

“Fascism” vs. “Communism” “Collectivism” & “Democide”

What is fascism?

Many people using the word *fascism* may not know its origin. Today we see very harmful patterns of abuse. Behaviors should absolutely be discussed and examined, but targeting individuals crosses many legal and personal boundaries. It may even be argued that targeting individuals is worse than simply holding a personal belief because targeting is an active attempt to harm others, whereas a value or belief is simply an opinion that does not necessarily need to be acted upon. People have a right to vote for politicians they believe will protect them, and all groups do this.

It would seem, however, that certain groups are often vilified today when they vote. A phenomenon is occurring in which it is not only politicians being targeted, but Americans themselves. Unfortunately, people begin to miss the understanding that harming one's own citizens, ultimately harms the country; a country should actively work to protect its citizens and preserve a healthy state. Without this protection, the result is destabilization and declining social well-being among citizens.

Political targeting is therefore far worse than simply holding a belief. Moreover, political targeting is often based on assumptions and personal bias. Targeting others for their beliefs assumes that one fully understands how another person thinks and feels. But is this really true? Even if the individual being targeted felt comfortable enough to express their values, would the political aggressor truly listen? Would they be able to communicate? Would the victim of political targeting feel comfortable speaking with someone actively attacking them?

Worse still, in today's climate, some individuals threaten violence or even murder while labeling others as “KKK” members or “fascists.” Such repeated mass rhetoric is often used to vilify opposing political groups. While some speech may be considered protected free speech, what is the *practical reality*? Would people view this as hate speech if they themselves were being targeted and labeled as members of the KKK or as fascists? Would they become closed off to dialogue? How could this affect their personhood, career, or family?

Where accountability is lacking within activist spheres, it should not become the burden of ordinary people to absorb the emotional and social consequences. This atmosphere of hateful language and constant anger comes at a cost to the American people. For many, it simply is not worth the emotional energy.

The Origin of the Word “Fascism”

Benito Mussolini coined the term “fascism” in 1919 to describe his political movement in Italy.

The word *fascism* derives from the Italian term *fascismo*, which itself comes from *fascio*, meaning “bundle” or “group.” Mussolini adopted the term for his political organization, the *Fasci Italiani di Combattimento*, founded on March 23, 1919, in Milan.

The term referenced the ancient Roman *fasces*, a bundle of rods bound around an axe, carried by lictors as a symbol of authority and strength through unity. Although Mussolini coined the word in its modern political sense, *fascio* had already been used in Italy since at least 1872 to describe *labor and agrarian unions representing groups united for a common purpose*.

By adopting the *fasces* as a symbol, Mussolini emphasized the ideas of unity, authority, and the subordination of individual interests to the state.

The word entered English shortly afterward, with “fascist” first appearing in 1919 and “fascism” in 1921. Over time, the term became associated with Mussolini’s regime and similar authoritarian movements throughout Europe during the twentieth century.

In summary, while the linguistic roots of *fascism* trace back to earlier Italian and Roman symbolism, Mussolini is credited with coining the term in 1919 to define his political ideology and movement.

Essentially, fascism began as an *ideological movement* centered on self-preservation and group protection. Why did Mussolini feel compelled to protect himself and his “group”?

More Context

Why Mussolini Felt He Needed to Protect His Group

Mussolini believed he had to protect his “group” because he viewed it as the only viable force capable of restoring order, unity, and national strength in Italy after the chaos of *World War I*. His sense of duty toward his people stemmed from political strategy, ideological conviction, and personal ambition.

1. Political Necessity and Survival

After the war, Italy experienced severe economic hardship, political instability, and growing socialist and communist movements that threatened the existing order. Mussolini believed that without a strong centralized authority, the country would descend into chaos.

His paramilitary squads, known as the Blackshirts, used violence to suppress socialist and communist uprisings, seize local governments, and eliminate political opposition. Protecting the movement became essential to maintaining control and ensuring its survival.

2. Ideological Commitment

Mussolini's fascism promoted the idea of a strong, unified state led by a single leader exercising extensive control over society and the economy. He viewed the fascist movement as the embodiment of this vision.

To preserve it, he suppressed dissent, eliminated rivals, controlled unions and the press, and used state power to weaken opposition parties.

3. Leadership and Personal Authority

Mussolini portrayed himself as indispensable to the movement's success. He believed that only a forceful and decisive leader could dismantle the old political order and create a new Italy. Protecting the group was therefore closely tied to preserving his own authority and the future of fascism itself.

