Descriptions of ideologies

1. **Esoteric Nazism**
   1. **Esoteric Nazism**Even before it became a continent-conquering force, National Socialism was far from a homogeneous movement defined by an orthodox line. From the highest echelons of power to the very bottom of the Party bureaucracy, commitment to state-espoused ideals was varied, especially at the individual level. Indeed, a skeptic might assess National Socialism as little more than an ill-brewed melange of cynical politics and the worst aspects of the German national character. In this view, the triumph of Nazism is little more than proof of a world run mad. How narrow-minded. How foolish. How unenlightened. Certain privileged souls have found in the tenets of National Socialism an ethos to surpass all others - one which utterly annihilates existing truths and norms, thereby revealing the true path to utopia. For these true believers who have had the scales lifted from their eyes, nothing else matters anymore. Materialism, rationalism, morality - all revealed as transient illusions of a degenerate world ruled by sinister forces. Subhumans, and even many Aryans, are blind to this newly illuminated reality, but so long as the light of truth burns within a single uncorrupted heart, hope for the pure race endures. Let National Socialism unfurl its wings in glory, and follow it to whatever end, for it is the way, the light, and the truth. The means and the words matter not - only utopia.



* 1. **Imperial cult**On the night of 17 July 1918, Bolshevik revolutionaries executed the Romanov imperial family in a cellar beneath Yekaterinburg. Their deaths ought to have marked the end of the story of House Romanov. Instead, Russia remained haunted by them. Through revolution, war, and dissolution, rumors spread that one of Nicholas's children had survived. As the country shattered, some came to believe that the Romanov children remained in hiding and would return, one day, to restore Russia to greatness. These delusions came to coalesce around one man, Sergey Taboritsky, and his imperial cult of Alexei. A shambling corpse of a movement held together by fear, imperial nostalgia, and virulent antisemitism, the imperial cult's sole goal is to hasten Alexei's return to Russia. To this end, supporters believe in mobilizing all resources of the state toward purification, hoping for their savior's return once the Russian people have proved themselves "worthy" of him. Advocates support the systematic extermination of Russia's minorities, enforced poverty of the mass public, and the construction of grand, imperial monuments. Their system of mass surveillance and extreme punishment is directly inspired by the purified realms of the Reichskommissariat Kaukasien and its leader Josias, a man Taboritsky openly admires. Yet, the movement's sustainability is unclear. Every day that their savior fails to return, the cult grows more desperate. Soon, observers fear, there may not be a Russia for Alexei to return to.  
     
  2. **Agrarian spartanism**It is the nature of an ideology to adapt to its surroundings. The Burgundian System of Ordenstadt Pleskau is no exception. Birthed in the aftermath of the failed SS coup d'etat amid the ruins of Pskov, Pleskau's agrarian spartanism represents a rural, non-industrial take on Himmler's ultra-totalitarian racialism, an agricultural state ruled over by isolated and mad fanatics. Led by anti-urban, anti-industrial figures of the SS, Pleskau's agricultural spartan movement promotes a highly stratified, neo-feudal system. At its lowest rungs are the slaves, a population of hundreds of thousands of Russians forced to engage in back-breaking agricultural labor and prohibited from learning skills. These slaves are assigned to large estates managed by men of the SS, the nucleus of a new landed gentry, who are encouraged to think of the land as entirely theirs, connected to them by blood. While these men maintain iron fists over their property, their officers maintain iron fists over them, enforcing puritanical cultural standards and hardline traditionalism. Connections outside strict hierarchies are highly discouraged. Cities and urban settlements, seen as dens of degeneracy, exist only for administration or strategic purposes.



* 1. **Burgundian system**When Germany's luck began running out after the Second World War, certain fanatical and unorthodox members of the Nazi Party - chief among them Reichsführer-SS Heinrich Himmler - sought to reconcile their belief in the superiority of National Socialism with the increasingly bleak reality unfolding before them. They eventually arrived at the conclusion that the Nazi Party had lost sight of itself and collapsed into decadence, and that only they were fit to preserve National Socialism as truly intended. They quietly isolated themselves from the Third Reich's political structures, secretly building their own systems in parallel. When Himmler was made head of the SS-Ordensstaat Burgundy, he began implementing this purified vision of Nazism unimpeded. Much like how many of the Reich's ideological goals revolve around Hitler's increasingly erratic statements, the tenets of the Burgundian System are rather ill-defined. The only way one could attempt to understand it is to analyze Himmler's increasingly inscrutable actions and cryptic beliefs, which range from vague and seemingly contradictory ideals of agrarianism and hyper-industrialization, to the establishment of a Germanic neopagan state religion and exploration of the occult. What is absolutely certain, though, is that his regime implements Nazi policies to a unique extreme: the SS is exalted above all other social strata, draconian racial hygiene laws are harshly enforced, and National Socialist theory is deliberately incorporated into every aspect of waking life. It also imposes an incomparable degree of totalitarianism upon the entire population, in hopes of removing all potential sources of decadence or complacency. Whether this has succeeded at all - or will do so in the future - is known only to Reichsführer Himmler, for while secrets flow like a river into the Ordensstaat, they are never permitted to leave.



* 1. **Spartanism**For some, National Socialism's success was forever enshrined by its triumph, and its failures were only due to specific misfortunes or political errors. They say that the Reich, for all its faults, is not in need of anything more than reform or rejuvenation. They would see the status quo continue in perpetuity, leaving Germany as, ultimately, just another empire. For Reinhard Heydrich and his followers in the Deutsche-SS, that is not enough. It will never be enough. While the Himmlerites delved into esotericism, and the Waffen-SS betrayed their cause for wealth and power, Heydrich and his devotees already had a vision of their own, far different from that of the corrupt NSDAP and degenerate liberals. It was one of a better, simpler, more pure society of the ancient past, where men were warriors, women were mothers, and all traces of profligacy and weakness were excised. No cities bubbling with filth; no "pragmatic" mercy for subhumans. In barracks-towns and country estates, the pure race drilled for war and worked the land, while their progeny was honed to perfection through purges and bloodshed. They were the Spartans, espoused in thrilling tones by Heydrich as the ancient manifestation of Aryan supremacy - and when the world revolves upon the axis of Germany, even history itself will bend to the Führer's will. It falls to the true believers of National Socialism - the SS - to realize the promised land. Infused with the spirit of Sparta and forged anew upon the anvil of the Volksgemeinschaft, the Reich will be made eternal. Even if the blood must flow in rivers and overtake the sea; if countless millions must choke and die; if the foundations of utopia are laid upon the mass grave of all mankind; it will be worth it. One has not the luxury of counting the cost.



1. **Ultranationalism**
   1. Ultranationalism is a vicious blend of rabid militarism and fervent devotion to the nation above all else. Ultranationalists are keen to purge their nations of perceived foreign influence of any sort. Thus they favour autarky, stratification and a strong military involvement in everyday affairs to insure that the country is kept independent and "safe from outside corruption". The idea of a glorious state is the key to all things for the ultranationalist, and they will call upon images from the past to stir up and inspire in combination with a paranoid and savage hatred of the other and the outsider. Racism and other forms of discrimination are weaved into all parts of life, to further raise up and separate the ideal countryman from those that do not fit in. In order to make truth of their promises of the "great nation", ultranationalism presents the military as the ultimate tool for prosperity and greatness. Service to the state in this manner is therefore mandatory for most and deeply glorified as a part of the nation's triumph over the rest of the world. Ultranationalism has often manifested as part of a desire for revenge against foreign enemies and uses this desire to drive the nation forward. While some differences are known to exist between each ultranationalist movement, they never differ in their mad desperation to see eternal glory rain down upon their lands.



* 1. **Slavo aryanism**According to the more esoteric adherents of Nazism, prehistoric Europe was once dominated by an Aryan superculture that preserved their racial purity, built great works of art, and founded majestic cities. However, over time they were corrupted by deceitful Jewish interference, who manipulated them into intermarrying with lesser races and covered up their glorious heritage. Their descendants, who have fallen far but may regain their former glory, are now known as the German people. Slavo-Aryanists would agree with everything above, but replace "German" with "Slavic." To them, it is the Russians who are the heirs of the all-powerful Aryan race, and the Germans are actually inferior Asiatics who occupied Aryan lands at the behest of the Jew. But beyond that, they quibble plenty over all the details. They disagree on the Aryan race's point of origin: some say the Russian heartlands, some say the far north, some say a lost landmass that inspired the story of Atlantis, and some say the Levant. They are solidly anticlerical and believe that Christianity is a tool of the Jew to undermine the soul of Russia, but they bicker about the proper spelling of Perun and the canonicity of Hindu Vedas. When it comes to coherent economic and political theory, they have none. The ancient Aryans did not need to know about GDP or postclassical realism to achieve their perfect society, so why should they bother learning it today? The only aspect that truly matters is war, a total war, one that will reinvigorate the Russian spirit and reawaken the blood of the Aryan that flows through the vein of every Slav. And when the last Jew is strangled with the guts of the last German, they claim, the Aryan race shall be restored once more.



* 1. **Eurasianism**A focused subset of ultranationalist thought, Eurasianism is defined by its relation to the proposed Eurasian 'super-ethnos,' the ideo-social concept that the Eurasian peoples, ranging from the Carpathian basin to the Mongolian steppes, must unite into a single social and political grouping in order to achieve national strength and protect against destructive influences from without. Through both preparing for and actually doing so, the 'passionarity,' or overall drive, of this ethnic grouping will be maximized, allowing for greatness to be achieved on a societal scale. This concept naturally encourages an extremely militant approach towards its implementation, with maximal distrust of and aggression towards any ethnic grouping not considered Eurasian, whether that be foreign entities or domestic minorities that must, in time, be cleansed in some fashion in order to protect the super-ethnos. This approach also extends towards the forcible integration of Eurasian states into the proposed singular framework in order to realize the doctrine of cultural unity, whether those that live within them actually want to be included into this state-to-be, or not.



* 1. **Ultramilitarism**Ultramilitarist regimes are, in general, little more than a military organization expending the minimal effort possible to provide civilian state institutions, in order to redirect all that possible towards the military and military-related interests. They are, in essence, an army with a state, with every decision of policy ultimately, in some fashion, supporting military endeavors, and with nearly all actions underlaid by an ideological doctrine of rabid and uncompromising nationalism. To achieve this, they are often internally characterized by omnipresent propaganda and the active promotion of nationalist thought. In addition, and in order to sustain their military administration, such governments typically display extreme aggression on the world stage, towards both neighboring states as well as those considered state enemies, for reasons of history, political expediency, or others as determined. This often results in the nation being in near-eternal conflict, armed or otherwise, which to its leaders and people is often a desired goal in itself.



* 1. **Fundamentalism**Typically characterized by the twin pillars of a uniting religious authority or purpose and a rabid hatred of or mobilization against some external enemy, Fundamentalist governments tend to be defined by the narrative of their perceived national and ideo-religious struggle. Very often, their political structure is largely composed of religious or otherwise clerical figures, and their social and domestic policies are formed in close adherence to the tenets and scriptures of their organizing religion, whatever it may be. The perception of this intrinsic national struggle often results in these governments acting to both dehumanize their foes and subsequently act aggressively against them, whether by military expansionism or more subversive means. Diplomacy, especially with those seen as sympathetic to their doctrinal enemies, is extremely difficult, when possible at all. Summarized, such governments are often synonymous with near-eternal conflict, overt or covert, against an almost ever-growing list of mortal enemies.



* 1. **Stratocratic nazism (ultranationalism)**Following the end of the Second World War, Nazism went in many different ways. From Speer's reformism to Oberländer's orthodoxy, National Socialism seemed to be split in different tendencies, all vying for power in the halls of the Reichstag. One tendency, however, stood out from the rest due to its main leader's vehemency: Joseph Goebbels' Stratocratic National Socialism. First devised by Goebbels at the beginning of the fifties, and then championed by such people as Ferdinand Schörner following the propagandist's untimely demise, it differs from traditional Nazism by calling for a greater emphasis on the national military. It advocates for measures such as harsh racial and antisemitic policies and a strict maintenance of eugenicism, along with the glorification of the concept of war. Extremely hawkish even among their Nazi consorts, they desire to adopt a hardline stance against the other great powers, and believe that the Cold War shall be won thanks to Blood and Iron.



1. **National socialism**
   1. **National socialism**National Socialism, the iron fist clutching the heart of Europe for nearly thirty years, refers to the various styles of fascism which incorporate fervent racism, extreme militarism, and a totalitarian, one-party state where individuals are subordinated for the common good. It is distinct from other forms of fascism in its core tenets of brutally enforced racial hierarchy and aggressive, genocidal expansionism as "living space" for its nation's peoples. the German sense, Nazism holds several key tenants close to its black heart - anti-Semitism ingrained in every political action; A deep disdain for traditional liberal democracies, the parliamentary system and capitalism; and finally its strong hatred for Communism. While most National Socialist nations are either with or direct collaborators with the German Reich, the term is now often used to describe a variety of fascist movements around the world which echo Nazism's foundations, each with their own unique attributes, such as radical Japanese imperialism.



* 1. **Idiosyncratic nazism**National Socialism is an ideology, a state of thought, and a state of life with the Aryan race at its fundamental heart and center. To subjugate the importance of the Aryan people to the whims of a Führer, the cowardice of practicality, or even the confines of a German state is the height of folly. This is the National Socialist dream, and long has it laid idle at the foot of corrupt tyrants. This sect of reformist National Socialists, led by Theodor Oberländer, seek to reform the German state and ideology around what they consider to be their ultimate purpose: the strengthening and preservation of the Aryan people as a whole. They advocate for rule by and representation of the Aryan person, more comprehensive racial policy to protect non-German Aryans, and a re-centering of the Reich's policies around its Aryan citizens.



