

# The far right as a global phenomenon: the ecosocialist alternative

In recent years, we have seen a spectacular rise in reactionary, authoritarian and/or fascist far-right movements across the globe. They already govern half of the world's countries, including Trump (USA), Modi (India), Orbán (Hungary), Erdogan (Turkey), Meloni (Italy), Netanyahu (Israel), and, recently, Milei (Argentina). Elsewhere, they have recently governed Brazil (Bolsonaro) and are serious candidates for power with the National Rally (France), the AFD (Germany), the Republican Party's Kast (Chile), etc. And Putin's regime in Russia is not very far from this model.

In each country, the far right has its own characteristics: in many cases (Europe, the United States, India), the 'enemy'—i.e. the scapegoat—is the Muslims and/or the immigrants; in some Muslim countries, it is some religious minority (Christians, Jews, Yezidis). In some cases, xenophobic nationalism and racism predominate; in others, religious fundamentalism, or hatred of the Left, feminism, and homosexuals.

Despite this diversity, there are some common traits shared by the majority, if not all: authoritarianism, integral nationalism—'Deutschland über alles' and its local variants 'America First', 'O Brasil acima de tudo', etc; religious or ethnic (racist) intolerance; and police/military violence as the only response to social problems and crime. The characterisation as fascist or semi-fascist may apply to some, but not to all. Enzo Traverso uses the term 'post-fascism', but I believe that *neo-fascism* is the best term to describe both the continuity and the novelty of the 21st-century far right.

## Neo-fascist not 'populist'

The concept of 'populism' is used by some political scientists, the media and even part of the Left. But it only serves to sow confusion. While in Latin America from the 1930s to the 1960s the term corresponded to something relatively precise—Vargasism, Peronism, etc.—its use in Europe since the 1990s has become increasingly vague and imprecise.

Populism is defined as “a political position that sides with the people against the elites”. But this applies to almost any political movement or party! This pseudo-concept, applied to far-right parties, leads—intentionally or unintentionally—to legitimising them. It makes them more acceptable, if not sympathetic—who is not for the people against the elites?—while carefully avoiding terms that cause offence: racism, xenophobia, fascism, far right. 'Populism' is also used in a deliberately misleading way, by neoliberal ideologues, to conflate the far right and the radical Left. They are characterised as 'right-wing populism' and 'left-wing populism', since they are opposed to liberal policies, 'Europe', etc.

## Climate change rejected

One common element in most of these neo-fascist governments or movements is *negationism*—the refusal to acknowledge the ecological crisis and climate change. In spite of the overwhelming scientific evidence, they persist in denying, or simply ignoring, the reality of global warming. Donald Trump is only the most vociferous and vulgar proponent of this trope, which is not only an ideology but an ecocidal *praxis*.

This is illustrated again by Trump, who is totally devoted to the unlimited development of fossil fuels. These suicidal politics represent the interests of the fossil oligarchy—the capitalist sectors linked to the production of oil, coal, gas, chemicals, plastics, cars and airplanes, etc. Their short-

sighted perspective is exclusively focused on immediate opportunities for profit and accumulation.

### **Back to the 1930s?**

History does not repeat itself; we can find similarities or analogies, but current phenomena are quite different from past models. Above all, we do not-yet-have totalitarian states comparable to those of the pre-war period. The classic Marxist analysis of fascism defined it as a reaction by big capital, with the support of the petty bourgeoisie, to the revolutionary threat posed by the labour movement. One may wonder whether this interpretation truly accounts for the rise of fascism in Italy, Germany and Spain in the 1920s and 1930s. In any case, it is not relevant in today's world, where there is no 'revolutionary threat' anywhere.

There are other significant differences with the fascism of the past: neo-fascist regimes are devoted to neoliberalism, not to corporate-national economies. And they are involved in ecocidal activities on a much larger scale than in the 1930s.

### **What is the explanation?**

It is difficult to offer a general explanation for such diverse phenomena, which are the expression of contradictions specific to each country or region of the world.

One 'explanation' that should be rejected is that it is linked to waves of migration, particularly in the US and Europe. Migrants are a convenient pretext, a useful tool for xenophobic and racist forces, but they are by no means the 'cause' of their success. Moreover, the far right is thriving in many countries—Brazil, India, etc.—where immigration is not an issue.

