Solidarity with the anti-corruption and anti-extractivist movements in Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Bulgaria

Since November 2024 the Balkans have seen the largest sustained street mobilisations in more than 30 years. In Serbia, the collapse of the Novi Sad railway canopy put students and workers on the streets in numbers not seen in a generation, and they have stayed there for eighteen months. In Bulgaria, protests against the 2026 austerity budget – the largest in decades – brought down the Zhelyazkov government in December 2025. In Albania, opposition to the Kushner-backed resort at Zvernec grew from a village blockade in May 2026 into the "Flamingo Revolution", with 1 in 10 of the national population on the streets on 20 June and daily demonstrations in a dozen cities. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, communities are resisting mining concessions granted over their heads by law. These are not separate national crises. They are responses to the same thing: governments across the region selling land, minerals, coastline and labour to whichever foreign power will pay, and policing the population that objects.

Serbia may be heading toward elections. But President Aleksandar Vučić intends to move to the office of prime minister rather than leave power. Neither the ruling Serbian Progressive Party (SNS) nor the liberal parliamentary opposition has offered a credible answer to the demands that have sustained the youth-led protest movement since November 2024: accountability for the disaster, an end to the Jadar lithium project, and an end to impunity for the violence used against protesters. If elections are held, the students and the other campaigns that have carried this movement should

nominate their own candidates – people who represent these demands directly – rather than leave the ballot to politicians who have failed to answer them.

Vučić has spent years hedging between Moscow, Beijing, Dubai and Brussels, selling access to Serbian resources to each in turn in exchange for their toleration of his rule. Albania and Montenegro have taken the opposite course, competing to be EU accession "frontrunners" through unconditional compliance – and have seen the same pattern of foreign-backed dispossession of public land regardless.

The Kushner-backed resort project at Zvernec and Sazan Island in Albania is the clearest case. Our solidarity is with the communities defending protected wetland and public land from dispossession, and the left-oriented Lëvizja Bashkë (Together Movement), which has organised against Prime Minister Edi Rama's accommodation with Kushner's capital on that ground.

Neither strategy, Vučić's hedging nor Rama's compliance, is a road out of peripheral dependency

Three decades after the Dayton agreement, Bosnia-Herzegovina remains a western protectorate, under a foreign (so far, always EU) High Representative empowered to override its own institutions, controlling the state's sovereignty from foreign capitals regardless of the population's will. Governments in both of Bosnia-Herzegovina are obsessed with the same resource politics seen in Serbia: a 2024 law in Bosnia-Hercegovina's Serbian Republic stripped local communities of the right to consent to mining on their own land. Serbian Republic leader Milorad Dodik, defying the Bosnian state court, has offered Donald Trump access to raw materials in exchange for US backing of a secession of Bosnia-Herzegovina's Serb majority entity –most likely followed by union with Serbia itself. In 2026 Bosnia's Croat-Muslim Bosnian Federation government –

traditionally pro-EU and pro-NATO – awarded a major gas pipeline project without competitive tender to a US company with no prior infrastructure experience but reported links to Trump, prompting the EU's own ambassador to warn that Bosnia-Herzegovina's accession prospects and access to EU aid were now at risk.

Across the region, leaders are now betting that Trump's Washington, unlike Brussels, will trade some meaningful recognition or support for a cut of the resources underneath their feet.

The EU controls Kosovo by a different mechanism: Five EU member states – Cyprus, Greece, Romania, Slovakia and Spain – still refuse to recognise its independence, for reasons rooted entirely in their own domestic nationalities politics rather than anything Kosovo has done. Because EU accession requires unanimous consent, this blocks Kosovo's membership indefinitely.

Bulgaria's current crisis shows that even full membership does not resolve the problems of the EU's peripheral states. Already inside the EU since 2007 and the eurozone since January 2026, its government collapsed in December 2025 under the weight of protests against an austerity budget.