* 1. **Clerical fascism**Fascism is a truly malleable and fickle ideology by nature. Due to this, it has always been able to be adapted to fit the ideological needs and peculiarities of those wielding it even in the days when it was first adopted by Benito Mussolini. Given the widespread and still heavy influence of religion on millions worldwide, it is not surprising that many fascist movements ranging from the infamous Iron Guard of Romania to the Ustase of Croatia have attempted to wield faith and Fascism simultaneously in their quests for power and control over the very souls of their nations. The resulting child of this often-grotesque pairing is known to the world as Clerical Fascism. While religious influences within fascist movements is nothing out of the ordinary, these regimes tend to be extremists on par in their fanaticism with National Socialism. They are obsessed with theories of "salvation" that are bound inseparably with race and the nation in the minds of its practitioners. Unless their vision of purity is achieved, warn these modern-day zealots, their people will soon find themselves damned both here and in the afterlife. Truly, is there anything as dangerous as those absolutely assured of their own righteousness?



* 1. **Stratocratic nazism ( National Socialism)**Following the end of the Second World War, Nazism went in many different ways. From Speer's reformism to Oberländer's orthodoxy, National Socialism seemed to be split in different tendencies, all vying for power in the halls of the Reichstag. One tendency, however, stood out from the rest due to its main leader's vehemency: Joseph Goebbels' Stratocratic National Socialism. First devised by Goebbels at the beginning of the fifties, and then championed by such people as Ferdinand Schörner following the propagandist's untimely demise, it differs from traditional Nazism by calling for a greater emphasis on the national military. It advocates for measures such as harsh racial and antisemitic policies and a strict maintenance of eugenicism, along with the glorification of the concept of war. Extremely hawkish even among their Nazi consorts, they desire to adopt a hardline stance against the other great powers, and believe that the Cold War shall be won thanks to Blood and Iron.



* 1. **Ordosocialism**In 1847, Karl Marx shook the world to its very core. He created an ideology that discarded the old order, and addressed the true struggle of the common man. Now, Marx's true successor has arrived. Ivan Serov, creator of Ordosocialism, did not understand why one's patriotic love for their country must be at odds with their nation's class struggle. Why must they demonize the Germans, when their ideology clearly has unique characteristics that could better serve the forces of revolution? Ordosocialism is the resolution to these conflicting questions and ideals. Ordosocialism is the synthesis of the class struggle and the national struggle. Ordosocialism is the synthesis of all that opposes both capitalism and cosmopolitanism. Ordosocialism concerns itself with the destruction of those who decided to follow the path of reaction, and those whose reactionary tendencies are of a more... hereditary nature. Some fools accuse Ordosocialism of being a reactionary, corporatist betrayal of all that Marx stood before. Some fools accuse Serov of being a madman, no better than Hitler himself. These individuals attempt to weaken the revolution with their slander, and defend hereditary reactionaries despite their inherent opposition to the revolution. Serov and his followers will not let these false claims distract them, however, for they have a new revolution to bring forth. A revolution free of the rot that plagued its predecessors.



* 1. **Reform bureaucracy (national socialism)**Like most great powers, Japan found itself deeply divided during the interwar period of the early 20th century. At the close of the Great War, it had been a mere 60 years since the nation had begun its transformation from an isolated, feudal society to a modern and industrialized nation-state. No such change would be without teething problems, particularly in the field of economics - after all, the free-market status quo had originally developed naturally, over a lengthy period of time, and the arrival of revolutionary socialism only complicated matters further. From a combination of that era's uncertainties, ideological experimentation, and the new experience of colonialism emerged a uniquely Japanese phenomenon: 'kakushin kanryo', or 'Reform Bureaucracy'. For such an unassuming name, Reform Bureaucracy carries quite the legacy of cruelty and exploitation. Best realized in the ruthlessly exploited puppet state of Manchukuo, it is unapologetically dehumanizing, corporatist, and even fascistic. To these bureaucrats, economics is a matter of nothing but numbers and well-trained cogs, a series of gears dedicated to expanding the nation's preparedness for war and mobilisation. Drawing upon the 'total war' economy of the late German Empire, the economic rationalization of the Weimar Republic, and the planned economy espoused by many hardline socialists, Reform Bureaucracy's ultimate goal is simple: the complete subordination of the economy to the needs of the state, generally with the military and a politicized bureaucracy as the main benefactors.



* 1. **Technocratic nazism**Technocratic Nazism, despite what the name could suggest, is as corporatocratic as it is technocratic. Mostly popular in Germany's various colonies and Reichskommissariats, it is a form of governance that could best be described as a mix between reckless and ambitious industrialization and national socialist racialism. such a system, the various megacorporations which populate the German economic landscape are given quasi-free reign to do as they please, and the populations deemed as non-Aryan endlessly toil away in the mines or in the factories for what amounts to basically nothing. A tried-and-true system in the eyes of Germania's colonial bureaucrats, it allows for the exploitation of the East's riches while at the same time keeping the natives from revolting, because of the system's sheer brutality making quasi-impossible the organisation of a revolt: a perfectly adequate way to govern, one would think. And yet, some critics have arisen in Germany's hall of powers: from Speer's ragtag band of reformists, who argue that such an oppression of the Slavs is counterproductive, to some Burgundian adherents advocating for an agrarian society, it seems that Technocratic Nazism is at least somewhat polarizing within Germany proper.



1. **Fascism**
   1. **Fascism**Of the ideologies that emerged in the tumult following the First World War, the one that proved to have the greatest success in achieving and maintaining power in Europe was the ideology known as fascism. Borne out of the beliefs of disillusioned communists and authoritarian nationalists, fascism is often characterized as being "third positionist" due to its ideological inspiration from both the radical left and right. Although traces of Marxist doctrine can still be found buried in its worldview - it embraces a producer-parasite dialectic, but between nations instead of economic classes - its virulent nationalism puts it at odds with the internationalist mindset of socialism, and it inevitably led to violent conflict within Germany, Spain, and Italy in the interbellum decades. In all cases, the fascist parties eventually won out and forced their socialist rivals underground. Fascism's most defining qualities come from its slavish devotion to the state. The government, often under the control of a single strongman, serves as the final arbitrator and authority in the land. Religious institutions, trade unions, private businesses, and the like are permitted to exist in some limited form, though their subservience to the state's authority is made clear. The government also upholds a national mythos, spinning tales of a noble people with past glories that were unfairly stripped from them, and demands that the populace find strength in unity and reclaim what was lost. They sneer at liberal nations for decadent complacency and socialist nations for succumbing to degeneracy - yet paradoxically view those outsiders as a looming threat who are posed to destroy everything they hold dear.



* 1. **Reformed national socialism**All ideologies that achieve power evolve as they rule, and Nazism is no exception. In its earliest decades, the arbiter of Nazism was Adolf Hitler, summed up in the concept of "Führerprinzip": the Führer's word is the final word, and Nazism is whatever he says it is. But as time passed and Hitler's practical influence within the party waned, he could no longer enforce his will as the sole gatekeeper of National Socialist thought. One of the people who took advantage of that vacuum was Albert Speer. Speer's National Socialist praxis is marked by a watering down of many of Hitler's more unsavory policies. The meticulous racial quantification, the futile quest for economic autarky, the endless empowerment of the military, even the blind worship of Hitler; Speer considers none of these tenets to be sacred and plans to do away with all of them. These inevitably earn him derision from his more devout rivals: he's a revisionist, he's a factionalist, he wants to replace Nazism with weak and effeminate Italian fascism. Some have even accused him of being a crypto-democrat who wants to destroy Nazism entirely. What they fail to realize is that Speer isn't reforming Nazism to destroy it, but to save it. By making ideological concessions in the name of pragmatism, Speer is able to amputate the gangrenous limb and keep the rest of the body alive. By limiting rampant militarism, he can diminish the risk of Caesarism in the general staff. And by allowing criticism of Hitler, he can preserve a cult of personality while maintaining the appearance of openness. If everything goes according to plan, Speer can transform National Socialism from a bloated mess of self-destructive contradictions into a workable ideology while preserving its core. There will still be a one-party state, there will still be racial purity, and most importantly, there will still be one all-powerful Führer.



* 1. **Corporate statism**Money can buy many things - towers of steel, cities of gold, the loyalties of craven men - but not a monopoly on violence. Or a country. At least, not yet. Although the role of corporate capital in this polity is monumental - entirely out of the scope of what would be expected anywhere else in the world - the state maintains its prerogatives. Though the corporations and their lieutenants are omnipresent, and their wishes cannot be ignored, their desires and machinations are ultimately subject to the whims and needs of a single primarch. Even if the economic and social life of this society is dominated by private enterprise, the political direction of the state remains firmly in the grip of a singular entity, bending the efforts of others to serve a purpose greater than mere profit. Here, labor and capital are both subsumed under the vision of their betters.



* 1. **Corporatism**Corporatism, from the Latin word for the human body, is one of the earliest economic models that presented itself as a "third position" to counter both capitalism and socialism. It is subject to a great many influences, from classical Greek philosophy to leftist syndicalism, but it was ultimately the proto-fascists who dominated the legacy of corporatism. It became deeply associated with Catholic and other religious traditionalism, integralism, and "clerical fascism" in the interwar years, and it served as a model to people such as Gabriele D'Annunzio, Engelbert Dollfuss, and Antonio Salazar. While corporatism is collectivist and believes economic classes are a fundamental unit of society it teaches that the greatest good can only be achieved through class collaboration rather than class struggle. Workers and employers alike are organized into some form of corporate body - be it guilds, syndicates, trade unions, or worker cooperatives - based on their industry, and it would be these corporate bodies that lobby the government on their behalf. The amount of representation the individual is afforded in the government is subject to variance, but usually often very little. Corporatism is also marked by a heavy preference towards a traditionalistic interpretation of the moral codes prevalent in the locality, especially with regards to marriage, sexuality, family structures, and popular media.



* 1. **Sansepolcrismo**Taking its name from a discourse held by Benito Mussolini in Milan's Sansepolcro Square, Sansepolcrismo is the very first incarnation of the fascist ideology, back when the PNF didn't exist yet, and fascism still called itself "Fighting Fasces". At the time, the movement's name and iconography were a tribute to the Arditi, Italy's elite assault corps and the very first to wear the black shirt - which would become the uniform of the future MVSN, the feared Camicie Nere. The Sansepolcro Manifest advocated for a "Third Way" between capitalism and communism, taking the best from both sides while discarding what was deemed unnecessary. As such, early fascism conjugated private economic initiative with heavy state intervention in the economy, parity between sexes and worker uplifting programs with rabid nationalism and unbridled militarism, vote for women with single party state: a mèlange of political, social and economic beliefs, kept together by the messianic figure of the Duce, the voice of the people, who knew what was best for all - and had the strength to pursue it. Abandoned over the years in favor of less revolutionary policies that catered more to the middle classes, Sansepolcrismo has been brought back to the forefront of political discourse by Ettore Muti's meteoric rise to power. While unstable and somewhat erratic, it is undeniable that this ideology finds fertile ground among the lower classes and the military, making it a powerful tool to counter the advancement of socialism in society: only time will tell whether it will be successful, inaugurating a new age of nationalistic zeal and class cooperation, or it will once again be forgotten.



* 1. **Fascist mysticism**Founded by Niccolò Giani, the School of Fascist Mysticism has spent years crafting a comprehensive analysis of both modern and ancient philosophy, society and religion. Constantly striving to find the reasons behind the great events of History, the members of this school came to the conclusion that matters of state, economy, religion, ethics and race are tightly bound: as such, there must be something capable of holding everything together, espousing the supreme good and fighting the supreme evil - and that something is Fascism. In the eyes of Niccolò Giani, Fascism is more than a political ideology. Preaching eternal devotion to the State, unflinching faith in God, and utter loyalty to one's family, comrades and brothers-in-arms, it is a comprehensive code of values that can find application in every moment of a person's life, replacing all other social constructs, including religion: in fact, Fascism is the final and logical conclusion of Christianity, with the messianic figure of the Duce acting as paragon of virtue, and supreme authority in both political and religious matters - making the corrupt and decadent Clergy unnecessary. Previously confined to academic halls and theoretic debate, Niccolò Giani's meteoric rise to power in the Italian Empire has seen Fascist Mysticism experience a dramatic increase in both importance and adherents, as its teachings offer hope to desperate Italians: duty in place of uncertainty, and devotion in place of doubt. As the faithful grow in strength and numbers, the Duce smiles, for every new follower is not only a step closer to what Fascism was meant to be - it is a step closer to ascension, in both body and soul...



* 1. **National syndicalism**Despite what some may think, National Syndicalism is not exactly fascism, but nor is it socialism either. As revolutionary as it is anticommunistic, rooted in the writings of both Georges Sorel and Ramiro Ledesma Ramos, it is a very idiosyncratic ideology, merging various influences to become something wholly new. Just as its name indicates, National Syndicalism could be described as a fiercely nationalist version of revolutionary syndicalism. Seeking to organize society around a system of syndicates, and promoting class cooperation instead of class struggle, it aims to constantly revolutionize itself, which means that it is, at least in theory, deeply progressive. National Syndicalism, while still fairly popular in Latin American countries and a lingering influence on Spanish intellectuals, is not as voguish as it once was. Indeed: times have changed since the 1920s, and what was once seen as a young, fiery ideology has now been eclipsed by other radical currents, such as national socialism or communism. Nevertheless, a resurgence, while certainly unexpected, still seems to be possible, for National Syndicalism's perpetual modernisation might turn out to be its greatest strength.



