

**How Do Eco-Fascist and Eco-Anarchist Movements Each Construct
the Relationship Between Nature, Humanity, and the State,
and What Does This Reveal About the Ideological Plasticity
of Environmentalism as a Political Framework?**

Jiangzhake Mushajiang
jiang.zhke.m@gmail.com

Abstract

This proposal examines how eco-fascist and eco-anarchist movements have each built a relationship between nature, humanity, and the state, and what their comparative structure reveals about the ideological plasticity of environmentalism. Despite sharing a similar concern with ecological crisis, these movements arrive at contradictory political conclusions: eco-fascism demand for an authoritarian-led, ethnically homogenous state in order to impose ecological order, while eco-anarchism identifies hierarchy itself — including the state — as the structural and direct root cause of environmental destruction. This proposal argues that environmentalism functions as a 'thin' ideology in Freedman's (1996) sense: A set of key concerns that aren't clear enough to produce a full political program without depending on another ideology. Using a comparative ideological analysis, drawing on primary texts from both movements as well as secondary scholarship in political philosophy, environmental history, and extremist studies. This research will create contribution by integrating two diametrically opposed movements that are rarely ever placed in direct dialogue to make a unified model of environmentalism's political vagueness.

1. Introduction

Few political phenomena are as intellectually disconcerting as the coexistence of eco-fascism and eco-anarchism. Both movements are refreshed by the same observational crisis which is the effect of industrial capitalism's destruction of the natural world, yet they produce political approaches that stand in absolute opposition to one another. Eco-fascism demands for a strong, racially ordered, homogenous state to reinforce ecological order and to protect the sacred bond between a people and its land. Eco-anarchism insists that the state, as an inherently hierarchical institution, is incapable of genuine ecological stewardship and so it must be dismantled. From growing rise of eco-facism through citations in manifestos from the Christchurch and El Paso shootings (Ebner, 2020), and as well as ever-so increasingly confrontational of eco-anarchist movements, a key problem is the gap in current literature as there aren't enough texts that haven't developed eco-anarchism and eco-facism in near total isolation, treating both of them as distinct ideological phenomenon.

2. Literature Review

The foundational text for the study of eco-fascism remains Staudenmaier and Biehl's *Ecofascism: Lessons from the German Experience* (1995), which traces origins from German Romantic Naturphilosophie through Nazi blood-and-soil ideology to contemporary far-right environmentalism. Staudenmaier demonstrates that the Third Reich implemented considerable nature protection legislation while simultaneously pursuing genocide, exposing the fatal contradiction of environmental politics that excludes humanity from its ethical scope.

In *The Ecology of Freedom* (1982), Bookchin develops his social ecology thesis: that the domination of nature and the domination of human beings are not similar phenomena but are historically linked through the institution of hierarchy. This movement is complemented by Arne Naess's (1973) deep ecology, which replaces anthropocentrism with biocentrism. Naess's framework has proven philosophically contested, claimed as a resource by eco-anarchists and eco-fascists alike, making it a particularly revealing site for analysing environmentalism's ideological plasticity.

This proposal's central thesis comes from Michael Freeden's *Ideologies and Political Theory* (1996), which introduces the distinction between thin and thick ideologies. A thin ideology, in Freeden's framework, only has a small set of core ideas and cannot become a full political programme by itself; because of this, it depends on a stronger and more developed ideology such as nationalism or anarchism in order to become politically operative. Dobson's *Green Political Thought* (2007) applies a similar framework to green politics, distinguishing practical environmentalism from radical ecologism, while Eckersley's *Environmentalism and Political Theory* (1992) examines why ecocentric philosophy does not directly entail a single political outcome.

3. Methodology

In the first stage, a primary text collection is assembled for each tradition. The eco-fascist text includes Richard Walther Darre's *Blood and Soil* (1930), Ludwig Klages's *Man and Earth* (1913/1980), and contemporary far-right ecological manifestos documented and contextualised by Forchtner (2019). The eco-anarchist corpus includes Bookchin's *The Ecology of Freedom* (1982) and *Post-Scarcity Anarchism* (1971), Naess's *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* (1989), and Jensen's *Endgame* (2006).

In the second stage, each text is subjected to close reading using Freeden's (1996) morphological method, which identifies the core, adjacent, and peripheral concepts of an ideology and analyses how they are logically configured in relation to one another. Findings from each reading will be organised around three structural questions: What conception of nature strengthens the movement's ecological politics? How does the movement conceptualise the relationship between humans and the natural world? What role does the movement assign to within the state in resolving an ecological crisis?

In the third stage, the comparative profiles are brought into dialogue with Freeden (1996) and Dobson (2007) to test and develop the thin ideology thesis. The analysis won't just attend to the obvious differences between the two movements but to their structural similarities that are shared conceptual resources such as anti-industrialism, critiques of enlightenment rationalism, and conceptions of pre-industrial nature in order to explain why the same ecological material can be organised into radically different political programs. The methodology requires no fieldwork, interviews, or access to restricted data; all primary and secondary sources are available through academic libraries and public archives, making the research fully feasible.

4. Conclusion

By placing eco-fascism and eco-anarchism in rigorous comparative dialogue for the first time, and by placing that comparison through Freeden's morphological framework, this research will generate an original theoretical account of environmentalism's political uncertainty. Its central claim which is of that environmentalism is a thin ideology requiring an external ideological host to become politically actionable, offers an explanation for one of contemporary politics' most disorienting features: that the same ecological crisis can simultaneously inspire authoritarianism and anarchism, nationalism and internationalism, as well as admiration for hierarchy and its total rejection.

References

- Biehl, J., & Staudenmaier, P. (1995). *Ecofascism: Lessons from the German experience*. AK Press.
- Bookchin, M. (1971). *Post-scarcity anarchism*. Ramparts Press.
- Bookchin, M. (1982). *The ecology of freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy*. Cheshire Books.
- Darre, R. W. (1930). *Das Bauerntum als Lebensquell der Nordischen Rasse*. J. F. Lehmanns Verlag.
- Dobson, A. (2007). *Green political thought* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Ebner, J. (2020). *Going dark: The secret social lives of extremists*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Eckersley, R. (1992). *Environmentalism and political theory: Toward an ecocentric approach*. State University of New York Press.
- Forchtner, B. (Ed.). (2019). *The far right and the environment: Politics, discourse and communication*. Routledge.
- Freedden, M. (1996). *Ideologies and political theory: A conceptual approach*. Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, D. (2006). *Endgame: Vol. 1. The problem of civilization*. Seven Stories Press.
- Klages, L. (1980). *Man and earth*. In R. Pois (Ed.), *Race and nation* (pp. 41–68). Croom Helm. (Original work published 1913).
- Naess, A. (1973). The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement: A summary. *Inquiry*, 16(1–4), 95–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747308601682>
- Naess, A. (1989). *Ecology, community and lifestyle* (D. Rothenberg, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.