The Fourth International supports the demand for every European citizen, whether their country belongs to the EU or not, to have free access to European goods, to be able to travel and have access to the labour markets – access that offers real material benefits to working people, including the right to work and move freely. The Fourth International stands against fortress Europe and its liberal policies and for freedom of movement.

But this must not be bought at the price of surrendering these countries' ability to protect domestic industry, agriculture, land and labour standards. Inside or outside the EU, this

requires a rupture with current policies. A trade relationship that runs one way, and a ‘European citizenship’ that comes with duties but no vote, is not integration; it is only another form of the periphery these countries already occupy.

The Fourth International salutes the courage of the movements resisting this multifaceted exploitation on the ground and calls for the cross-border solidarity between them that a struggle against transnational capital requires.

– Serbia’s elections are not a substitute for accountability – nominate candidates who represent the movements, not the parties that have failed them!
– No to the Jadar lithium project and all foreign-backed dispossession of Balkan land and resources!
– No land, coastline or public resources for Kushner or any oligarch – Balkan or foreign, East or West!
– End the High Representative’s protectorate over Bosnia – for genuine popular sovereignty.
– No to EU accession with duties but no vote!
– Yes to EU market and labour-market access on terms that protect Balkan countries’ domestic industry, agriculture and workers – no to access that demands their sacrifice!
– Neither hedging between great powers nor unconditional integration – sovereignty for the peoples of the Balkans!

Statement by the Executive Bureau of the Fourth International 19/08/2026

Image Copyright Albinfo, CC BY 4.0, via Wikimedia Commons

COP 30: Entrenching the crisis of climate politics

As the dust settles after COP30 in Belém, the scale of the failure becomes impossible to ignore. The world is on a path toward catastrophic warming, ecological systems are collapsing, and millions across the Global South face annihilation, not in the distant future, but today. The world's political and economic elites arrived in the Amazon to negotiate when the 1.5°C target had already slipped out of reach, and they left with little more than symbolic gestures. No binding emissions cuts. No serious plan to phase out fossil fuels. No meaningful climate finance for adaptation. No accountability for the destruction already unleashed.

The gap between official international climate policy and the lived reality of a warming world has never been wider. In Belém, that gap became a chasm.

The world is heading towards roughly 2.8°C of warming by the end of the century. This is not a scenario compatible with human dignity – or even, for many, with life itself. Rising seas, extreme heat, drought, and flooding are eroding food security, displacing communities, and driving inequality to historic heights. The economic costs of climate disasters are skyrocketing, but the social and human costs are immeasurable: lives lost, livelihoods shattered, ecosystems irreversibly damaged.

These worsening crises play out in a world shaped by neoliberal austerity and debt dependency. Countries battling climate shocks are forced to cut social spending, privatise public goods, and surrender sovereignty to creditors. Governments continue pouring billions into militaries, fossil fuel subsidies, and the enrichment of corporate elites. The current political economy accelerates both warming and war.

The growing irrelevance of the COP

COP30 offered no mechanisms for enforcement, no firm deadlines, and no clear pathways to keep warming below 1.5°C. Nor did it include a fossil-fuel phase-out; oil-producing nations blocked binding language, and the final deal focused on voluntary road maps instead. What it did offer was an expanded space for corporate actors, carbon traders, and mining interests seeking to greenwash extractivist projects.

What is staring society in the face – and what too few scientists are willing to acknowledge – is that the climate-crisis regime cannot be separated from the logic of capitalism. So-called "green transitions" simply open new arenas for profit while remaining embedded in the same global system of accumulation. Renewable energy may be expanding, but it does not replace fossil fuels; it merely adds to an energy expansion rather than driving a real transition.

Climate summits have become a "safety valve" for capital. They offer the illusion of action, while allowing the core exploitative relations to continue. For workers and communities already suffering climate breakdown, it is indisputable that the COP has failed them.