* 1. **Fascist populism**Some leaders are fond of expressions such as "the world has need of our nation, and our nation has need of all its people." Yet behind these apparently neutral calls for national unity and joint effort is a system no less fascistic than that first envisioned by Benito Mussolini, the Master of the Mediterranean, all those years ago: that of Fascist Populism. Fascist Populism is fascism for the farmers and peasants of the countryside - it focuses on the interests and welfare of the idealized "Old Country", far away from the alleged "decadence" and "corruption" inherent in cities and towns. As a result it focuses on the welfare of rural areas to an extent even many agrarian leftists and centrists would find irrational. Fascist Populism also eagerly plays on the neuroses and concerns of the average farmer to strengthen its base. An abhorrence for the "other", most frequently manifested in xenophobia and anti-Semitism, figures prominently in their policy. Just as important to them is well-deployed welfare - to ensure that farmers "can receive from the Nation their just reward for their work" - and protectionism, to shield the rural industries (whether deservedly or not) from their "hostile" competitors outside. The loudest and most obvious example of Fascist Populism is Pierre Poujade of France; however, others like him do exist, and it is anyone's guess just how faithful he will be to the ideology he was so loudly promoting in 1962 and beforehand.



* 1. **Revolutionary nationalism**Heralding a new era for the people now stood atop the shoulders of slain giants, a new wave of energy had emerged from the rotting carcasses of empires; a zealous 'Revolutionary Nationalism', materializing wherever the imperialist boot had once tread. Rejecting unequal treaties from London, resource-pillaging from Paris, and imperial diktats from Berlin, this newfound nationalism has roared in the shadows of Europe's empires to repel the horrors and brutality that had once emerged from the colonial office. Many of these post-colonial regimes govern underdeveloped and highly hierarchical economies as a result of their historical exploitation. However, authorities drive to modernize their countries, often unifying their people around a powerful figure or institution alongside patriotic, and sometimes revanchist, rhetoric. The newly-founded nation remains at the center of all political life; workers are instructed to toil for the strength of the country just as soldiers are told to fight to defend the homeland's recent freedom. Social views on morality and personal autonomy vary, but almost all agree upon a single, unified cultural identity in the face of a new modernity. As Europe lies fractured and limp under the grey jackboot, the liberated peoples cheer to celebrate independence from the masters who could no longer bear the whip.



* 1. **Reform bureaucracy (fascism)**Like most great powers, Japan found itself deeply divided during the interwar period of the early 20th century. At the close of the Great War, it had been a mere 60 years since the nation had begun its transformation from an isolated, feudal society to a modern and industrialized nation-state. No such change would be without teething problems, particularly in the field of economics - after all, the free-market status quo had originally developed naturally, over a lengthy period of time, and the arrival of revolutionary socialism only complicated matters further. From a combination of that era's uncertainties, ideological experimentation, and the new experience of colonialism emerged a uniquely Japanese phenomenon: 'kakushin kanryō', or 'Reform Bureaucracy'. For such an unassuming name, Reform Bureaucracy carries quite the legacy of cruelty and exploitation. Best realized in the ruthlessly exploited puppet state of Manchukuo, it is unapologetically dehumanizing, corporatist, and even fascistic. To these bureaucrats, economics is a matter of nothing but numbers and well-trained cogs, a series of gears dedicated to expanding the nation's preparedness for war and mobilisation. Drawing upon the 'total war' economy of the late German Empire, the economic rationalization of the Weimar Republic, and the planned economy espoused by many hardline socialists, Reform Bureaucracy's ultimate goal is simple: the complete subordination of the economy to the needs of the state, generally with the military and a politicized bureaucracy as the main benefactors.



1. **Despotism**
   1. **Despotism**Despotism is a wide-reaching term that encompasses governmental systems where power is concentrated on a single individual or group of individuals. These people run the nation according to their own will, and almost always make heavy use of the military and the police to keep their citizens from revolting. Despotist governments very rarely tolerate other ideologies and when they do they have systems in place to prevent those groups from ever gaining power. Opposition forces are treated as enemies of the state and heavily repressed, and if elections are ever held they are either completely rigged lies or for positions with no power. Despotist governments also usually wish to establish control or dominance over other nations, and maintain extensive militaries to use in conquest and to protect the regime. While Despotists can use nationalism as a reason for their authority, they are not as nationalistic as Fascists and National Socialists and nationalism is usually more of an excuse than any real part of the agenda.



* 1. **Absolute monarchy**Absolute Monarchism is an ideology defined by total control by a monarch and the placement of all other government authority under their oversight. Most commonly, the monarch leaves the day to day management of the state to their ministers, but any decision can be overturned or reversed by them. With a history extending back thousands of years, absolute monarchy is one of the oldest and most enduring systems of government. The transition from antiquity to the medieval era across the world saw the control of monarchs diminished in favor of the power of the aristocracy, who in some cases had only a nominal allegiance to their king. As the feudal eras of Europe and Asia waned, however, this arrangement quickly began to change once more. As kingdoms and empires grew in strength around the world, the powers of the nobility were increasingly wielded by the monarch and their ministers, especially in Europe. Even as the powers of European monarchs were curtailed in favor of constitutional governments, absolute monarchies continued to survive in much of the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. Today, in a world desperate for hope, some might seek to place all faith in royalty once again. As the great French king Louis XIV once said: "One king, one law, one faith."



* 1. **Military junta**A Military Junta is a government where the military has taken political power into its own hands without any democratic element. Often this involves a suspension of the constitution of the state, and the rights contained therein. This leaves juntas free to stabilize the country into accepting their rule. An authoritarian oligarchic rule characterizes a junta, with power shared among military leaders rather than centralized in a single person. Sometimes, civilian governmental institutions continue to function as well, but with their activities supervised or even directed by the junta. Other times, the junta rules formally and directly, maintaining legitimacy through a variety of other methods, most often promises of future democratization or of reclaiming lost land. Usually, a Military Junta takes power by coup d'état, though occasionally military leaders are invited to take control in times of crisis. Besides an emphasis on military strength and national security, they tend to differ greatly in their aims depending on circumstance. However, among all juntas, one ideal remains the same: the soldier protects, but he does not serve.



* 1. **Civilian dictatorship**Civilian Dictatorship, though a republican form of governance, should not be mistaken for a democratic one. Defined by the dictatorial grip on a state by a civilian regime, the military leadership is completely or near completely under the control of the civilian state, without the ability, and sometimes desire, to interfere with government functions. Usually, the dictator legitimizes his government by creating or repurposing a political party to keep up the pretense of a democracy. This party both serves as a mask to hide the nature of the regime, and a tool to serve the needs of the state. It rarely holds real political power, but can serve to advance skilled politicians to assist the dictator. They are often created when power is centralized in the hands of a single person, who goes on to declare that for one reason or another, they would be holding that power permanently. This control almost always continues until either their overthrow or their death.



* 1. **Theocracy**Explicitly acknowledging a God or other such deity as their supreme authority, a Theocracy executes temporal functions through human intermediaries that are officially purported to receive divine authority or guidance. In order to do this many, most, or all of the nation's highest offices are occupied by clerical or religious officials, and state policy and actions are typically governed by the doctrines, beliefs, and scriptures of the religion that they purport to follow, whatever those may be or call for. Internally, such nations are often characterized by prominent displays of religious observance, parochial institutions, state or otherwise, and a high degree of religious participation by their citizenry, whether voluntary or forced. With regards to foreign nations, the basic cordiality of interactions on the part of the theocratic regime again depend heavily on the character of the religion in question, and on the proclaimed qualities of the deity that the ruling class claim to represent. Whether they actually do, or are only conveniently claiming to do so, is a perennial question.



* 1. **Papacy**Unique among many of its ideological peers, the Vatican exercises a wholly unique system of governance that blends monarchy, theocracy, and a semi-democratic elements into a coherent whole. The Pope is elected for life, though not chosen through inheritance or bloodline, by the College of Cardinals - senior bishops of the Catholic Church - during a Papal Conclave that convenes to choose the next Pope. Upon selection, the Pope becomes head of the Holy See, Vatican, and the Catholic faith itself, imbued with the authority of an absolute monarch. The authority the Pope can exercise is vast, and transcends traditional borders as Catholics live across the world. While this has little practical authority, it gives the words of the Pope more weight than many other heads of state, and few set out to antagonize the Vatican as a result.



* 1. **Interim government**An interim, or caretaker, government is an intrinsically temporary one that exists in between more formally defined governments, whether those be the result of democratic elections, military imposition, or some other method. Typically rapidly formed in the aftermath of the fall of a previous government, however that fall may have been characterized, their inherent perceived legitimacy is generally low. Therefore, should they not be quickly replaced, national disorder and unrest is sure to follow. Such interim governments tend to be relatively authoritarian even if apolitical, if only to ensure that the status quo as it relates to state institutions is maintained until such time as their successor is properly established. At the same time, they are very unlikely to possess either the political will, or the physical ability, to execute policy of any real significance. The nation, in essence, remains 'frozen' until the interim government is replaced.



* 1. **Colonial government**The very definition of an empire is predicated on the idea of one nation ruling over others. Sometimes, local collaborators or noblemen are able to step up and help their new overlords manage things smoothly. But oftentimes, there may be a dearth of willing assistants from the local population, or they may simply not want to be ruled over. Enter the colonial government. Staffed from top to bottom by bureaucrats, magistrates, and governors from the mother country, they take no orders from those they govern and would be loathe to do so. Their justifications for doing so may be myriad: the natives are uncivilized and not ready for home rule, doing so will harm their ruling country's political interests, or they simply don't trust the occupied nation enough to justify freeing them. If the governor is not a military man himself, they often have a close link to the military anyway, since it is the only institution the government can fully trust in event of an anti-colonial insurrection. Opportunities for a native under this regime are slim and none; if they are lucky, they will be able to get a job in the government's rank-and-file, with no hope for advancement beyond the lowest echelons of power. That is why these regimes so often tend to inspire fierce resistance; lots of angry, disenfranchised and disillusioned military-aged men with everything to gain and nothing to lose make for a wonderful anti-colonial rebel army.



* 1. **Neo baathism**From the ashes of the 1958 Syrian rebellion, a conflict between the Civilian-led leadership and the Military Command would ripple throughout the Arab Socialist Ba'ath Party. And from this conflict, Neo-Ba'athism, would emerge in reference to a broad front of ideological deviation from Ba'athist orthodoxy. United only by an emphasis on military supremacy over the party and the favouring of military-led struggle over civilian revolution. The Neo-Ba'athist movement would find itself disunited in nearly every other matter, whether it be economic or foreign policy. While the left of the faction are regarded by some as borderline Leninist, and favour pseudo-Marxist economic policy and even partially playing into the notion of class struggle; the right faction would position itself in favour of increased economic liberalization. Neo-Ba'athists are also generally characterized by a decreased interest in the ideas of Pan-Arabism, favouring more regionalist ideals. Derided by the old guard of the Ba'ath movement for their seeming abandonment of the party's original principles and their disregard of civil liberties, Neo-Ba'athism has nevertheless gained a sizeable influence over the party and the people due to their militant struggle, in contrast to the relatively tame intellectuals that form the orthodox cliques.



* 1. **Corporatocracy**While private capital exists in a tense relationship with the public interest in every developed country across the world, in almost every instance the public interest remains firmly in control of the levers of political power, with corporations being just one of many interest groups. However, this polity's unique circumstances has led to this normal state of affairs being reversed. Whether by regulatory neglect, corruption, or deliberate design, the political role of the state in a corporatocracy is dominated by corporate interests and representatives. Whether they rule indirectly via bought men and regulatory capture, or more directly by the outright seizure of political power, a corporatocracy operates for the benefit of its corporate denizens, their shareholders, and investors first - and for the betterment of its people a distant second.



* 1. **Vanguard anarchism**Freedom is something too precious to be in the possession of the people. Vanguard Anarchism attempts to combine the decentralized anarchist society with a standard, disciplined army to defend the society, often with a central, dominating leader of that army acting as the final voice when it comes to matters of survival of the society. Supporters of this style of anarchism argue it is fundamentally necessary in order to prevent more organized and stable external threats from overwhelming the communes. On the other hand, detractors consider this a fundamentally corrupt interpretation of anarchism, as the needs and will of the people are often subordinated to the army's authority in the name of defense and protection, and even besides, the sheer amount of individual power held by whoever runs the military makes them little better than any other tinpot dictator.



* 1. **Aristocratic conservatism**A state - be it republican or monarchical in nature - is not necessarily a democracy, and few socio-political schools of thought represent this idea in a subtle, yet insidious way more than Aristocratic Conservatism. A state so governed nominally possesses a constitution, and enjoys all of the structural institutions of a democratic polity. However, large portions of the representatives, bureaucrats, regional leaderships and perhaps even the head of state are under the favors, payroll, or threats of the "silent rulers" of the country. These could be nobles from young democracies or the old guard of a monarchic government, adapting seamlessly to what is just a more abstract court. Or they could be wealthy ranchers and landowners, making sure the taxation system and government projects don't hurt their bottom line, and ideally, even increase their profits. To say that this rule has no opponents is inaccurate. After all, an opposition is essential to keep up a democratic appearance. But said opposition is either backed by different patrons or is neutered, having no political backing. Political reaction is the rule; for those in charge, the situation of the country currently is the best it has ever been. whoever disagrees can be simply labeled an enemy of the state or branded a subversive revolutionary. All men have their price, after all, and nobody understands this better than the true rulers behind the veil of this government.



* 1. **Warlordism**When people speak of power, they speak of man's control over the minds and actions of other men. Among the nations of the world, this control is often political. Leaders exert power through some combination of orders, threats, and persuasion, mediated through institutions that seek to restrain the real use of violence. Warlord states lack the interest and the capacity for such subtleties. Cruel and brutal, warlords are leaders of armed bands who rely on violence to exert power over lands ravaged by war or crisis. They terrorize civil authorities, plunder resources, and exterminate uncooperative populations. Those unfortunate enough to live in a warlord state are often forced to contend with marauding bands of fighters, unpredictable and unrestrained from the rules of decency. While individual leaders can have complex goals and motivations, the bloated military apparatus they lead tends to be extractive, seeking to enrich itself at the expense of others.