The most obvious and undoubtedly relevant explanation is that capitalist globalisation—which is also a process of brutal cultural homogenisation—produces and reproduces, on a global

scale, forms of 'identity panic' (a term coined by Daniel Bensaïd). This leads to nationalist and/or religious intolerance and fosters ethnic or religious conflicts. The more nations lose their economic power, the more they proclaim the immense glory of the 'Nation Above All Else'.

Some of these explanations are useful, but they are insufficient. We do not yet have a comprehensive analysis of a phenomenon that is global and is taking place at a specific moment in history.

### **How can we fight back?**

Unfortunately, there is no magic formula. Bernie Sanders' call for a Global Anti-Fascist Front is an excellent proposal. At the same time, we must build broad coalitions in defence of democratic freedoms in every country affected. This is also an ecological imperative: prevent the rise of negationist and ecocidal governments, or when they are in power, resist their destructive politics.

But we must also take into account that the capitalist system, especially in times of crisis, constantly produces and reproduces phenomena such as fascism, coups d'état and authoritarian regimes. The root of these tendencies is systemic, and the alternative must be radical; it must be anti-systemic. In 1938, Max Horkheimer, one of the leading thinkers of the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, wrote, "If you don't want to talk about capitalism, you have nothing to say about fascism." In other words, a consistent anti-fascist is an anti-capitalist.

This is more relevant than ever today, when the active destruction of the environment and global warming are the inevitable consequences of the expansive logic of the capitalist system. If we want to avoid ecological catastrophe, the only way is to look for anti-systemic proposals, such as ecosocialism.

## **Ecosocialism the way forward**

Ecosocialism is an attempt to provide a radical, civilisational alternative, based on the basic arguments of the ecological movement and of the Marxist critique of political economy. It counters capitalism's destructive idea of 'progress' with an economic approach guided not by money or economics, but by social needs and ecological balance. This dialectical synthesis is attempted by a broad spectrum of authors (including Joel Kovel and John Bellamy Foster). It is at the same time a critique of 'market ecology', which does not challenge the capitalist system, and of 'productivist socialism', which ignores the issue of natural limits.

Ec  
os  
oc  
ia  
li  
sm  
ha  
s  
th  
e  
po  
te  
nt  
ia  
l  
to  
br  
in  
g  
to  
ge  
th  
er

so  
ci  
al  
an  
d  
ec  
ol  
og  
ic  
al  
mo  
ve  
me  
nt  
s,  
pe  
as  
an  
ts  
,  
in  
di  
ge  
no  
us  
pe  
op  
le  
s,  
yo  
ut  
h,  
wo  
me  
n  
an  
d

wo  
rk  
er  
s,  
in  
th  
e  
re  
si  
st  
an  
ce  
ag  
ai  
ns  
t  
ne  
o-  
fa  
sc  
is  
t  
ne  
ga  
ti  
on  
is  
m  
an  
d  
en  
vi  
ro  
nm  
en  
ta  
l

de  
st  
ru  
ct  
io  
n.

An ecosocialist transformation is impossible without public control over the means of production and planning; that means public decisions on investment and technological change. These must be taken away from the banks and capitalist enterprises to serve society's common good. Socialist planning is grounded in democratic and pluralist debate, on all levels where decisions are taken: different propositions submitted to the people, in the form of parties, platforms, or other political movements, and delegates elected accordingly. However, representative democracy must be completed—and where necessary corrected—by forms of direct democracy, in which people directly choose among options on major issues at the local, national, and, later, global levels.

The passage from capitalist 'destructive progress' to socialism is a historical process, a permanent revolutionary transformation of society, culture and ways of thinking. This transition would lead not only to a new mode of production and an egalitarian and democratic society, but also to an alternative way of life—a new ecosocialist civilisation, beyond the reign of money, beyond consumption habits artificially produced by advertising, and beyond the unlimited production of commodities that are useless and/or harmful to the environment.

Such a process cannot begin without a revolutionary transformation of social and political structures, and the active support of the vast majority of the population for an ecosocialist programme. The development of socialist consciousness and ecological awareness is a process in which the decisive factor is people's own collective experience of

struggle, from local and partial confrontations to the radical change of society.

**Michael Löwy** is a Franco-Brazilian sociologist. Emeritus Research Director at the CNRS (National Centre of Scientific Research), Paris, and author of, amongst others, *Ecosocialism: A radical alternative to capitalist catastrophe*.