The Just Transition heist

COP 30 adopted the Belem Action Mechanism for a Global Just Transition (BAM) – a proposed new institutional arrangement under the UNFCCC designed to address the current fragmentation and inadequacy of global just transition efforts. Trade unionists and workers should have no illusions about this mechanism. It has no finances or concrete plans to protect workers and communities affected by energy and other decarbonising initiatives. There are no resources for a re-industrialisation in harmony with the protection of nature. So workers and other vulnerable sectors will simply be left behind. Words and policies in COP statements are a dime a

dozen. Reality is harsher.

Why mass movements matter – and why institutions don't

If COP30 cannot deliver the mechanisms for decarbonisation or social protection, then the hope must lie in movements of people: workers, peasants, indigenous people, women, youth, and the urban poor. Outside of a global mass movement rooted in national realities, the necessary steps to confront the climate crisis will not occur. Yet such a movement cannot be built if it fails to address the immediate needs of the working classes and the poor. The fight for climate protection and ecological justice must therefore begin with the fight for life itself – for clean water, decent housing, jobs, food, and security against the elements.

Right-wing climate denialists exploit the desperation of the poor to drive a wedge between ordinary people and climate action. They present environmentalism as a threat to livelihoods rather than the path to survival. To win the majority, our movement must link ecological transformation with social justice. We must demand the redistribution of wealth and power away from the billionaire class, big tech, and ruling elites who plunder the planet for profit.

By Brian Ashley, First Published in Amandla!, 25 November 2025

Brian Ashley is a member of Zabalaza for Socialism and serves on the Amandla! editorial collective

Brazil’s Decision to Drill for Oil Off the Amazon Shows Limitations of Government’s Approach

[On 20 October, exactly three weeks before the beginning of COP30 in Belem, Brazil’s environmental regulator, IBAMA, finally approved a licence for the state-controlled oil company, Petrobras, to drill an exploratory well off the coast of Amazonia, close to the mouth of the Amazon River. That same Monday, within hours of the announcement, drilling began. A couple of days later, Petrobras said it would need to sink three more wells in Block 59 to evaluate the exact extent of the reserves. Petrobras is hoping these deep-sea oil fields will prove to hold reserves similar in size to the estimated 11 billion barrels that Exxon-Mobil has begun to exploit further north off Guyana, in waters disputed with Venezuela. That’s more than 30 times the amount of oil held in the Rosebank field off Shetland, which the UK government is about to rule on.

On 23 October, eight Brazilian NGOs sought a legal order to block the drilling. They pointed to the lack of any proper consultation with Indigenous peoples in the region, and the failure of any full evaluation of the environmental impact, both locally and globally. They suggested the move made a mockery of the Brazilian government’s commitments for the coming COP30. But it seemed unlikely their injunction request would succeed. President Luis Inacio Lula da Silva, of the Workers Party (PT), regretted that “nobody is in a position to do without fossil fuels”. He said the income from the Amazon oil would be used to combat poverty and pay for the transition away from fossil fuels.

Subverta, one of the currents in the PSOL that makes up the Brazilian section of the Fourth International, says the decision reflects a much more fundamental limitation in the government's approach to the environment.]

On the eve of COP 30, to be held in Belém in Pará, this decision is by no means just a technical choice, but rather a political repositioning of Brazil in the face of the global climate crisis; it contradicts the image of a country seeking to lead a global just transition and reinforces the perception that Brazil remains trapped in a historical cycle of dependence and extraction.

Although the current government's programme is based on an ecological transition with social and environmental justice, this authorisation of oil exploration in one of the most sensitive regions of the planet highlights the contradictions between theory and practice. The rhetoric of a 'just transition' collides with the continuation of an extractive model that depends on fossil fuels, and which is justified on the grounds of energy sovereignty and national self-sufficiency.

Exploration on the Equatorial Margin will have an impact well beyond Brazilian territory. Much of the oil extracted would go for export, transferring emissions to other countries and undermining Brazil's global climate responsibility. According to estimates by climate organisations, burning the oil potentially extracted from this region could release more than 11 billion tonnes of CO_2. That is about 5% of the total remaining carbon budget available if warming is to be limited to 1.5 °C. In other words, this has a planetary impact, not just a regional one, which compromises the country's role in the international climate fight.