* 1. **Personalistic dictatorship**Autocrats have come in many forms throughout recorded history. Whether ideologues or lawgivers, saints or tyrants, the greatest among them had something in common: a vision, pursued to the utmost with every means at their disposal. From the republic-turned-empire of Augustus to the continent-spanning revolutionary ambitions of Napoleon, the mark such individuals have left upon history is truly indelible. Of course, those tend to be exceptions, rather than the rule. Most autocrats have far less high-minded motivations. Forget ideology, nation-building, or anything of that sort. For these men (and occasionally women), power is both the means and the end; "All for me, and none for thee." Egoism defines both their rulership and their personalities. They rule not by popular mandate or under the guidance of a higher cause, but by and for themselves. Extensive use of nepotism, brute force, and criminality can make their regimes, no matter how unpopular, exceptionally difficult to remove.



* 1. **Partisan movement**Freedom earned through blood is better than tyranny enforced through blood. That is the thesis of a partisan movement - if war is necessary to free their people from foreign occupation, then let loose its hounds and cry its chants. Besides a devotion to the cause of liberation and a general use of guerilla warfare, partisan movements can hold nearly any ideology, be made up of any class or nationality, and can be organized in nearly every way a movement can be. They can fight in the cities, in the fields, in the forests and in the mountains. From any place a person can hide, a partisan can fight. As the jackboot continues to press on Europe's neck, as the rising sun's rays of oppression shine over Asia, as the colonies of Italy languish under the Roman eagle, partisan movements have exploded in size and diversity to combat these evils. From the UPO in the Reich's "Model Colony" to more ideological groups like the UMAJF in Malaya, partisans across the globe continue their struggle. The oppressors will fall, the tyrants will burn, until the partisans reach the beautiful light on the horizon, the promised land they so desperately march towards. Hope for their people, who have lost it long ago. Justice for those that caused all of the pain and misery. And most of all, what every partisan fights for above all: Freedom. For their people, for all time.



* 1. **National catholicism**The intersection of statecraft and religion goes back for as long as statecraft and religion have existed. Since time immemorial, matters temporal and spiritual have not only existed side by side, but both have crossed over and influenced one another to degrees so profound that it simply cannot be overstated. In the modern age, it is no different with the Catholic faith. The National Catholics believe firmly that the best way to run the country is in accordance with traditional Catholic values and the enforcement of such, giving them a distinctly authoritarian and quite conservative character in general. Rather than merely encouraging adherence to tradition and the upholding of values, rigid adherence is something that must be enforced instead, separating them from other political Catholics. Rather than putting leadership directly in the hands of the faith as in the case of a theocracy, National Catholics typically push for a cooperation with another arm of governance that would allow them to enforce their laws more effectively. Usually, but not always, it is a military force that provides the enforcement part of a National Catholic regime, especially in countries where Catholicism is a dominant religion in the country's populace- and therefore, its armed forces as well. Such a thing is, of course, necessary to prevent any backsliding into decadent, depravity and entropy.



1. **Authoritarian democracy**
   1. **Authoritarian democracy**The past twenty years of human civilization have shown, above all else, that might truly does make right. It is the strong nations, the nations which are united, that have the best chances of winning out on the world stage. Anyone who wishes to replicate their success should also replicate their rigid sense of nationhood, this is where National Conservatism comes from. A deeply right-wing ideal, national conservatives believe that the unity of their particular nation is paramount to all other social goals, and that this unity is maintained by upholding the nation's unique traditions. The state becomes an organ by which this national cohesion is strengthened, and although many national conservatives support laissez-faire economic policies; others believe that the state should provide for the people in a paternalistic capacity. Many of these conservatives emphasize the differences between their ideas and those of fascists, many more are perfectly willing to collaborate with fascists when there is an alignment of goals. Whether or not the ideology can survive in a world dominated by Fascism is yet to be seen.



* 1. **National conservatism**The past twenty years of human civilization have shown, above all else, that might truly does make right. It is the strong nations, the nations which are united, that have the best chances of winning out on the world stage. Anyone who wishes to replicate their success should also replicate their rigid sense of nationhood, this is where National Conservatism comes from. A deeply right-wing ideal, national conservatives believe that the unity of their particular nation is paramount to all other social goals, and that this unity is maintained by upholding the nation's unique traditions. The state becomes an organ by which this national cohesion is strengthened, and although many national conservatives support laissez-faire economic policies; others believe that the state should provide for the people in a paternalistic capacity. Many of these conservatives emphasize the differences between their ideas and those of fascists, many more are perfectly willing to collaborate with fascists when there is an alignment of goals. Whether or not the ideology can survive in a world dominated by Fascism is yet to be seen..



* 1. **Social nationalism**One of the most egregious crimes that man can commit against his fellow man is that of colonialism. To colonize a land, a people, and a country is to deny them of their right to a proper existence. It turns the nations that fall victim to it into husks of what they could have become, and it turns its perpetrators into glutenous parasites, incapable of proper social function. This state of affairs can be seen clearly all over the world, whether it be with the Americans and Europeans in Africa or with the Japanese in Asia. No crime can go unanswered for too long, however, and the answer to the brutality of colonialism is the theory of Social Nationalism. It, unlike the nationalism which birthed the Reich and the Showa, posits that the colonized can become nationally cohesive units through the recognition of a shared struggle. Social nationalists do not argue that their people should unite on the grounds of their ethnic or cultural superiority, instead, they must unite to defeat their oppressors. Although social nationalism can use any economic system to achieve its aims, most of its proponents also struggle for the establishment of at least some form of socialism in their lands. In the first decade following the war, social nationalism found itself crushed under the weight of German bombs and Japanese military exercises, but the world is changing now. If all the cards are played right, they might just be able to win.



* 1. **Controlled democracy**In our modern era, there is no greater achievement in the world than democracy. The ability for the citizens of the nation to have a say in how their government is to be run and managed is one of the greatest achievements in the past few centuries. Elections provide accountability through the ballot box and allow the marketplace of ideas to weed out the bad ideas. But the largest problem with democracy is the fact that sometimes the people don't know what they want, or what is best for them. In fact it's very likely that voters, blinded by impossible promises or destructive slogans, can actually destroy the nation by elected unqualified politicians. Many a Fascist or Communist dictatorship was established in democracies with lies and vague promises, and look how that has turned out! Controlled Democracy resolves this flaw by preventing such radical and destructive thoughts from entering the system with the use of heavy government propaganda to tell the people what is best for them, and ensuring that all the political parties in the nation agree with and support the long term strategies of the nation. Free and fair elections are still held, but the results will never challenge the overarching goals of the nation, no matter what that goal is. There is opposition to Controlled Democracy, namely that elections are seen as a sham, and it's basically an authoritarian system in the disguise of a democracy. Of course, the people who say such things are those that would undermine and destroy the nation, so why should we care what they say?



* 1. **Stratocracy**Stratocracy is a form of government centered around military service. Military forces control all branches of government, but unlike other military governments, it is not entirely undemocratic. Both active service members and honorably discharged veterans have a voice in the direction of the government, and all that one has to do to earn political power is serve loyally. Rather than involving a suspension of the constitution, stratocracies often have constitutions in laws explicitly supporting the military's role in society. Though stratocracies do not by nature have to be oligarchic or autocratic, they often end up as such due to the necessities of military rule. Stratocracies that do not take care to maintain their meritocratic characteristics usually become regular military dictatorships, and the civilian government and armed forces separate, not always peacefully. This fusion of military and democratic governance is exceedingly rare, and comes about through a combination of meritocratic beliefs and sustained military pressure, such as through war or domestic conflict. This rarity should not be mistaken for weakness, however. A stratocracy is legion, and a legion conquers.



* 1. **Oligarchy**Oligarchy, derived from the greek words oligos, few, and arkho, to rule, represents a government where power rests in the hands of a small group of people. They may be separated from the general population because of their wealth, education, military or political control, or in some cases, a minority group that maintains control of the majority. This form of government can be backed up by law, either under the guise of an emergency or transitional government, or through illegal or secret means. Although some oligarchal states pass power down hereditarily, this does not ring true for every oligarchy government. An oligarchy can arise from many different circumstances. For instance, over time power can become concentrated in the hands of the elite through continued enfranchisement of the upper class, until the wealthy dominate all aspects of government, either overtly or covertly. Or perhaps after a coup d'etat, a victorious general works to entrench the power of his clique or the military in general over the population. Although one oligarchy state can be vastly different from the other in terms of what group is in power, they all usually exert heavy control over the populace. Civil liberties are usually limited, and voting at any level is usually restricted. However, exceptions can be found in states where some form of sham democracy, whether a sham by intention or by effect, exists. These sham elections may allow for a veneer of democracy, but ultimately the average person has no control over their leaders.



* 1. **Solidarism**Solidarism is the ideology promoted by the Vyatka-based National Union of Solidarists. Violently rejecting communism, it aims to provide a twentieth-century basis for dealing with present-day issues, rejecting a purely materialistic approach to socio-economic and political problems, and promoting inter-class solidarity, brotherhood, Christian tolerance, and charity. They also claim to promote democratic participation in government (with or without a Russian monarch), individualism, and civil liberties. Their end goal is to bring about a Second Revolution that is "neither left nor right but at the front" and will rebirth Russia without returning to Bolshevik or Tsarist errors. Its critics, on the other hand, argue that it displays a predisposition towards a corporatist organization of society and an overfriendliness to the prospect of a "temporary" dictatorship in order to bring about their desired "moral and spiritual regeneration". To these critics, solidarism is alarmingly similar to Italian fascism, as well as the corporatism practiced in Salazarist Portugal and the former State of Austria pre-Anschluss.



* 1. **Military mandate**Military Mandates are regimes where the nation is governed by a foreign military power, and almost always led by a high-ranking military officer. Almost always the result of invasion or annexation, military mandates tend to be authoritarian, and preoccupied with eliminating local resistance. Military mandates can be temporary structures, designed merely to protect a strategic region, facilitate annexation, or help smoothly transition into a new regime. With complete control of government given to a foreign military power, there tends to be little civilian representation in these regimes, and they often are dominated by that foreign government's interests and ambitions. These military mandates rarely, if ever, have any true independence. If their masters demand they endanger the stability of their regime in order to comply with orders, they will follow those orders. If their masters demand they dismantle their regime and return home, they'll do exactly that. Regardless of their support amongst the local populace, military mandates live and die by the competency of their soldiers and officers. An incompetent regime quickly becomes a massive resource drain for the occupying power, quickly becoming counterproductive to their initial purpose. However, even a powerful military can crumble if they fail to adapt to their conditions, and the demands of the people. With the increasing prominence of asymmetrical warfare, and the current status quo crumbling, many of these military mandates must prepare for the coming storm.



* 1. **Neoconservatism**Born out of classical liberal economics, conservative moral values, and hawkish foreign policy, Neoconservatism combines what its adherents think are the best aspects of every ideology. They come from a multitude of backgrounds: some are disillusioned "liberals mugged by reality," others are conservative scholars who think modern moral relativism leads to destructive nihilism, and some are pragmatic government officials who want to aggressively oppose the global spread of fascism. Against all odds, they have found common ground and developed a compatible worldview. Neoconservatism holds that the highest form of government is the liberal democracy, as embodied in nations like the United States of America. These free nations have the moral obligation to propagate democracy at every opportunity, as well as fight the influence of totalitarian fascism or communism They are heavily influenced by "containment theory," which advocates actively countering fascism or communism at every opportunity, and condemn détente as capitulation to tyranny. Economically, neoconservatives reject standards of both traditional conservatism and liberalism. Although they are fine with deficit spending and are not rabidly opposed to "big government," they nonetheless believe in the necessity of free market capitalism, and oppose any and all barriers to free international trade. Their social policies are rather standard for conservatives, with their endorsement of religion and other traditional institutions as the bedrock of a moral society.



* 1. **Dixiecrat**A Dixiecrat (a portmanteau of 'Democrat' and 'Dixie') is a complex description of the various factions and figures in the American South who were originally members of the Democratic Party, but who, for one reason or another, have fled to the National Progressive Party as its right-most wing. Originally coined by a journalist during the 1948 Presidential campaign to describe Richard Russell of Georgia's States Rights' Party, it has now become the go-to term for the NPP's southern wing. Divided and highly fragmented on economic grounds, with many Dixiecrats adhering to either rural populist traditions of figures like Huey Long, Thomas Watson, and Benjamin Tillman, or traditional liberal or conservative economics, they are united in their dislike of civil rights and federal intervention in 'home affairs'. Depending on the candidate, the Dixiecrat base can range from white workers, southern industrialists and business owners, social conservatives, and the traditional agricultural barons that continue to control the South a century after the Civil War. Many are haunted by the stories of post-Civil War Reconstruction, and are intent on using their collective power on all levels of government to maintain segregation -- one way, or another.



* 1. **Corporate paternalism**Even within polites that operate for the benefit of its investors and corporate mavens above all else, most corporatocracies maintain the form of a nation-state for external convenience, its successes built on the back of its people - its 'employees,' bereft of a voice in the machine that profits from their labor. An emerging heterodox school of thought among the corporate elite challenges the notion that capital should solely be an exploitative enterprise in opposition to labor. Proponents emphasize the benefits of stability over profit provided by reflecting the demands of labor in business decisions to a 'reasonable' extent, arguing that a content workforce is more productive in the longer term. While this model of industrial relations is not uncommon in capitalist societies, the unique circumstances of a polity centered around corporations inevitably means this economic theory carries significant political implications. The advocates of this theory envision a more expansive role of the government in providing public services to the nascent 'citizen-employee', in exchange for their labor and a continued acceptance of corporations and market forces dominating public life.