First published in [Amandla](#), 16 March 2026

---

# **US/Israel hands off Iran! No liberation through US bombs!**

***Statement adopted by the Executive Bureau of the Fourth International on 28 February 2026.***

1. After several years and different US governments threatening Iran with military attack, the USA, in alliance with Israel, has launched missile strikes and bombs against the country. Trump has called on the Iranian military to surrender or 'face certain death'. Iran has retaliated with strikes on US military bases across the Gulf and now there is a threat of a wider regional war.

2. The pretext for this war is the 'inconclusive' negotiations around Iran's nuclear programme and Trump's claim that Iran is building long range missiles to strike at Europe or even the USA, the same refrain as when George W Bush and Tony Blair claimed that Iraq could strike at western targets with only "45-minute warning" in 2003. The hypocrisy of the strongest military powers – equipped with global striking power and nuclear weapons – claiming that Iran is a meaningful threat to

people as far away as New York is obvious. Iran had offered some concessions in its Uranian enrichment programme and also to open up its gas and oil to US contracts – this was not enough for a bully and a war monger like Trump who demands complete subservience and obedience to himself personally and the US geo-politically.

3. Military actions must be viewed in the context of the openly aggressive and colonialist turn of the US under a neofascist government, with growing competition between imperialisms for direct access to resources as the neoliberal and globalizing order disintegrates. The kidnapping of Nicolas Maduro and Cilia Flores in Venezuela, and the consequent control over the country government, Trump's threats against Greenland, ongoing genocide against the Palestinians and the planned "reconstruction" of Gaza, the annexation of the West Bank and now the bombs falling on Tehran, are all part of this new world order. The first missiles were initially launched by Israel before being followed up with US military ordinance launched from its warships and aircraft carriers in the region. This once again demonstrates the close military and political connection between the two countries.

4. While this latest aggression continues the Trump governments' pattern of contempt for international law, the sovereignty of nations, and the use of threats and actual violence to advance what it regards as US interests, Trumps attack on Iran is the just the latest chapter in a long history of US aggression against Iran and its peoples. The US has never forgiven Iran for overthrowing the US backed repressive comprador regime of the Shah in the popular 1979 revolution that overthrew the Pahlavi monarchy. All US presidents since then have used economic boycotts and occasional military action against the country. They have all cynically claimed to support the Iranian people against the dictatorship of the mullahs as thin cover for their desire to control the region and its oil supplies.

5. The recent popular uprising against the Iranian government and the brutal way in which the Iranian theocratic regime has crushed it might cause some people to be sympathetic to the US/Israeli attack in the hopes of creating regime change. Sensing an opportunity to return to power the military strikes have been praised by supporters of the exiled Iranian royalist leader, Reza Pahlavi son of the Shah, whose family was overthrown in the revolution in 1979. Pahlavi visited Israel in April 2023 to discuss regime change in Iran and has made no secret of his hopes that Netanyahu can be helpful his plans for restoration.

6. As the bombs started to fall Trump announced to the people of Iran that "The hour of your freedom is at hand". This attack is not about liberation, and no one should believe that the USA or Israel, hands soaked in blood from Gaza and elsewhere has any interest in human freedom or happiness. This a geopolitical strategic consideration by the forces of US imperialism to assert greater control of the region. As we said in our [statement from 5 January](#) "We reject the plans for 'regime change' by Trump and Netanyahu, who are attempting to impose a solution from above by financing the monarchist movement and threatening further military intervention against Iran. Behind Trump's plans lies the explicit objective of gaining control of fossil fuel reserves, as he clearly stated with regard to Venezuela."<sup>1</sup>

7. The masses of Iran have been struggling for years to overthrow the Iranian theocratic government. Iranian women in particular have been in the forefront of these movements, most notably in the "Woman, Life, Freedom" movement in 2022. Iran has a large working class and trade unions that fight, particularly in the oil sector. Students most recently came out in mass protests after the regime slaughtered thousands in January. The Iranian government is weak, held together only by violence and fear.

8. The task of overthrowing the Iranian regime is the task of

the people of Iran, and the Fourth International supports the anti-imperialist and class struggle democratic forces there in their struggle.

**For mobilisations against the war across the world!**

**No US and Israeli war on Iran**

**Solidarity with the people of Iran**

**End U.S. imperialism and Israeli colonialism**

[1 Against the theocratic and authoritarian regime in Iran and imperialist interference: solidarity with the struggle of the Iranian people](#)