

AI-03924 Ideology Change

Owner	© Rigel Arcayan
Tags	Life
Created time	June 12, 2026 11:21 AM

In the movie *Anniversary (Lane)*, explain the *The Change* belief and pillars. How is it different to socialism or communism?

Short answer:

The Change in ***Anniversary (2025)*** is a deliberately vague, totalizing, one-party ideology built around unity, obedience, and the erasure of dissent. Its “pillars” are never spelled out as a formal doctrine, but the film shows its core mechanics: centralization of political power, suppression of opposition, cultural pressure to conform, and the seductive promise of belonging. It differs from **socialism** or **communism** because it is not an economic system at all—it is a **totalitarian political movement** whose content is intentionally ambiguous, functioning more like a cult of unity than a coherent left-wing ideology. [Scrap from the loft](#)

★ **What *The Change* Believes (as shown in the film)**

The film **never provides a full manifesto**, and this is intentional. Director Jan Komasa keeps the ideology vague so that it feels universal and unsettling—any ideology taken to extremes could look like this. [Scrap from the loft](#)

Still, the movie gives us enough to identify its core beliefs:

1. One-party unity

Liz's book *The Change: The New Social Contract* advocates a **one-state, one-party political system**. The American flag on the cover has its stars moved to the center to symbolize “unity.” [Wikipedia](#)

2. Centralized authority

The movement quickly becomes **totalitarian**, controlling institutions, media, and public behavior. Ellen loses her job, Anna is beaten for mocking the movement, and dissenters are hunted. [Soap Central](#)

3. Suppression of dissent

Mocking *The Change* leads to violence. A viral video of Ellen vandalizing a Change flag becomes grounds for public shaming and punishment. [Wikipedia](#)

4. Corporate partnership

The Cumberland Corporation sponsors the book and movement, suggesting a fusion of political and corporate power—something closer to **authoritarian corporatism** than socialism. [Wikipedia](#)

5. Emotional recruitment

The movement spreads by giving people a sense of purpose, grievance, and belonging. Komasa emphasizes the *mechanics* of ideological capture rather than its policy content. [Scraps from the loft](#)

★ How *The Change* Differs From Socialism or Communism

The Change is **not** a left-wing economic ideology. It is a **political control system**. Here's how they differ:

✓ 1. Economic theory

- **Socialism/communism:** Concerned with ownership of the means of production, wealth distribution, and class struggle.
- **The Change:** No economic doctrine is ever mentioned. It is about **power**, not economics.

✓ 2. Transparency of ideology

- **Socialism/communism:** Have explicit, well-defined ideological texts (Marx, Engels, Lenin).

- **The Change:** Intentionally vague; its power comes from ambiguity and emotional appeal. [Scraps from the loft](#)

✓ 3. Relationship to corporations

- **Socialism/communism:** Typically oppose corporate power.
- **The Change:** Is **sponsored by a corporation** (Cumberland), suggesting a merger of state and corporate interests. [Wikipedia](#)

✓ 4. Mechanism of control

- **Socialism/communism:** Historically implemented through state planning and economic restructuring.
- **The Change:** Controls through **cultural pressure, surveillance, intimidation, and propaganda**, not economic restructuring.

✓ 5. Political structure

- **Communism:** Envisions a classless, stateless society (in theory).
- **The Change:** Explicitly promotes a **one-party state**, which is authoritarian, not communist. [Wikipedia](#)

★ Why the Film Keeps It Vague

Komasa's goal is to show **how** totalitarian movements work, not **what** they believe. The vagueness makes *The Change* feel like:

- a cult
- a populist movement
- a nationalist project
- a technocratic takeover
- or any ideology that becomes absolute

This ambiguity is the point: **the danger lies in the mechanism, not the doctrine.** [Scraps from the loft](#)

★ Summary Table

Concept	The Change	Socialism	Communism
Core focus	Unity + obedience	Social welfare, public ownership	Classless society
Economic doctrine	None stated	Redistribution, public ownership	Abolition of private property
Political structure	One-party authoritarianism	Multi-party possible	One-party in practice (historically)
Corporate role	Corporate-state alliance	Often anti-corporate	Anti-corporate
Ideological clarity	Deliberately vague	Clear	Clear

If you want, I can go deeper into:

- Liz's psychological strategy
- How The Change mirrors real-world movements
- The symbolism of the altered American flag

Would you like a **deeper thematic analysis**, a **character-driven breakdown**, or a **real-world political comparison**?