* 1. **Social credit**Social Credit is an economic theory developed by British engineer Clifford H. Douglas after World War I. In the 1920s, he argued that economic depressions were caused by arbitrary discrepancies between the market prices of goods, the costs of their production and the wages of those who produced them. Essentially, he noticed that businesses were arbitrarily selling the prices of their manufactured goods far higher than their workers could actually afford. Because of this artificial scarcity created in the pursuit of profit, the workers' lives suffered and economies were hindered by lower consumer spending. To remedy this, Douglas called for governments to distribute money, or "social credit", to consumers in order to close the gap between production and their own purchasing power so that consumer spending could rise and drive economic growth. In Canada, Douglas's economic theories have been synergized with Christian fundamentalism to form a right-wing populist political programme. The Social Credit Party worships individualism and private enterprise almost as much as they worship Christ. They call for a vast expansion of the money supply through providing direct lines of credit to consumers and producers and decry the national debt as a tool used by international bankers to loot the economy for profit. While championing free markets, they are far less keen on free moral choice. They are rabid opponents of counter-culture movements and believe their conservative interpretation of Christianity should be upheld as Canada's official religion. Some members of the party even praise the economic policies of the Iberian Caudillos and the late Duce of Italy, and progressive Canadians dread discovering where Social Credit will take their nation.



* 1. **kemalism**Kemalism, as the name suggests, is based around the ideals of the Turkish Republic's founding figure, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Born as a rejection of the perceived backwardness of the late Ottoman period, Kemalists seek to create and preserve a modern Turkish nation-state based on six guiding ideals; republicanism, populism, nationalism, laicism, statism and reformism. Kemalism has historically held a tenuous relationship with democratic principles, having served the official ideology of both elected and unelected governments. The principle of Turkish nationalism has been increasingly emphasised in the years following the Second World War, largely as an overture towards the fascist powers of Europe, and a countermeasure against the far-right at home.



* 1. **Semi constitutional monarchy**As absolute monarchism has fallen out of favor over the world in favor of a constitutional equivalent, a different alternative has also manifested. While in most constitutional monarchies, the power has been delegated to officials, executive, and legislative state organs, this is not the case in a Semi-Constitutional Monarchy. Within this system, checks on their power are few, and often symbolic in practice, leaving monarchs who wield significant power over the government, be it executive or legislative. Semi-Constitutional Monarchies have often been driven by monarchs themselves, who wish to moderate their image, and simultaneously not give up their existing power. While not as unrestrained as an absolute monarchy, there ultimately remains little in place that can effectively challenge them, leaving nations at the mercy of the monarchy they have no means of removing.



* 1. **Dominant party democracy**Sometimes, a political party is not just a political party. Often times, in periods of great upheaval or change, political and otherwise, a party will emerge alongside it, representing the new way of doing things without any true competition as the country changes dramatically. It's possible, in times like these, that the political party can travel with the tide and emerge with a near-monopoly on power, even in systems that include democratic systems and traditions. It is not that there is a lack of other parties or ideologies, but that it has been difficult or impossible for them to gain enough in the way of traction or foundations to challenge the establishment. As a result, any meaningful pluralism of politics and ideas takes place within the party's halls itself, rather than necessarily by way of democratic discourse, a fact that only serves to make ending the system all the less likely. This entrenchment and institutionalization of power is often aided by the very foundation and democratic structure of a country, which is shaped to favor it. But these institutional methods act as a mere safeguard, in case the primary means of maintaining control falls through. The truly key component of dominant-party systems is that the power is not something that must be maintained by micromanagement of the political situation, devious schemes to subvert the will of the people, or by sheer force of political or military might. The party itself has become such a fundamental fact of life in the politics and everyday lives of the people, that most of them would never dream of voting for anyone else. Whether driven by true belief or cynical acceptance, many have simply embraced the party's sheer pervasiveness as a fact of life, unchanging and unassailable.



* 1. **Peronism**As the world's attention was occupied with the fall of London and Moscow, Colonel Juan Perón magnanimously accepted an apparent demotion to the most recondite corner of Argentine ministerial politics: the Secretary of Labor and Prevention. The move, however, was a calculated attempt to achieve Perón's overarching vision: saving Argentina from the spectre of communism, by ensuring that its working class and its trade unions would be integrated into the political system as an estate of the realm. In the course of accomplishing this, Colonel Perón's movement absorbed wildly different ideological currents: Socialists, Conservatives, Catholic Liberals, and Fascists; all congreated around the rising figure of Perón, and their views seeped into the virgin mold of the ideology of which he would become the namesake. Which particular facet of Peronism is most prominent on any given day is ultimately the Colonel's decision. Years of manoeuvring in and out of government have, however, distorted and stretched the definition virtually beyond recognition. Insofar as Peronism - or Justicialism, its technical name - still retains any recognizable characteristics beyond its vagueness, its exaltation of the unwashed masses against the decadence of oligarchy, its predilection for economic nationalism, and its adoration for trade unions, are just about all that remains. Of course, this raises the possibility that said characteristics, and by implication Peronism, could outlive its creator in an organized form, the extreme personalism of the movement notwithstanding.



* 1. **Provisional government**The horrors of war do not simply fade away when conflict passes, they remain as scars, continuing to haunt nations as they descend to chaos and their regimes collapse. Emerging from these ruins is the provisional government. Serving to restore order and the rule of law after extended periods of turmoil, the relative serenity that arrives with these temporary governments is often cheered on by the people as a soothing comfort in comparison to the near-anarchic conditions of the previous era brought on by never-ending war or the volatility and violence that comes with revolutions. The discord of the past is often discarded off in favour of renewed national dialogue, as the regime begins to define the legal structure of the subsequent permanent government. The regime partakes in a long struggle of rebuilding: reviving institutions eroded by neglect and corruption, clarifying laws; assessing the damage sustained by the nation, and both literally and figuratively dealing with the messes and troubles that remain from the former regime's administration through programs of political and economic reconstruction in hopes of restoring any sense of normality to a nation shaken to its core and its accompanying citizenry.



* 1. **Right wing populism**Populism, unlike what some may think, is a two-edged sword. While it can serve the interests of the left by appealing to the common people's desire for equality and social justice, it can also be used by the right as a tool to get in power, which makes it difficult to categorise as a coherent ideology: however, one can always still try. Right-Wing Populism, as such, is an ideology with a few identifiable core tenets: first, an emphasis on an anti-elites rhetoric; said elites are portrayed as corrupt and greedy, and are opposed to the common man. Unlike left-wing populism, however, such elites can be used to represent national or ethnic minorities as well. Right-wing populism is also keen on giving out welfare to the people, at the cost of disregarding the wellbeing of the economy. Right-wing populists, while economically populist, generally take a conservative stance on social issues, and quite a few are avowedly anti-communist. Such a combination of attributes could be thought to be a recipe for disaster, but it seems that the tidal wave of populism has started its march nonetheless; and for now, God only knows when it will die down.



* 1. **Xunzheng**Dr. Sun Yat-sen set up three stages for China's transition to democracy; Xunzheng, KMT-guided politics, is the final step of preparation for the eventual democratization. Under Xunzheng, though the Kuomintang remains the de jure ruling party, limitations on public gatherings are eased, and non-Kuomintang parties are permitted to have seats and votes in the Legislative Yuan. It is expected that the final stage of democratization - Xianzheng, constitutional politics - will take place once the domestic and foreign situation has been stabilized. The late Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek claimed China had entered the stage of Xunzheng under his rule. But his concept of it was more centralized and authoritarian than had been envisioned; one could say it was merely a façade of legality for his stratocratic rule. Today, with the Republic of China reborn through the efforts of the NPA, Xunzheng shall live up to the true meaning bestowed upon it by Dr. Sun.



1. **Conservative democracy**
   1. **Conservative democracy**Conservative Democracy, known more commonly as Conservatism, is the wing within democratic nations that tends to rely more on tried-and-true ideas, traditional values, and varying degrees of nationalism. Conservatives are generally more opposed to change in both culture and law, and for those changes they do approve of they tend to advocate for more gradual implementation. However, proponents of this ideology differ from more radical traditionalists in that they still believe fervently in some form of democratic process, and believe that the people will choose the path towards traditionalism in elections rather than it being needed to be forced on them by an oppressive regime. Conservatives like these will usually concede defeat if they are defeated by a vote and are more willing to work with other parties and ideologies.



* 1. **Agrarianism**Farmers and the peasantry have long occupied a prominent place in the political imagination. They are often viewed in romantic terms as simple and hard-working people of the soil. Unlike the workers who toil away in the factories or the academics who study in their ivory towers, rural farmers are free people untainted by the corruption of urban life. Advocating an eclectic and occasionally contradictory series of positions, agrarian parties center themselves around this idealized image. They tend to be anti-regulation but pro-environment, supporters of traditional family structures but advocates of radical democratic reform. Agrarians are often deeply skeptical of socialism, fascism, and unfettered capitalism alike. While agrarianism has roots everywhere, it is most influential among the Nordic states where it represents a "third way" between political extremes.



* 1. **Paternalistic conservatism**Some societies aspire to be egalitarian, ensuring that everyone has an equal voice to affect the world around them. Others aspire for hierarchy, hoping to ensure that each social class recognizes their place in society and works hard to fulfill the duties of their position. Paternalistic conservatism represents the latter of these types. Preoccupied with concepts such as duty and honor, paternalistic conservatism argues that the privileged members of a society are the most capable of caring for the poor and destitute around them. They encourage humanitarianism and private charity, viewing elites as benevolent actors able to ensure that those below them have access to economic opportunity. Although they support social safety nets and other forms of government intervention to guarantee good working conditions for the poor, they strongly oppose anything resembling a command economy. Instead, they aspire to use elites to balance the interests of the individual and the state, hoping that it promotes stability for all.



* 1. **Liberal conservatism**In a world filled to the brim with radicals, extremists, and vagabonds, the rational man is perhaps humanity's greatest hope. It takes discipline and a strong will to maintain the values of democracy, that brilliant idea which was forged on the hills of Athens, and the Liberal Conservatives are those strong willed and disciplined people. Unlike pure conservatives, these people are more open to social change in their society, as long as it can be tempered and controlled by the powers that be. They generally support the free market capitalist system, although individual practitioners might want to see more or less state intervention in the economy. As of now, liberal conservatism finds its strongholds in the Organization of Free Nations, as well as in some of the unaligned democracies of Africa, Latin America, and Asia. Whether or not these moderates will be able to survive the rest of the 20th century, with all of its absolutist violence, is yet to be seen.



* 1. **Christian democracy**Christian Democracy is founded on two pillars of thought: that it's the duty of those that believe in God to help the people, and that democracy is the best form of government there is. Beyond this foundation, there is next to no set standard of what is Christian Democracy, and there are many beliefs and ideas on how to go about it. Some parties are opposed to both of the "materialist" ideologies of Capitalism and Socialism, while others support a social market economy that supports free market economics with a strong government supported safety net and regulations. Other parties claiming to be Christain Democratic can be seen as either conservative or liberal depending on the country and history. Or they can straddle the line: maybe they are center-left on economic issues and civil rights, while center-right on cultural, social and moral issues. Christian Democracy can be almost any denomination, though most are Catholic or some variation of Protestantism. While the European home of the original Christian Democratic movements such as Germany, Austria and Belgium are now held in the tight grasp of anti-religious Nazism, there is a flourishing Christian Democratic movement in Latin America, and hope that someday a democracy that is humble, moral and blessed will return to Europe.



* 1. **Islamic democracy**The Qur'an lays out many rules and teachings which believers are encouraged to follow, but the functions of government and their relation to the faith has always been a source of great debate among Muslims. In the modern era, particularly in the face of foreign colonization, some have sought answers in the great caliphs of days gone past, arguing that governments of strength will drive out the colonizers from the Holy Land and bring about a new Islamic golden age. Others, however, are not so keen on these ideas, and this is where the concept of "Islamic Democracy" has emerged. A generally conservative ideology, Islamic democracy seeks to combine Islamic religious principles and representative forms of governance. As with any democratic tradition, there is much arguing as to what exactly a 'democratic system' should look like, with the added context of how such a system would relate to an Islamic society. Most Islamic democrats are Sunni, but the ideology is not exclusive to any religious tradition within Islam.



* 1. **Populist conservatism**There is a stereotype about conservatives. The stodgy, stubborn, unwavering moralist is an everpresent figure in the minds of all sorts of people- both on the far left and the far right. But there is another prominent type of conservative, and in many ways they are the exact opposite of the common sentiment. Rowdy, tenacious, and fiercely pragmatic in their crusade to maintain the spirit of their nation and people, the Conservative Populist is a fiery figure on par with any socialist rabblerouser or fascist provocateur. Often, these brands of conservatives are not only not averse to passing reform, but they're even fully on board with passing certain reforms that help the common man in direct ways. These reforms, however, are always geared towards curtailing radical sentiment and ensuring the survival of the status quo in whatever form they can manage. As such, Conservative Populists tend to do the best among rural populations, where both a respect for tradition but also understanding and reacting to the day-to-day struggles of the everyman in a timely and competent fashion is respected equally. When properly mobilized, this bloc of support can be one of the strongest in most nations, and Populists of this bent are often derided as demagogues and hellraisers for exactly this reason..



* 1. **Revisionist zionism (conservative democracy)**The logical counterbalance to Labor Zionism, Revisionist Zionism is a center-to-far-right ideology, made to counterbalance the, in its eyes, 'Bolshevization' of Theodor Herzl's Zionist dream. Revisionist Zionism seeks to 'revise' the Zionism of the political establishment - specifically, in terms of the territory of the future state of Israel. While many Labor Zionists compromise with a two-state solution, or a state 'merely' spanning the borders of Palestine, Revisionist Zionists champion a larger state, with even moderates seeking the annexation of Transjordan, with some few extremists even arguing for the Biblical borders of Israel - that is, the Nile to the Euphrates. Revisionist Zionism is, for the mainstream, still Democratic, however, with its' founder, Ze'ev Jabotinsky, subscribing to British Liberalism, and the idea that, while Israel is, of course, a Jewish State, Arabs should be free to assimilate and participate in its' electoral systems. The feasibility and morality of this, however, is hotly debated by Zionists both Revisionist and Labor.