4. Fear of Internal and External Threats

Mussolini feared both internal threats, such as socialism and communism, and external threats, including the international spread of communist revolution and possible *foreign* intervention. He viewed fascism as a barrier against these dangers.

In short, Mussolini believed his movement was the only force capable of saving Italy from *instability*, preserving his power, and fulfilling his vision of a unified authoritarian state.

Why Communism and Fascism Both Threaten the State

Communism and fascism are often viewed as ideological opposites, yet in practice both systems became highly authoritarian and collectivist. Both centralized power in the state and weakened liberal democratic institutions.

1. Centralization of Power

Both ideologies rejected the checks and balances associated with liberal democracy.

- Under communism, the state controlled economic and political life with the goal of abolishing private property and class distinctions.
- Under fascism, the state heavily directed the economy and society, even where private property formally remained.

In both systems, authority became concentrated in a single party or leader.

2. Suppression of Dissent

Communist regimes, such as the Soviet Union under Joseph Stalin, used purges, labor camps, and censorship to eliminate opposition.

Fascist regimes, such as Nazi Germany and Mussolini's Italy, dissolved political parties, suppressed dissent, and relied heavily on propaganda and political violence.

Both systems sought to eliminate challenges to state authority.

3. Rejection of Liberal Democracy

Fascism openly rejected parliamentary democracy, viewing it as weak and corrupt. Communism often claimed democratic legitimacy but *ultimately centralized power* within a single ruling structure.

In both cases, state legitimacy came increasingly from force and control rather than broad democratic consent.

4. Collectivism Over Individual Rights

Both ideologies prioritized collective goals over individual liberties:

- communism emphasized economic equality and class revolution,
- fascism emphasized nationalism, unity, and militarism.

This often resulted in restrictions on free speech, political participation, and civil liberties.

5. Threats to State Legitimacy

By dismantling democratic institutions and suppressing opposition, both systems weakened long-term political legitimacy. *Authority increasingly depended on coercion rather than public trust.*

In summary, both communism and fascism threatened democratic governance by concentrating power, suppressing pluralism, and reshaping society through authoritarian control.

Results of Mussolini's Fascism and the Communist Response

Mussolini's rise to power in 1922 marked the beginning of a totalitarian dictatorship in Italy. Following the "March on Rome," he dismantled democratic institutions, banned political parties, and established a police state.

His regime promoted nationalism, militarism, and the supremacy of the state over the individual. Mussolini's Italy later became aligned with Adolf Hitler and joined the Axis Powers during World War II.

Impact of Fascism

Domestically

- Economic recovery occurred during portions of the 1920s and 1930s.
- Political opposition, labor activism, and civil liberties were heavily suppressed.

Internationally

- Italy's alliance with Nazi Germany contributed to the devastation of World War II.
- The war left Italy economically and socially damaged.

Ideological Legacy

- Fascism spread throughout Europe and influenced numerous authoritarian movements.

Communist Response

The Italian Communist Party (PCI), founded in 1921, became one of the earliest organized opponents of fascism.

Fearing a Soviet-style revolution, many liberal elites and business interests initially supported Mussolini's rise to power. Communist organizers were heavily repressed, many militants were killed, and the PCI was forced underground.

Despite this repression, the Communist Party survived and later became a significant force in anti-fascist resistance movements during World War II.

Communist–Fascist Dynamics

The survival of communism in Russia following the Bolshevik Revolution kept fears of communist expansion alive throughout Europe. This fear contributed to fascism's appeal among some political and economic elites who viewed fascism as a defense against revolution.

However, fascist regimes ultimately failed to prevent the global spread of communist movements, and most fascist governments collapsed following World War II.

In summary, Mussolini's fascism brought short-term political stability and some economic recovery, but at the cost of democracy, civil liberties, and long-term national prosperity.

Meanwhile, communist movements continued to expand globally, shaping much of twentieth-century political *conflict*.

[True Freedom Is Free of Force, Fraud & Coercion. It has rules, it has safety, it has freedom.]

Communism and World War I

Communism significantly influenced the political landscape during World War I, particularly through the Bolshevik Revolution, which established the first communist government in Russia and altered the course of the war and its aftermath.

The Bolshevik Revolution and Peace Negotiations

The Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917 marked a major turning point in Russian history.

Led by Vladimir Lenin, the Bolsheviks came to power promising “Peace, Land, and Bread.” They sought to withdraw Russia from World War I, which had caused immense suffering and unrest.