This puts us in a situation of even greater climate insecurity and uncertainty. The planet has already exceeded seven of the nine planetary boundaries (defined by the scientific community

as the limits of stability for the planet's ecosystems), and the fossil fuel industry is primarily responsible for this. It is a mistake to expand drilling for more wells, wherever they may be.

In addition to the environmental and climate impacts, there is also an economic argument that cannot be ignored. Several international studies, such as those by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), warn that Petrobras' oil expansion represents a high-risk investment. They estimate that up to 85% of new production projects would only be profitable in a scenario of global warming above 2.4°C, i.e., in a context incompatible with the Paris Agreement targets. Although economic factors and figures alone should not be our main motivation for rejecting exploration, they show that, even according to the logic of profit, the country is investing in assets that may quickly become stranded by the global transition to renewable sources.

Petrobras, as a strategic company, occupies a paradoxical position in this situation. While seeking to reposition itself as a leader in the energy transition, with many renewable energy projects (despite a number of conflicts around wind and solar power plants in the Northeast of Brazil) and a lot of green advertising, it is also investing heavily in new oil fields. IBAMA's decision legitimises this ambiguity, and puts off confronting the need for a social and territorial restructuring of the energy sector.

The Equatorial Margin coastal region, stretching from Natal in the Brazilian Northeast to the border with French Guyana, is renowned for its high marine and river biodiversity, as well as being home to artisanal fishing communities, quilombolas and indigenous peoples who depend directly on coastal ecosystems. Even the installation of infrastructure for research and exploration in the Amazon estuary region will have a significant impact, not to mention the future risk of oil spills and contamination that could damage entire

ecological chains, affecting fishing, water quality and traditional ways of life.

From an eco-socialist perspective, the permit given to Petrobras shows that territories on the periphery continue to be sacrificed for the sake of a centralised, dependent development project; it illustrates in practice the impasse of a ‘transition’ that has been captured by capital. It is not a question of denying the need for energy, but of questioning who produces it, according to what logic, and in the service of what kind of society.

Drilling for oil in the Amazon estuary reveals a conflict between two kinds of rationale: the productivist rationale (of ‘commodity peoples’, in the words of Davi Kopenawa), which transforms nature into a commodity, and the ecological rationale (of the forest peoples), which understands the interdependence between living systems, territories and cultures. Defending the Amazon is not an ‘environmentalist’ demand in the narrow sense, but a political struggle for other ways of living and other kinds of social reproduction. Protecting the mouth of the Amazon means fighting for a future for our civilisation that cannot be measured in barrels of oil, but in flows of life, autonomy and socio-environmental diversity.

This dispute between different rationales also reveals how the path of more drilling for oil reproduces historical inequalities. The indigenous, quilombola and traditional communities that live on the Amazonian coast find themselves confronting the advance of the energy frontier with no access to real decision-making mechanisms. The absence of any free, prior and informed consultation, as laid down in ILO Convention 169, reinforces the marginalisation of these peoples. The colonial logic of exploitation and environmental racism is revived, imposing socio-environmental risks on those who benefit least from the extracted wealth.

The challenge facing the progressive camp, especially those who make up the social and political base of the government, is to insist that there can be no socio-environmental justice without a break with fossil capitalism. We need to strengthen initiatives that contribute to the development of a new energy infrastructure, with communities playing an active part from the planning stage onwards the aim must be to replace thermal power and fossil fuels with decentralised, accessible, renewable and low-pollution public infrastructure at all levels.

We are opposed to any new thermal power plants, to drilling new oil wells and all other polluting projects, as well as to renewable power projects that lack socio-environmental justice. We must continue to promote dialogue with oil workers’ unions and other workers in the fossil fuel sector. Only organised struggle will be able to stop fossil capitalism, and we call on everyone to join us in this struggle!

22 October 2025