1. **Liberal democracy**
   1. **Liberal democracy**Liberal Democracy can trace its roots back to the philosophies of John Locke. Locke first and foremost believed that all people on the planet are entitled to natural rights, consisting of life, liberty, and property. He also believed that citizens create a social contract with the nation they live in, defining the state as something that exists solely to protect its citizenry, and must use its powers to do so. Therefore, a nation can only rule from the consent of the governed and must use their position to protect and advance the rights of the people. Liberalism sprouts from the idea that social progress and equality can be brought upon not by violence and revolution, but instead through the creation of laws and policies. These liberals believe in the democratic process, and are willing to work with political enemies in order to achieve their goals, including universal suffrage, universal education, property rights, and the advancement of marginalized populations. Alongside this, they strongly support capitalism and free trade while also believing that governmental oversight is necessary for a healthy economy and safe populace. Due to the rise of fascism and other right-wing extremist ideologies, many free nations have drifted towards liberalism, and many people see it as the most sane way to counteract such a dramatic shift in the world.



* 1. **National liberalism**Originating in the continental European democratic movements of the 19th century, National Liberalism is a synthesis of liberal political theory with nationalist philosophy on the integrity of the nation-state. It retains liberalism's emphasis on individual and economic freedom, but stresses that the continued health of the two is predicated on continued, unthreatened national sovereignty. National Liberal theory can manifest in anti-immigration and economically protectionist policy, but also in support for limited industrial planning and state subsidies for critical economic sectors. National Liberal praxis, however, is not tightly bound by strict ideological tenets. Because National Liberal theory orbits the salient concerns of sovereignty and liberty, subservient policy areas can be reoriented in their defense. Protectionist economic policy can sometimes give way to free trade agreements, and industrial planning to free enterprise, if doing so is considered conducive to the maintenance of state sovereignty and individual liberty.



* 1. **Christian progressivism**Christian Progressivism is a form of Christian Democracy in which a heavy amount of emphasis is put upon the ideals of justice, tolerance and the need to care for the poor and oppressed as preached by Jesus Christ. It differs from most other forms of Christian Democracy by virtue of a greater impetus for social change, as opposed to a call for conservatism, though it still maintains the belief that Democracy is the best means of achieving Christian values. Oftentimes, it seeks to interpret Christianity through the lens of modern knowledge, science and ethics, as opposed to those held at the time of the writing of the scriptures. In terms of economic policy, Christian Progressivism is usually in the center, though it can lean further to the left or to the right depending on the specific application. Socially, Christian Progressivism is usually center-left, being especially likely to be so on issues such as Civil Rights. However, Christian Progressives can often lean conservative on certain issues due to the fact that the ideology is still heavily based on Christian thought. Christian Progressivism also tends to place more weight on Christian values and morality, as opposed to adherence to specific Christian doctrine.



* 1. **Liberal radicalism**Something of a relic of the past, the concept of Radicalism holds its roots in the days of the French Revolution in specific and the Enlightenment in general, and has kept itself close to those roots moreso than the adherents of other liberal ideologies. To the Radical, the ideals of democracy, secularism, and the development and advancement of human rights come before all other priorities. As the world continued on into the 20th century, things began to change as more and more radical ideologies took center stage. As first Marxist, and then later Fascist, ideologies began to overwhelm the continents of Europe and Asia, many strains of liberalism began to shift and evolve as reactions to the changing tides. In the 40's, Italy's and Germany's utter and complete victories over the democracies of Western Europe looked to be the deathknell of their ideology, but twenty years later, one can see that has not been the case. After the stagnations and failures of Italy and Germany in the 1950's, people began to look for answers once more, and a renewed faith in Enlightenment ideals has taken root in many parts of the world, especially in the West. A torch once thought snuffed out has been lit once more, and has been raised to the heavens as many call for a return to the virtues liberty, equality, and brotherhood.



* 1. **Revisionist zionism (liberal democracy)**The logical counterbalance to Labor Zionism, Revisionist Zionism is a center-to-far-right ideology, made to counterbalance the, in its eyes, 'Bolshevization' of Theodor Herzl's Zionist dream. Revisionist Zionism seeks to 'revise' the Zionism of the political establishment - specifically, in terms of the territory of the future state of Israel. While many Labor Zionists compromise with a two-state solution, or a state 'merely' spanning the borders of Palestine, Revisionist Zionists champion a larger state, with even moderates seeking the annexation of Transjordan, with some few extremists even arguing for the Biblical borders of Israel - that is, the Nile to the Euphrates. Revisionist Zionism is, for the mainstream, still Democratic, however, with its' founder, Ze'ev Jabotinsky, subscribing to British Liberalism, and the idea that, while Israel is, of course, a Jewish State, Arabs should be free to assimilate and participate in its' electoral systems. The feasibility and morality of this, however, is hotly debated by Zionists both Revisionist and Labor.



* 1. **Market liberalism**Market Liberalism was, at one point and time, the largest strain of political thought in the West. Whether it was the Liberals of Great Britain, the Republicans in America, or the Radical Liberals of France, it dominated the West under its most three most famous policies: free speech, free election, and free trade. Now, though, Market Liberalism has to contend with alternate ideas from both the right and the left, believing that it has been unwilling to deal with the human cost of its ideas. But it's adherents are still many, especially in the Americas. Believing in a government that does not intervene in the economy or in the private space of its citizens, Market Liberalism seeks to create a society that ensures that every man can become successful, with a little hard work and ingenuity. Practically, this means lowering taxes, eliminating trade barriers, and ensuring an 'equal playing field' for everyone. Sometimes, however, Market Liberals are willing to intervene in the economy for the sake of increasing economic development, such as subsidies and tax credits. Believing in the sanctity of the free market, Market Liberals believe that a 'rising tide can raise all ships', regardless of whether those ships are poor or rich.



1. **Social democracy**
   1. **Social democracy**Social Democracy is an umbrella term covering leftist movements that still wish to operate within a mostly capitalist framework. Proponents of Social Democracy still believe in markets, the ability of an individual to run a business and manage others as employees, and in the freedom to earn and spend money, while also advocating for vast social programs like welfare, free and public healthcare, shelter for the homeless, and good minimum wages among many others. While decidedly on the left end of the political spectrum, followers of Social Democracy and those of other leftist ideologies like Communism and traditional Socialism generally dislike each other, and they rarely intermingle or work together. Social Democrats do not advocate for the revolution and radical rebuilding of the system that their further-left counterparts do, and are more accepting of various other democratic ideologies.



* 1. **Демократический социализм**Democratic Socialism covers those who believe that socialism and democracy can not only be established, but that the establishment of one cannot be established without the other. Socialism and democracy are one and the same, no more capable of being removed than lyrics from a song, or rhythm from a poem. Democratic socialism thus places a high value upon democracy in both the workplace and in government, with all believing in a minimum input from workers in the production of goods and services. Typically, democratic socialists believe in a decentralized or market socialist economy, with a mix of both nationalized companies and small, private workers cooperatives and syndicates. Democratic socialism is typically reformist Marxism in nature, although it is not unheard of for revolutionaries to use the term. This particular strain of socialism was pioneered by European Social Democratic parties in the 19th and early 20th century, with a major base of support being unions, workers, and middle to upper middle class intellectuals. While social democracy gradually turned towards a regulated form of welfare capitalism, democratic socialists still maintain a loyalty to the creation of a socialist state based on human rights and democratic voting.



* 1. **Progressivism**A moderate response to the excesses of capitalism, Progressivism, composed of moderate social democrats and center left progressives, intends to be a middle ground between social liberalism and social democracy, with a focus on economic efficiency, a moderate welfare state, and a major focus on social justice. Pragmatic and willing to compromise, Progressivism believes in gradual change over time, with a focus on making capitalism more humane while allowing for its best aspects to shrine through. Progressivism believes in allowing room for the free market to take over while maintaining a welfare state intended to catch those who would fall through the cracks. Rather than focusing on economic equality, Progressivism intends to fight against institutional problems that harm equality of opportunity. Racism, sexism and other 'isms' are the main enemy of Progressivism, who believe that it is the government's place to protect the weak. Economically, Progressivism believes that government management is inefficient and that, rather, the private market, with public oversight, could be beneficial to both parties. This extends to matters of infrastructure, healthcare, and even basic government operations. With this efficiency, poverty can be eliminated through saved welfare spending and opportunities for a better life.



* 1. **Left wing populism**As the popular masses work all over the world in search of riches, hoping that they someday will attain the level of their masters; as inequality and hunger ravages even in developed countries; as the elites enrich themselves off the backs of the people, some people stand up and say "No". No to poverty, no to hunger, and most of all no to wealth disparity, for injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. Left-Wing Populism is the umbrella under which these people fall, although it is not an coherent ideology as much as it is a broad movement: combining anti-elites and left-wing rhetoric with populistic economic measures, those who claim an affiliation to it style themselves as the defenders of the "common people", opposing the economic elites and the establishment who oppress the poor and the little man. However, it is not too rooted in socialist theory, generally eschewing Marx or Lenin in favor of James Connolly or Léon Blum, and its most radical part is quite often its rhetoric, calling for the uprooting of the political and economic elites and for a fairer and juster society made by and for the people. And with a lot of effort and a tad of luck, such a society might even come true.



* 1. **Left kemalism**In prior decades, Kemalism held an almost monolithic presence within Turkish politics, encompassing left, right and centre. However, in recent years, Turkey's right flank has steadily drifted away from Kemalism's desire to emulate Western notions of progress, largely due to Kemalist prohibitions on religious expression and growing support for a model inspired by the fascist powers. As a response, many Kemalists have decided to emphasise the progressive aspects of their ideology and Atatürk's legacy, seeking to realign Kemalism to the left of centre, with a much greater commitment to social welfare. Emphasising populism and reformism, as opposed to their more nationalism-oriented orthodox cousins, Left Kemalists continue to espouse a Turkish national identity which may remain alienating towards certain minority groups.



* 1. **Labor zionism**"A land without a people for a people without land." Labor Zionism is the primary wing of the Zionist Movement as well as its left wing; it incorporates both socialist and nationalist elements in the attempt to merge a new Jewish national identity. This is done mainly through the use of both urban trade unions, most notably the Histadrut, which the majority of Jewish workers belong to, and the Kibbutzim, a rural commune that many a Labor Zionist will proudly boast of as the closest humanity has come to achieving true socialism. While initially many categorized the native Palestinians as "Shela Neelama" - the Hidden Question - modern Labor Zionists are split on how to best solve the "Palestinian Issue," with many advocating for an equitable and free two-state solution where both peoples may enjoy their right to self determination. A minority advocate for drastic measures such as expulsion of the Palestinians, who they see as lacking a concrete national identity and instead having an almost generic 'Arab' one, from the land of Israel. A smaller minority still advocates for confederation with their neighbors. Regardless, Labor Zionism remains defined by a simple creed : Zionism first, Socialism second.



* 1. **Popular front**United we stand, divided we fall. No ideology exemplifies this so clearly as the Popular Front. Most typically drawn from a very, very broadly leftist set of ideologies, the Popular Front can include support from hardcore, insurrectionist communists all the way to democratic liberals and everything in between. Sometimes, in extreme cases, it can even include conservatives in the mix, though that is certainly a rarity. Often, these temporary arrangements are made when there is a significant shift in the status quo, or the threat of such a shift in some cases, and those opposed put aside their differences to fight against it, whether that be electorally, with armed conflict, or by other means. The concept of the Popular Front is as broad in its application as it is in its composition. The Front is usually forged first by finding some bare minimum ground, often of the moral variety, upon which to oppose the nascent threat. In other instances, a common matter of policy or ideology provides the adhesive element that keeps the Popular Front united, if the Front itself might lean more socialist or more liberal in its composition. And then its strategy is solidified, whether it is an agreement to vote in accordance with one another, or to support one another in terms of direct action and conflicts in the streets. The sheer variety of applications of the Popular Front, as it should be clear, makes it hard to define precisely. As such, it may not be considered much of an ideology at all, so much as a strategy that parties and groups of parties pursue to advance their ideologies.



* 1. **Social radicalism**"While many in the liberal sphere have utterly rejected Marxist principles and the ideologies that it spawned, others have found common ground on many of its more reasonable points. Equality is a common value between both the radicals and the socialists, after all, and much ground has yet to be gained until true equality is reached. While mainstream Radicalism will reject all socialists and socialist philosophy wholesale as a matter of principle, it is the Social Radical who finds common ground with them, reaching for their mutual goals and putting aside historical rivalries to do so. Above all else, the Social Radical aims for the establishment of equality, an end to want, and the elevation of social programs to aid in the former two ambitions. They are willing to make whatever compromises are necessary to end inequality in whatever forms it takes. Many further to their right call them idealistic, naive even, and those further to their left call them unimaginative, lacking in ambition or true dedication to the cause they profess. Despite this disdain they receive from both ends of the political spectrum, Social Radicalism continues to plow its own road ahead, to finish the work that the Enlightenment had started.



1. **Socialism**
   1. **Socialism**Socialism is a lot of different things, depending on who you ask. Whether revolutionary or reformist, and whether marxist or utopian, it is and always has been of many different shapes. One thing remains, however: it is an ideology by the people, for the people. One of the main characteristics of socialism is, of course, the social ownership of the means of production. While it may either be introduced gradually over time or more immediately in the case of a revolution, it is one of its stated goals, as adherents of the ideology believe that it is a way to create a juster, fairer economy, built for the many instead of for the few. Also important to socialism is the establishment of workplace democracy, giving the worker a say in how his business operates, and it is often coupled with a greater-than-usual emphasis on political democracy, whether it be electoral or soviet. Socialism has been, through the ages, equally praised as it has been reviled. And yet, it marches on. Despite the hardships, and despite the setbacks, socialism continues its almost unrelenting course, aiming to free the worker and the common man from the tyranny of capitalism.



