? Legacies and trajectories reforming communism "in Tismaneanu, Morjim Marc Howard, Rudra Sil (eds.), *Op. Cit.*, P. 65;
- [11]. See Jean Francois Soulet, *Eastern European history from WWII to the present*, Polirom, Iasi, 2008, pp. 196-197;
- [12]. Ibid , p. 197;
- [13]. See Ibid, pp. 197-198;
- [14]. Nikolai Petrakov, Evgeni Yassine, "Economic Methods of Planned Centralized Management" in *Sovietskaia Ekonomitcheskaia Reform: Poisk I Reschen*, Moskow: Nauka, p. 64 cited Adam Przeworski, *Op. Cit.*, Pp. 135-136;
- [15]. Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the market economy*, All, Bucharest, 1996, p. 137;
- [16]. Ibid
- [17]. Ibid , p. 138;
- [18]. See Giovanni Sartori, *The theory of democracy revisited*, Polirom, Iași, 1999, p. 465
- [19]. See Adrian Gorun, *Political Philosophy*, ed. Academic Brancusi, Targu-Jiu, 2009