Internal disagreements emerged regarding peace negotiations with Germany. Ultimately, the Bolsheviks signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918, ceding large territories to Germany and formally exiting the war.

This decision intensified political division and instability within Russia.

War Communism and Economic Policies

To address economic collapse during the Russian Civil War (1917–1922), the Bolsheviks implemented “War Communism.”

This policy included:

- nationalization of industry,
- forced grain requisitioning,
- strict labor controls,
- and centralized economic management.

Although intended to support the Red Army and stabilize the state, these policies contributed to famine, hardship, peasant resistance, and uprisings such as the Tambov Rebellion.

Communist Regimes and Death Tolls

World War I was one of the deadliest conflicts in history, with an estimated 15–22 million deaths, including both military personnel and civilians.

While World War I itself was not caused by communism, the war weakened imperial governments and contributed to revolutionary upheaval, particularly in Russia.

Following the Bolshevik Revolution, the Russian Civil War caused millions more deaths through warfare, famine, and political repression.

The twentieth-century history of communist regimes is associated with large-scale political violence and state repression. Under Stalin, millions died through purges, forced labor camps, famine, and state-directed repression.

Some scholars use the term *democide* to describe mass killing carried out by governments against civilian populations.

In summary:

- World War I caused approximately 15–22 million deaths.
- The Bolshevik Revolution and Russian Civil War contributed to further mass casualties.
- Twentieth-century authoritarian regimes, including communist governments, caused millions of deaths through repression, famine, labor systems, and political violence.

Union of Saint's Perspective on Peace, Protection, and Moderacy

The Union of Saint's teaches the Four Peaces:

- Peace
- Protection
- Preservation
- Progress

Furthermore, we teach anti-abuse communication and political moderacy. We are supportive of both the people and the state, recognizing that the state itself is made up of people. We believe all citizens should practice self-accountability and community responsibility.

We believe both fascism and communism can become threats to a safe and stable society. While these ideologies differ in theory, both can evolve into authoritarian systems that centralize power, suppress dissent, and destabilize the freedoms of ordinary people.

We strongly value freedom, but we also believe safety is a necessary foundation of freedom. Freedom cannot flourish where safety and stability are threatened.

For example, Americans once commonly felt safe going camping or spending time in the wilderness. However, if foreign invaders, traffickers, or violent criminal networks hide within those territories, people lose both safety and freedom. The woods no longer feel safe. This becomes a territorial issue in which war, slavery, trafficking, and assault are used as weapons of accumulation and control.

To restore peace, an opposing force becomes necessary. That force should ideally be proactive rather than reactive. For example, hostile foreign actors and organized criminal threats should be prevented from entering and establishing themselves within a territory from the beginning in order to mitigate violence, social instability, financial cost, and human suffering.

We believe political extremism on all sides can create instability within a culture and society. We are concerned about ideological movements that prioritize division, hostility, or group-based protection over the well-being of the population as a whole.

At this time, we believe certain modern political movements and policies, particularly those involving unchecked migration, rapid cultural restructuring, ideological extremism, and race-based hostility, have contributed to increasing social conflict and instability within the United States. We are concerned when any political ideology begins promoting selective human rights, vilification of groups, or hostility toward citizens based on race, culture, religion, heritage, or political belief.

We also believe there is a danger when political rhetoric becomes repetitive and ideological to the point that followers repeat ideas “down the chain” without reflection, nuance, or accountability. When movements normalize hatred, intimidation, or violence against others, they risk transforming from political movements into coercive systems of social control.

As a natural response to instability and political targeting, people often become more protective of:

- their families,
- women and children,
- their communities,
- their heritage and culture,
- and their personal safety.

This reaction is human and historically common in times of political and cultural conflicts.

The important question, then, is this:

Will society continue moving toward ideological extremism and division, or can Americans restore a healthier balance of freedom, safety, accountability, and mutual respect?

The Union of Saint’s believes lasting peace requires:

- strong boundaries,
- community responsibility,
- lawful order,
- respectful dialogue,
- anti-abuse communication,
- and the preservation of both liberty and public safety.

Isn't it time to end the hatred, revenge, and political dehumanization? To restore stability, accountability, protection of the innocent, and preservation of the social fabric that allows people to live safely and freely together?

So what is the lesson? Will people continue to support ideological extremism, division, and hostility, or can Americans once again normalize shared values of safety and freedom once again.

The Union of Saints supports humanity, safety, security, autonomy, dignity, and freedom as one cohesive and inseparable foundation of any healthy nation.

~US