* 1. **Anarcho communism**From the streets of Barcelona to the fields of China, anarchism is as tenacious and as stubborn as a rat. It would seem, at least on the surface, that anarchism is like a hydra- for every anarchist that is killed, imprisoned, or 'disappeared', two more will pop up in their place. But why? Anarcho-Communism is a radical left-wing ideology that is contrasted to more standard socialist ideologies like Marxism and democratic socialism by its strong opposition to authority, which it claims as synonymous with the evils of capitalism. Anarcho-communists are also notable for their distaste for large-scale industrialization, preferring to rely on local communes and farms for production. Anarcho-communists have had several brief moments of relative power, most notably with Nestor Makhno's Free Territory in Ukraine in 1920. But just as anarcho-communist societies are united behind common goals, they are also divided by almost everything else. Infighting, chaos and confusion are present in all anarcho-communist societies, and this usually leads to their downfall. Modern Anarcho-Communism began with the works of thinkers like Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Mikhail Bakunin in the mid-1800s. Seeking the total destruction of all forms of oppression, from capitalism to racism to the state itself, anarcho-communists exist in their own political bubble- scorned by the left and hated by the right. Nonetheless, Anarcho-Communism serves as a beacon of hope for any who have been cast aside by the existing system. One can be sure that no matter how dark and authoritarian the world becomes, anarchists will be hiding in the shadows, waiting for their opportunity to spring forth and realize their cries of 'no gods, no masters.'



* 1. **Christian socialism**Christian Socialism is a broad umbrella term to describe all beliefs that combine the moral teachings of Jesus Christ with the economic theory of left-wing ideologues. This mix spiritualism and materialism may seem like an oxymoron at first glance, but that has not stopped thinkers and theologians from synthesizing the two. They consider themselves to be just as devout as any other Christian, and they reject Marxist beliefs that religion is an "opiate of the masses" that is ultimately incompatible with the goal of revolution. Although many argue that socialism is inherently hostile to Christianity, Christian socialists argue that it is actually capitalism that is incompatible: they consider it to be akin to idolatry, a cult of the Almighty Dollar that encourages greed and condemns charity. They turn to the Bible to both support their viewpoints, pointing out that Jesus said "One cannot serve both God and wealth," as well as how the earliest Christians "held everything in common" and collectively shared their possessions. Only collectivist social policies, they say, can stay close to Christ's teachings while also helping all those in society.



* 1. **Revolutionary frontism**The Revolutionary Front is, at least in theory, a unified coalition of various different sects, strains and factions of the socialist, communist and anarchist left, all with the intended purpose of gaining institutional and government power to establish socialism. In practice, this means such varying ideologies as Democratic Socialists, who believe in revolution through the ballot box, and authoritarian socialists, who are disgusted with what they describe as 'bourgeois democracy', are expected to cooperate and work together for the advancement of socialism. This, unsurprisingly, can lead to a very incoherent bloc, with actual governing policies being based upon internal compromise or the result of certain factions winning out against others. Typically, the Revolutionary Front is most often seen in places where the political left can only hope to maintain power through a big tent and coalition building, or in places that are under threat from the right wing that seek to undermine the ability for such left parties to exist in the first place. Revolutionary Front leaders are as diverse as their base, and are often instrumental in maintaining the survival of the Front in the first place, if not its actual creator. Whether a Revolutionary Front can survive its leader, however, depends on whether it can learn sacrifice ideological purity for the sake of political (and sometimes literal) survival.



* 1. **Ultravisionary socialism**Since Mankind has first glanced at the celestial dome, it has dreamed of reaching higher than the ground it stands over. For that, mankind has evolved and banded together, reaching ever higher peaks of knowledge, so one day, it could fulfill their existential inheritance. While many would be content to claim that Communism is the next step of human revolution, Ultravisionaries are not content to simply sit on their laurels. A combination of Communism, with a heavy focus on the sciences, Ultravisionarism sees Socialism as not only the next step, but also an aspect of the next stage of human progress: the complete unity of the disciplines and laws of science. The stars could not be farther. Yet, there is glory eternal for those who look ever forward.



* 1. **Agrarian socialism**Unlike Marxist Socialism, which theorizes the driving force of the revolution to be the urban proletariat, Agrarian Socialism places the peasantry at the forefront of the revolution. Mostly popular in scarcely-industrialized, undeveloped states, its ideal society is based on an agrarian vision of society, where the land is owned by the people instead of by a landlord class. Along with a socialistic economic system, and the collective ownership of the means of production, agrarian socialism aims to realise an agrarian utopia, where the farmer toils away happily, for he knows that he truly and finally gets to reap the ripe fruits of his labor. Important to note, however, is that Agrarian Socialism is not an inherently revolutionary ideology: indeed, it can come to power through the ballot box as well as through the barrel of a gun, which makes it a quite broad and adaptable ideology to its supporters. Of course, it is not without its detractors: claims from the left that socialism and true equality cannot be achieved without industrialisation coincide with more "traditional" critiques from the right, which argue against the merits of socialism altogether.



* 1. **Syndicalism**What is socialism? In short, it is the workers' ownership of the means of production, whether directly or through the state. What, then, is more purely socialistic than Syndicalism - the idea that workers wrest from the capitalist class control of society and the economy through the revolutionary action of the general strike, and build a new society on the basis of trade unions directly composed of the workers themselves, with no middleman? Syndicalism argues for direct action - strikes, sabotage of production, and demonstrations - against the capitalist system both to secure better conditions for workers while living under capitalism and to ultimately overthrow and replace it altogether. Though the successes of the October Revolution and other factors sent the syndicalist movement into decline and marginalization, it has never truly gone away; perhaps one day, a new generation of syndicalists will strike fear into the hearts of bourgeoisie and politicians alike as the militants and saboteurs of the early 1900s did.



* 1. **Utopian socialism**The earliest strand of its kind, Utopian Socialism has been used as both a label of endearment and insult by leftists through the years. Originally pioneered in the early 18th and 19th century, Utopian socialism is primarily based upon both a distinct dislike of class conflict and a belief in the perfectibility of mankind and of society in general. Whether it be through the creation of local communes, making industry more efficient through nationalization of certain goods and services, or just simply a moral belief in raising the entire society as a whole through government and local intervention, utopian socialists believe that mankind as a whole can be brought up to a higher standard of living than what capitalism can currently deliver to us. The biggest distinction between utopian socialists and their Marxist cousins is a distinct dislike of class conflict or revolution, believing instead that all classes would be willing to adhere to such a system through convincing. This places it in opposition to the materialistic worldview that Marxism and more pragmatic socialists who intend on creating working class coalitions to win power. While most utopian experiments have failed, many persist in their experiments, believing that, one day, a perfect system of humanity can be created, and that all of mankind can bask in its glory of a newer, better world.



* 1. **Pan-africanism**First springing to life in the early 20th century, Pan-Africanism stands as the product of years of European oppression, from the British to the French to the Germans to a dozen other nations besides. Its proponents reject the idea of individual African nations, socialist or otherwise- instead preaching that, in order to truly stand against European colonizers, Africa must stand united under one banner. Falling on the far-left of the political spectrum, Pan-Africanism can be easily differed from its counterpart in African Socialism by its vanguardist attitude, its emphasis on anti-imperialism, and its staunch adherence to a pan-national identity for what Europe once called the "Dark Continent". While its adherents are primarily found in West Africa- specifically Cameroon- and South Africa as a major part of the ANC, ideologues can be found from Cape Town to Cairo- even gaining traction among Black communities in the United States and the Carribean. Motivated, angry, and aggressive in spreading its influence, those with interests in the region should keep an eye on the Pan-Africanists.



* 1. **Baathism**"One Nation, Bearing an Eternal Message."The brainchild of Michel Aflaq and Zaki al-Arsuzi, Ba'athism is a revolutionary Arab nationalist movement, aimed at creating a 'renaissance' across the Arab world by means of revolution against foreign oppressors. Ba'athist ideology combines notions of pan-Arabism, Arab socialism, and secularism into an ideological platform that aims to mobilize and subsequently unify the whole Arab nation through revolutionary struggle, regardless of faith or region. The Ba'ath party functions as the universal vanguard for the Arab nation, accelerating its development in order to bring about the renaissance into all aspects of life. Its ostensible goals are progress, liberty, and socialism as defined by Aflaq, within a context suited to the Arab world. Dedication to modernization and progress means that the party opposes not only foreign rule but also all the forms of feudal and noble reaction across the Arab world. Liberty in the Ba'athism sense does not necessarily mean liberal parliamentary democracy, as it may subvert the revolution, and socialism here substitutes the Marxist notion of class struggle for a national struggle against colonialism. 'Arab Socialism' is considered an important means of reaching the renaissance, but not its ultimate purpose. In reality, the ideological purity of Ba'athist parties across the Middle East is incredibly varied and intrinsically linked with local culture and tradition, as well as an influx of foreign political theories. The policies followed by the Ba'athist movements range from the rampant militarism of some branches to promises of representative democracy and socialism by others. Their only common goal is the creation of a united Arab state, stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the Arabian Gulf."



* 1. **Left wing nationalism**From the East to the West, from the most developed nation to the least, there arises a new trend in politics of the new age: left-wing nationalism. Espousing left-wing ideals of equality, class consciousness, and the ideal of a socialist modernity, its believers aim to challenge imperialism by fashioning these ideas into a clarion call for self-determination and independence. The proponents of left-wing nationalism transform socialist agitation into a weapon with which to combat either imperialist interference and influence in society. In the Cold War, left-wing nationalism is a wide label: it describes both revolutionary tendencies and electoralist reform; it covers a broad range of adherents, from Europe to Asia, from Africa to America. Despite this wide-ranging appellation, however, they all have something in common: nationalism is not irreconcilable with socialism or socialistic policies, and that self-determination and political independence is a necessary step in achieving equality and liberty.



* 1. **Guevarism**Of all the colorful personalities that took part in the Cuban Revolution, only one ever reached Fidel Castro's international fame - the Argentine Marxist known as Ernesto 'Che' Guevara. His ideas have come to be known as Guevarism. In its current context, Guevarism is an umbrella term for a variety of leftist movements whose chief distinction is their organization around the Revolutionary Coordination Junta and Guevara as a rallying figurehead. Radically breaking from all mainstream communist thought, Guevarism outright rejects the need for any established vanguard party to organize a Marxist revolution. Instead, small fast-moving bands of insurgents act as the vanguard themselves, mimicking Che's own experiences in the Cuban Revolution. Through generating discontent among the peasant class, propagandizing, and guerrilla warfare, the insurgents will put enough pressure on any corrupt and oligarchic political system to stir the populace into armed rebellion. Its fundamentally unifying tenets are an inherent focus on the peasantry and rural areas over the traditional urban workers, armed struggle, internationalism, and a belief in revolutionary willpower - that any group of sufficiently motivated militants will find success. Guevarism has mostly found success in Latin America as the mainstream strand of leftist revolutionary thought, but it lacks a formal doctrine due to its internationalist nature, and in consequence, the many differences in thought within the organizations tied to the Junta.



* 1. **Nasserism**To put it most simply and most incompletely, Nasserism is the ideology of Gamal Abdel Nasser. Like any ideology defined by the dictates of its founder, it is characterized by a certain level of flexibility and a lack of rigidness. However, in spite of this, Nasserism is characterized by three core principles. First is its Pan-Arabism, advocating for a union of Arab republics to secure itself across the Middle East to better protect against incursions from imperialist powers. Nasserism's flavor of Pan-Arabism is also characterized by its secular nature, often putting it into conflict with other grassroot ideologies in the region that are more colored by religious thought, whether it be Islamic, Christian or Jewish. Even if an Arab nation could not be formed, Nasser looks to aid and support the Arab world with only some regard to their own ideology, so as to protect the region as a whole. The second is of course, its simultaneous embrace of socialism and rejection of communism. While self-described communists and their parties are suppressed as it is seen as being at odds with Arab tradition, they wholeheartedly embrace a fluid interpretation of Arab Socialism, most obviously manifesting in a generally anti-capitalist stance and the aggressive nationalization of Egypt's resources. The third is Anti-Imperialism. One could even argue that the first two principles are merely a function of this third principle, when you get right down to it. Nasser's strong anti-imperialist stances are the core motivation for involvement outside of Egypt itself, as well as the populist rallying cry that lends the ideology most of its fervent support. Beyond these broad points, Nasserism is an ideology that has in of itself a great deal of leeway without an orthodoxy to limit its possible allegiances and shifts as the situation demands, whether for Egypt's sake, or Nasser's own.



* 1. **Neocommunism**Neocommunism, originating from Italy's Enrico Berlinguer's PCI, is less of an ideology and more of a collection of distinct revisionist based trends among European nations, with as much variety in specific policy prescriptions as there are differences in each particular nation that eurocommunism has spread to. There are, however, various commonalities that unite them, and that is a belief in peaceful revolution through the ballot box, an explicit opposition to the human rights abuses that other communist regimes have committed, and a recognition that all communist parties have to deal with different circumstances in different countries, as against the Bukharin 'one size fits all' approach. Loyally committed to democracy and the pluralistic rights that come from such traditionally western institutions, Neocommunism criticizes the collapsed Soviet Union under Bukharin as materially incapable of truly satisfying the conditions through which communism could be established, in addition to having its vanguardist ideology undermine the will of the working class. In contrast, Neocommunism seeks to maintain its interests as a vehicle of working class consciousness and power. Revisionist Marxist and reformist in nature, Neocommunism is committed to ending the exploitation of the capitalist system through peaceful means.  
     