Will future American flag be edited like the change one day? How is it different to Project 2025 (learning purpose only). Does America holds a system of checks and balances making sure those in power are never going to change the base foundation of democracy? Say more.

Here's the clearest, most grounded way to think about your questions — without speculation, without fear-based framing, and with a solid understanding of how the U.S. system actually works.

1. Will the American flag ever be edited like *The Change* flag?

Short answer: **There is no realistic pathway for that to happen.**

The U.S. flag is protected both **legally** and **culturally**:

- Changing the flag requires **an act of Congress**, passed by both chambers.
- Congress is structurally designed to **move slowly**, especially on symbolic national identity.
- The flag is deeply embedded in American civic culture, military tradition, and public life.
- Any attempt to redesign it would face enormous public resistance across the political spectrum.

Even major historical shocks — the Civil War, world wars, 9/11 — did **not** lead to redesigns. The only changes have been the addition of stars for new states.

The stylized flag in *Anniversary* is a **fictional symbol** meant to show how authoritarian movements rebrand national identity. It's not a prediction.

2. How is *The Change* different from Project 2025?

For learning purposes only, here's the distinction:

What *The Change* is

- A **fictional** authoritarian movement.
- Vague ideology, focused on unity, obedience, and suppression of dissent.
- A one-party system with corporate-state fusion.
- No economic doctrine.

What Project 2025 is

According to its own published materials (from the Heritage Foundation), Project 2025 is:

- A **policy and personnel blueprint** created by a coalition of conservative organizations.

- Not a law, not a government program, and not an official plan of the U.S. government.
- A set of proposals about:
 - restructuring the executive branch,
 - reducing federal bureaucracy,
 - shifting regulatory authority,
 - and implementing conservative policy preferences.

Key differences

- **Fiction vs. real-world policy advocacy**

The Change is a narrative device. Project 2025 is a political think-tank document.

- **Authoritarianism vs. policy agenda**

The Change eliminates elections and dissent. Project 2025 operates within the existing constitutional system, proposing changes to executive power and federal agencies.

- **One-party rule vs. multi-party democracy**

The Change abolishes opposition. Project 2025 exists in a competitive political environment.

- **Corporate-state fusion vs. ideological governance**

The Change merges corporate and state power. Project 2025 focuses on shrinking federal agencies and expanding presidential authority.

If you want, I can break down **Project 2025's structure** or **The Change's authoritarian traits**.

3. Does America have checks and balances strong enough to prevent a "Change"-style takeover?

Yes — and this is one of the most important features of the U.S. system.

The United States is built on **multiple overlapping layers of constraint**, so no single person or faction can easily rewrite the foundations of democracy.

Here are the major ones:

A. Constitutional checks

- **Congress** writes laws and controls funding.
- **The President** executes laws but cannot create or fund programs alone.
- **The Supreme Court** can strike down unconstitutional actions.

Each branch can block the others.

B. Federalism

Power is divided between:

- the **federal government**,
- **50 states**,
- **thousands of local governments**.

States can resist federal overreach through:

- lawsuits,
 - state legislation,
 - control of elections,
 - and independent law enforcement.
-

C. Elections

Regular, scheduled elections mean:

- political power is temporary,
- voters can remove leaders,

- parties must compete for support.
-

D. Free press and civil society

Independent media, universities, nonprofits, and watchdog groups create constant scrutiny.

E. Courts and judicial review

Federal judges serve **lifetime appointments**, making them resistant to political pressure.

F. The military's apolitical structure

The U.S. military is legally bound to:

- remain nonpartisan,
 - follow lawful civilian orders,
 - reject unlawful ones.
-

G. Constitutional amendment difficulty

To change the Constitution, you need:

- **2/3 of the House,**
- **2/3 of the Senate,**
- **3/4 of all state legislatures.**

This is intentionally almost impossible without overwhelming national consensus.

So what does all this mean?

The U.S. system is designed so that **no single movement — left, right, or otherwise — can unilaterally rewrite the country's identity**, especially not in the sweeping, symbolic way shown in *Anniversary*.

