

History Repeats Itself – In Reverse

Q: During Hitler's rise to power and his support by the Nazi Party wasn't there a huge movement to get rid of communists in Germany at around the same time?

History Prof: Reply

You seem to be asking about a very specific political dynamic in early 1930s Germany — not just Hitler's rise, but the parallel anti-communist push. I'm reading this as a question about the interplay between Nazi political strategy and the suppression of left-wing movements, especially the Communist Party of Germany (KPD). The emotional cue here is curiosity about whether anti-communism was a *major* driver in Nazi consolidation of power, which means I should focus on the political climate, the tactics used, and the timing.

The Anti-Communist Drive During Hitler's Rise

Yes — anti-communism was absolutely central to Hitler's rise and the Nazi Party's consolidation of power. In fact, it was one of the key ideological and strategic pillars of their movement.

Key points:

- **Post–World War I backdrop.** After Germany's defeat in WWI, the country experienced political chaos, including the 1918–1919 German Revolution and short-lived communist uprisings like the Spartacist revolt. These events left a lasting fear of Bolshevism among conservatives, the middle class, and industrial elites.
- **The Nazi Party's positioning.** Hitler and the National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP) framed themselves as the bulwark against a communist takeover. They portrayed the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) as a direct threat to German stability, culture, and private property.
- **Street battles and propaganda.** In the late 1920s and early 1930s, Nazi paramilitary groups such as the **Sturmabteilung** (SA), which translates to "**Storm Detachment**", frequently clashed with communist militias (Roter Frontkämpferbund) in violent street fights. These confrontations were used in Nazi propaganda to depict communists as dangerous and lawless.
- **The Reichstag Fire (February 1933).** The Nazis blamed the fire on a Dutch communist, Marinus van der Lubbe, and used it as a pretext to pass the **Reichstag Fire Decree**, which suspended civil liberties and allowed mass arrests of communists and other political opponents.
- **Elimination of the KPD.** Within months of Hitler becoming Chancellor in January 1933, the Communist Party was banned, its leaders imprisoned or sent to concentration camps, and its press shut down. This removed one of the largest political forces opposing the Nazis.
- **Support from elites.** Anti-communism helped Hitler win over industrialists, landowners, and conservative politicians, who feared socialist policies more than authoritarianism.

If you zoom out, the Nazi rise to power was as much about *destroying the left* as it was about promoting their own ideology. Anti-communism wasn't just a side effect — it was

a core selling point to the German establishment and a rallying cry to mobilize the middle classes.

Note: The term "Nazi" is a shortened form of the German word **Nationalsozialist**, which means National Socialist. It refers to a member of the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP) — the National Socialist German Workers' Party, once led by Adolf Hitler.

Q: If a political party in current times tends to support socialism and/or communist ideals would they not tend to or wish to falsely label any opposition as fascists or as Nazi supporters in order to rally their supporters behind their cause instead, knowing how the Nazi party and Hitler's actions will still be frowned upon in current times?

History Prof: Reply

I think what you are essentially asking about **modern political rhetoric** — specifically, whether parties with socialist or communist leanings might strategically label their opponents as “fascists” or “Nazis” to mobilize their base, given the enduring stigma attached to those terms. This isn’t just a historical question; it’s about **how political language is weaponized** in the present, and how historical memory shapes that tactic. The underlying theme here is political framing — using emotionally charged labels to define the opposition before they can define themselves.

The Use of “Fascist” and “Nazi” Labels in Modern Politics

Political scientists and historians note that in today’s polarized climate, accusations of fascism are sometimes used as a **rhetorical weapon** rather than a precise ideological description. This happens across the political spectrum, but in the context you’re describing:

- **Historical weight of the terms.** Fascism and Nazism are universally associated with dictatorship, mass violence, and human rights abuses. Because of this, calling an opponent “fascist” or “Nazi” can instantly frame them as morally illegitimate.
- **Mobilizing the base.** For parties on the left — especially those with socialist or communist leanings — invoking these labels can serve to **unify supporters** against a perceived existential threat. It taps into collective memory of WWII and the moral clarity of opposing Hitler’s regime.
- **Strategic framing.** This tactic works by shifting the debate from policy details to moral absolutes: if the opponent is “fascist,” then compromise is framed as unacceptable. It can also distract from criticisms of one’s own platform by focusing attention on the alleged danger posed by the other side.
- **Not unique to the left.** While your question focuses on socialist/communist-aligned groups, it’s worth noting that political actors on the right have also used extreme historical labels — for example, calling opponents “communists” or “Marxists” — to rally their own supporters.
- **Risk of overuse.** Scholars warn that when such terms are applied too loosely, they can lose their historical meaning and become seen as partisan insults rather than accurate descriptions. This can weaken public understanding of what fascism or Nazism actually are or were.

In short: yes, it's a known political communication strategy to use historically loaded labels like "fascist" or "Nazi" to rally supporters, and parties with socialist or communist leanings have used it — but so have their ideological opposites with different labels. It's part of a broader phenomenon where **history becomes a political weapon** in contemporary debates.

Conclusion

If the majority of the demoncrap party is made up of socialists and/or is truly organized and operated by Marxists and/or communists then one should not be too surprised when they repeatedly invoke terms like "fascist" or "Nazi" or "Hitler" to label folks like Trump, Kirk, etc. At the same time they would most likely shy away from labelling their opponents as communist, socialist, etc. This observation is just one more reason to believe that they might well be closet Marxists and/or communists in both principal and in fact.

Also, keep in mind that people who denounce individual liberty, who wish to be considered "socialist democrats", who support tyrannical leaders and lawless groups (such as supporters or NGO heads fostering mass illegal immigration or groups like ANTIFA), and/or who desire a "one world order" of sorts are equally as likely to be Marxist and/or communist thinkers as their opposites are likely to be "fascists" or "Nazis".

Any constitutional representative, conservative, libertarian or righteous political actors who fail to address or push back against these false labels and claims **strongly enough** will most likely find that such tactics used against them will cause them a huge amount of grief as a result.