1. **Communism**
   1. **Communism**Communism is a polarizing ideology, to say the least. As decried as it is praised, it can safely be said to have been, along with National Socialism, one of the defining ideologies of the 20th century so far. But what exactly is communism? Descended from the thought of Marx and Engels, and claiming the heritage of Lenin's revolution, its end goal is to establish a classless, stateless, humane society based on common ownership of the means of production and free distribution thereof according to one's needs. Its adherents are firm believers in the concept of class struggle, and aim to overthrow the bourgeoisie to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat - a society and government where the working class and the state are synonymous. While some movements believe in electoralism, most strains of communism are fiercely revolutionary, and tirelessly advocate for the coming of said revolution through 'praxis', or direct action. In this regard, they consciously emulate Lenin and reject the prospect of reform or compromise. Of course, critics abound from all sides; from people claiming that human nature is inherently individualistic and selfish, to socialists decrying the means employed to bring about the proletarian dictatorship, communism has no shortage of detractors. And yet, 'Reds' of all stripes fight on, for they know that once the workers of the world unite, they have nothing to lose but their chains.



* 1. **Bukharinism**Bukharinism combines Marxist theory, Lenin's principles on the application of Marxism, and late Soviet leader Nikolai Bukharin's adaptation of both to the material conditions of Soviet Russia. This ideology presupposes that history progresses through a series of developmental stages leading towards communism. In the 'proletarian dictatorship' stage of society - the furthest progress attained so far - the proletariat holds absolute political power, which is exercised through their 'vanguard party'. The Party exercises complete control over all social, political, and economic life in this polity as it guides the proletariat towards a socialist, and eventually communist, society. Chairman Bukharin's original contributions to the Marxist canon include the doctrine of 'Socialism In One Country': the idea that communist states should focus primarily on strengthening themselves and building their own socialist infrastructure as opposed to launching armed revolutions around the world. Simultaneously, he taught that socialism can only truly be developed over a long period of time, and that market economies should provide incentives to build up the nation's productive forces to prepare for a transition to true socialism. This was most clearly embodied in his liberal expansion of the New Economic Policy, to the point of allowing kulak farmers to enlarge the size of their farms and sell agricultural products on the open market, despite the protests of many hardline Bolsheviks. Though Bukharin is most widely known as the man who failed to save the Soviet Union from the Hun, his economic and political theories are still generally accepted as the most orthodox form of communism among its remaining adherents.



* 1. **Stalinism**Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin was one of many contenders to succeed Lenin as leader of the Soviet Union. While agreeing with Bukharin on the principle of "Socialism in One Country", he rejected the market-driven development of the New Economic Policy. Instead, he believed that the State should exercise total control over the economy to spur on rapid development of industrial and agricultural production. Private enterprise could never be trusted to develop a fully socialist state, and therefore all industry and agriculture ought to be collectivized and directed by Communist Party central planners to achieve the Union's goals. A key corollary to this policy is that, far from withering away after the revolution as the old Leninists believed, the State must indeed be strengthened a thousandfold in order to implement a full transition to a communist society. This was heresy to the likes of Bukharin, who would triumph over Stalin in the succession struggle after the latter perished in a tragic industrial accident. Once thought vanquished, Stalin's ideas have been reborn in the West Siberian People's Republic. Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism has found its Apostle in Chairman Lazar Kaganovich, a formerly obscure Soviet official banished to the Urals by Bukharin before the war. He proclaims that Stalinist collectivized industrial development would have allowed Russia to outcompete German industry and push the Hun all the way back to Berlin. Yet, claims Chairman Kaganovich, Soviet Russia can still be restored to its former glory through following Stalin's insights; his most important insight being that the Soviet State must hold absolute power within its borders in order to triumph over its enemies: Hun, Kulak, Collaborator and Class Traitor alike.



* 1. **Left communism**Espousing what they claim to be the most purely Marxist doctrine, Left Communists reject nearly all major political developments that have occurred since the death of Lenin, and even some during his life. This isn't of course to say that they are entirely bound to doctrines as described in the writings of Marx and Engels, but they do seek to remain as close to its spirit as possible, even at the expense of effectiveness in the moment. A rejection of parliamentary politics entirely, a defiance of vanguard party organization and its democratic pretenses, and a firm belief in the revolution as a historical inevitability characterize the Left Communism movement. This adherence to anti-populist attitudes and a focus on theory over praxis inspires no small degree of ridicule from their fellow leftists, but given how well history has treated them so far, Left Communists rarely feel threatened by these "opportunists" as they are often called. Despite stereotypes and criticisms to that effect, Left Communists are not simply idle or lazy, awaiting for an "organic" revolution that will never come. But rather, their preparation involves planning rather than giving grand speeches, learning and studying rather than waving guns and standing on soapboxes. If knowing is half the battle, then the Left Communists have already won. It is, after all, simply a matter of time.



* 1. **Stratocratic communism**Stratocratic Communism arises from both circumstance and ideological drive. Despite loathing of conventional armies being common in the far-left, that sentiment typically dies out once a military apparatus is secured, and nothing has ever barred military men from adhering to that side of politics to begin with. Some men of that sort even indulge in the time-honored tradition of 'theorizing' - and where the ethos of their chosen profession meets Marxist theory, it fuses to create a new mode of thought that few other radical leftists endorse, for reasons which become quite apparent once its tenets are elaborated upon. Foremost of those tenets is stated clearly in its name: the establishment of a revolutionary socialist government composed entirely of military officers and personnel. Detractors call this a cynical power-grab to hijack the revolution, little more than a revisionist junta. Those detractors (prior to their summary execution) would be met by the argument that the armed forces, being assembled from the conscripted proletariat, are the vanguard of the revolution by necessity. Moreover, the regime asserts that perpetual supremacy of the military is paramount to the ultimate triumph of socialism, for if the bourgeoisie cannot be defeated from within, it is the armed workers of the nation who must liberate their oppressed comrades by force. Cries of "Revisionist!" aside, a regime of this type is still ideologically-driven and cannot simply be described as 'apolitical' or a 'junta'. It is committed to communist principles, chief among them absolute control of state, society, and economy by the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. Still, even by the standards of a revolutionary government, Stratocratic Communism is extremely hardline, tolerating no dissent and displaying shameless aggression. Civilian leadership has no place here; only the Revolutionary Army, composed of class-conscious worker-soldiers, can ensure the propagation of the world revolution and the destruction of bourgeois imperialism.



* 1. **Maoism**Unlike Mao Zedong Thought, whose popularity is limited to East Asia, Maoism is an ideology that can be found all around the world. Named and inspired by the Chinese revolutionary Mao Zedong, it is based on his writings and posits him to be the next great Marxist theoretician, following in the footsteps of such figures as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Bukharin. It relies on a doctrine of internationalism and anti-imperialism, but differs from traditional Bolshevism by placing an emphasis on the rural populace instead of the urban proletariat. In its fight against capitalist domination in countries where ruralism is still prevalent, it deems guerilla warfare as the best way to conduct the revolutionary struggle, under the form of a "protracted people's war". Maoism is seen by its supporters as the natural continuation of Marxist thought, and thus as the next stage of Bolshevism: its fundamentally anti-imperialist principles have seen it adopted around the world, as oppressed peoples of all stripes begin take up arm against their oppressors. This new, revolutionary deviation of traditional Marxist thought has begun to make its mark throughout world history.



* 1. **Mao zedong thought**While the Communists may have been defeated in the Second Sino-Japanese War, the ideas of one of their founders, Mao Zedong, have however not disappeared: hiding until the imperial threat falters, waiting for the right moment to strike. Based on the writings Mao wrote during the Long March and his time in the Yan'an Base Area, Mao Zedong Thought borrows elements from a heavily rural-centric form of socialism, but to reduce it as a mere deviation upon it would be a mistake. Calling for revolutionary land reform and for the establishment of a system of New Democracy, adapted to China's conditions, it also advocates for the conducting of a protracted people's war, a type of guerilla warfare which it deems to be the best way to carry out the revolutionary struggle. It is important to note that Mao Zedong Thought can be found quasi-exclusively in Asia and China proper, due to its very specific nature as an ideology: while Mao himself has influenced multiple communist movements around the globe, and is the inspiration for the aptly-named Maoism, Mao Zedong Thought can only be found in East Asia due how integral Mao's contributions to the Chinese Communist Party are.



* 1. **Islamic marxism**Among the five pillars of Islam stands the Zakat, the duty of almsgiving. The responsibility to donate a part of one's income to society's less fortunate, it ensures that even the poorest of the poor can live a decent life. After the beginning of the 20th century, such an altruistic worldview was remarked by some thinkers to be quite close to the ideals of socialism, and one thing led to another as Islamic socialism began to take inspiration from Marx's theses to become Islamic Marxism. Theorized by such thinkers as Ali Shariati, it applies the economical and political systems of marxism into the framework of the Sharia, and tries to enact economic and social equality for all under the guidance of an Islamic state. This means that, unlike more "traditional" socialist ideologies such as Bolshevism, the goals of Islamic Marxism are twofold: materialistic, of course, but also religious. Mostly popular in countries with a majority Muslim population, Islamic Marxism has been making waves in recent years, most notably in Asia and in the Middle East. One could have thought, given the somewhat antireligious nature of Marx's writings, that such an ideology would have already collapsed under the weight of its own contradictions; but for now it shows no signs of decline, and seems poised to live on under the guidance of Allah.



* 1. **Amazonism**Named after João Amazonas, the chief ideologue of the PCdoB, this term describes the ideology held by several Latin American communist movements. Building on the works of Marx and Lenin, Amazonas posits that socialism will not arise naturally from the development of productive forces in Latin America. The capitalist system must be violently overthrown with a drawn-out "people's war" involving rural guerilla warfare of the masses away from population centers. Some analysts would argue that Amazonas' writings are derivative of the Guevarist line, especially in its notions of the importance of a revolutionary will and the "New Man", but Amazonism rejects the decentralization and lack of formal doctrine proposed by Guevara. This rejection comes in the form of support for the ideals of a vanguard party that must organize the revolutionary struggle to truly connect with the masses. Thus, the PCdoB has refused any association with Che's Revolutionary Coordination Junta. Followers of Amazonism firmly reject any association with capitalist powers, seeing it as a sign of betrayal of their anti-imperialist ideals. Amazonas claims that only the vanguard party can awaken the masses and raise their consciousness towards revolutionary zeal. While the PCdoB is small and politically isolated, Amazonas will cooperate with other groups on the left to reach a common goal, even across borders. The party's unwavering support for a rural-based and drawn-out people's war attracts those on the left who seek to rise up in arms against the capitalist forces. Should an authoritarian government seize power in Brazil, the PCdoB's ranks will surely grow, and the Amazonists will step up to lead the fight against all forms of tyranny from the right.



* 1. **Arab communism**Communism has a history in the Middle East that goes back to the days of the Russian Revolution, an ideology adopted and advanced by intelligentsia, workers and the disaffected of the region as early as 1917. The Middle East is an area of the world that has suffered under the heel of European imperialist capitalism in very direct ways starting in the early 20th century, beginning with the carving up of the Ottoman Empire by the victorious Entente after the First World War, and then being upheaved once again by the fascistic Axis after the Second. The attraction to communism in particular is informed by this recent history, and for many, communism forms the crux of resistance against imperialism itself. Much like other regions of the world that have suffered under the thumb of empires, communism in the Middle East began to take on a life and distinction of its own as both grassroots movements and the Arabic intelligentsia put their own spin on traditionally marxist messaging and ideology specific to their region of the world. For many Arabic Communists, the simple changing of the mode of production was not enough. Arabic Communism not only needs to contend with foreign imperialism, but also with more conservative local leadership with a nationalist bent. To this end, the urban laborers and thinkers of the Middle East often demand change to the social fabric of the Arab World itself, with a particular emphasis on popular movement and social justice alongside political and economic change. The exact degree and character of these demanded reforms varies sharply from country to country, party to party, and even ideologue to ideologue, with Arab Communism encompassing a wide variety of movements and thoughts, from socialistic nationalists who simply want independence and socialism, to some who dream of a united pan-Arab nation to better resist outside interference and imperialist ambitions.



* 1. **National communism**When Karl Marx penned his fateful works, he imagined a global communist utopia, where workers all over the world would be free, and where the oppression of nationalism would be a distant memory, if that. This mantra was preached over and over again, organizations like the various Internationales grew and grew, and the left began to embrace the whole world in its mission. And it failed. Nikolai Bukharin championed the idea of "Socialism in One Country" when he led the Soviet Union, where a single socialist nation - the USSR - would focus on strengthening itself against reaction before liberating the world. And it failed. But internationalism was never the sole destiny of communism. Another wing had followed it - National Communism, that had posed an answer to the national question - that communism was not the enemy of nationalism. That communism is true nationalism. It is the key to liberation from the twin devils of imperialism and capitalism, who seek to suck nations dry and leave them for dead. National Communists are as diverse as the different nations that host them, from Ukraine to Central Asia to Africa. Some support a loose union of communist states, others are more isolationist, yet they are all united by a common belief in national self-determination, communism, and anti-imperialism. For the oppressed, for the enslaved, for all who suffer under the tyranny of imperialism and capitalism, National Communism is a beacon of hope in a dark, cruel world. And unlike other communist experiments, it may just succeed.



* 1. **Workerism**Workerism, also known as Marxist Autonomism, is a term used to describe a network of interlinked movements and individuals emerging in the early 1960s in Italy. The original core of Workerism was a group of marxist intellectuals who engaged in a critical revision of the interpretations of Marx's thought which had been en vogue among communists since Lenin's time. The key idea of workerism is that the traditional communist idea, preaching that the working class struggles are a reaction to capitalist development, is in fact backwards: capitalist development, according to workerists, is a reaction to the struggle of the exploited workers. The working class is thus the "negative engine" of development, and accordingly, all revolutionary strategies must come from and be driven by the working class itself, with no interference from bourgeouis collaborationist unions and certainly not from exploitative vanguard parties. Indeed, the working class should reject any alliance with "progressive" or "empathetic" bourgeoisie. The working class must stand on its own, rely upon itself to seize power, with an emphasis on revolutionary violence and grassroots organization in order to achieve such ends. This dynamic, fresh-faced take on communist ideology has a great deal of pull among younger students and workers, for whom the fires of political and ideological enthusiasm have yet to dim.