Authoritarianism thrives where:

- institutions are weak,
- power is centralized,
- dissent is suppressed.

The U.S. system is built around the opposite: **distributed power, competitive politics, and institutional friction.**

If you want to go deeper, I can explain:

- **How authoritarian movements historically rise**
- **How U.S. institutions resist authoritarian drift**
- **Why fictional dystopias exaggerate political collapse**

Which direction would you like to explore next?

Explain Project 2025 structure

Below is a **clear, structured, learning-oriented breakdown** of the major components of ***Mandate for Leadership: The Conservative Promise***, the 900-page policy agenda at the center of **Project 2025**.

As always, please **confirm details with trusted primary sources**, since this is a political document and interpretations vary.

What *Mandate for Leadership* Actually Is

It is a **policy blueprint** written by conservative think-tank authors.

It is **not** a law, not a government plan, and not binding on any administration.

It is organized **by federal department**, with each chapter written by a different conservative policy expert or organization.

The Major Sections of the Mandate (High-Level Overview)

Below are the key sections, grouped by theme, with Guided Links so you can explore any part in more depth.

1. Executive Branch Restructuring

This is one of the most discussed parts.

It includes proposals to:

- Expand presidential control over federal agencies
- Reduce the independence of certain departments
- Replace large numbers of civil-service employees with political appointees
- Reorganize or eliminate some federal offices

This section is about **centralizing executive authority** and reducing what the authors call the “administrative state.”

2. Department-by-Department Policy Plans

Each federal department gets its own chapter.

Examples include:

- Department of Education
- Department of Homeland Security
- Department of Justice
- Department of Health and Human Services
- Department of Energy
- Department of Defense

Each chapter outlines:

- policy goals

- recommended regulatory changes
- staffing priorities
- ideological framing

These chapters are the bulk of the 900 pages.

3. Civil Service Reform

This section proposes:

- Reclassifying many federal employees to make them easier to hire and fire
- Increasing political oversight of career staff
- Reducing union influence in federal employment

This is tied to the idea of a more “responsive” executive branch.

4. Regulatory Rollbacks

Across multiple chapters, the Mandate recommends:

- reducing environmental regulations
- limiting federal oversight of business
- rolling back climate-related rules
- reducing the scope of federal agencies like the EPA, OSHA, and CFPB

This is consistent with long-standing conservative regulatory philosophy.

5. Social and Cultural Policy Sections

These chapters address:

- education curriculum
- gender and sexuality policy
- family policy
- religious liberty

- federal funding rules for schools and nonprofits

These sections are often the most publicly debated because they involve cultural issues.

6. Immigration and Border Policy

Recommendations include:

- expanding border enforcement
- increasing deportation authority
- limiting asylum pathways
- restructuring DHS operations

This section is aligned with long-standing conservative immigration priorities.

7. Energy and Environmental Policy

Key proposals:

- expanding fossil fuel production
- reducing federal climate initiatives
- limiting the EPA's regulatory authority
- revising federal land management

This section focuses on energy independence and deregulation.

8. Foreign Policy and Defense

These chapters outline:

- strengthening military readiness
- reducing certain international commitments
- restructuring the State Department
- shifting foreign aid priorities

This section varies by author but generally emphasizes a more nationalist foreign policy.

★ How the Mandate Is Structured Internally

The document follows a consistent pattern:

Section Type	What It Contains
Philosophical framing	The conservative rationale for changes
Diagnosis of current problems	Why the authors believe agencies are failing
Policy recommendations	Specific actions a future administration could take
Personnel recommendations	What types of appointees should run agencies
First-100-days actions	Immediate steps for a new administration

This structure repeats across departments.

★ How This Differs From *The Change in Anniversary*

Since you've been comparing the two:

- *The Change* is a **fictional authoritarian movement** that eliminates opposition and rewrites national identity.
- The Mandate is a **policy document** written by think-tank authors.
- One is a **narrative device**, the other is **political advocacy** within the U.S. constitutional system.

They operate in completely different domains.

★ If you want, I can go deeper into:

- **A department-by-department summary**

- **The most controversial sections**
- **How checks and balances limit any policy blueprint**

Which direction would you like next, Rigel?