

THE POPULAR FRONT— WHAT IT IS AND WHY IT IS NEEDED NOW

History, Authoritarianism, and the Democratic Unity This Moment Requires

A Democratic Strategy Forum Essay

The Democratic Strategy Forum publishes analysis and strategy for defending and deepening democracy.

[Visit the Democratic Strategy Forum: forum.cbpr.org](https://forum.cbpr.org)

Why Use This Term Now?

The phrase “Popular Front” can sound archaic in the United States. It can sound like a relic from another era, another continent, another political language. But the problem it names is not archaic at all.

It names a very modern political necessity: what do democratic and left forces do when an authoritarian movement is growing, when the institutions of democracy are under pressure, and when no single political current is strong enough to meet the threat alone? In that situation, the old name still has real value because it describes a real strategic problem.

The term matters precisely because it is more than a loose call for unity. A Popular Front historically names a broader anti-fascist formation that extends beyond the usual boundaries of the democratic camp. It does not simply bring together liberals, labor unions, civil rights groups, women’s organizations, environmental organizations, and other forces already broadly aligned within democratic politics. Those relationships should already exist and should be strengthened on their own terms.

A Popular Front becomes necessary when the danger is so great that liberals, social democrats, communists, anti-capitalist democrats, and other forces further left must find a way to act together in defense of democracy, despite real differences in long-term vision.

A Warning from History

We are not the first generation to face a moment like this. History has already given us both a warning and a lesson. In the 1930s, fascism did not rise in a vacuum. It rose in the space created by division, fragmentation, delay, and the failure of democratic and left forces to act together in time. In Germany, that failure proved decisive. A Popular Front never took shape before it was too late.

Deep divisions between major political forces, combined with underestimation of the threat and escalating violence, gave authoritarian power the room it needed to consolidate.

Elsewhere, where broader alliances did form, they revealed both the promise and the limits of Popular Front strategy. In France, a Popular Front government brought together diverse forces to push back against the far right and win meaningful reforms. But even there the coalition came under enormous economic and political pressure, and unity by itself did not resolve the full crisis. The lesson is not that the strategy failed because unity was impossible.

The lesson is that it did not materialize soon enough, or at the necessary scale, before the wolf was at the door—and wreaking havoc.

What emerged from these experiences was a hard-earned political truth. Authoritarianism feeds on fragmentation. It exploits hesitation. It benefits when democratic and left forces act on separate tracks while the Right learns how to move as a bloc. That is why broad anti-authoritarian unity is not optional in a crisis like this. But history also teaches that such unity has to be built early, built broadly, and sustained under pressure.

The Situation We Face

Today, we confront a movement that is not simply conservative, reactionary, or conventionally right-wing. It is organized, coordinated, and increasingly authoritarian. It is backed by money, media, institutional power, and a political culture that is becoming more openly anti-democratic. It is not waiting for its opponents to get organized. It is moving now.

And yet the opposition remains fractured.

Labor is organizing. Civil rights organizations are organizing. Environmental groups are organizing. Women's organizations are organizing. LGBTQ organizations are organizing. Democracy organizations are organizing. Public health, education, immigrant rights, and other forces are organizing. All of that work matters. But the problem is that these forces should not have to wait for a Popular Front in order to find one another.

They belong, broadly speaking, to the mainstream democratic camp. Their alignment, coordination, and cooperation should already be a political baseline.

That gap matters. Authoritarian politics advances not only because the Right is strong, but because democratic forces remain dispersed, unevenly coordinated, and too often confined to issue silos. The danger is not only that the opposition is too small. It is that it is not yet acting with the kind of strategic alignment that the moment demands. This is why the present moment cannot be met with rhetorical unity alone.

It demands organizational and strategic unity inside the democratic camp—and, beyond that, a broader anti-fascist formation capable of reaching across deeper ideological lines when necessary.

What a Popular Front Actually Means

The Popular Front is often invoked as a historical symbol, but its real meaning is strategic. It names the effort to align forces that do not share the same final political horizon but do share an urgent interest in preventing authoritarian rule. That is what gives the term its force. It does not ask every organization or tendency to dissolve its own politics. It asks whether, in a moment of genuine danger, they can identify the greatest degree of common ground and act on it with discipline.

That is why a Popular Front should not be confused with ordinary coalition work among democratic organizations that are already ideologically close enough to cooperate. A labor-civil rights-environmental-women's-democracy coalition is necessary. But it is not yet the same thing as a Popular Front in the historical sense.

The latter arises when the defense of democracy requires broader cooperation between liberals and forces to their left—social democrats, anti-capitalist democrats, communists, and other currents that may disagree profoundly on long-term political direction but

understand that fascism would destroy the ground on which all further struggle depends.

To say this clearly matters in the present. A Popular Front does not ask us to give up our foundational principles. It asks us to identify the broadest possible common purpose in a dangerous moment: resist fascism and defend democracy, with all its shortcomings, before the ground beneath democratic life is further destroyed.

What This Means Now

If we take history seriously, then the path forward is not mysterious. We need stronger alignment across the democratic camp now, and we need to think seriously about what it would take to build a true Popular Front if and as conditions demand it. That means not only coalition statements and shared events, but real structure: shared analysis, shared priorities, mechanisms for coordination, and the capacity to act together at speed and scale.

It also means rejecting two common mistakes. The first is treating broad unity as a sentimental slogan rather than an organizational task. The second is imagining that the time to build such unity is after the crisis has fully matured. It is not. A Popular Front built too late is no front at all. By the time everyone agrees on the scale of the danger, the damage may already be far advanced.

For movements and democratic institutions alike, the implication is plain. We can no longer afford a politics of parallel efforts with minimal strategic connection. We need stronger coordination among labor, civil rights organizations, women's organizations, environmental groups, democracy organizations, and others across the democratic camp. And we need a sober, serious discussion of the broader forms of anti-fascist alignment that may become necessary as the crisis deepens.

We are still in the window where such a project can be built. But that window will not remain open indefinitely.

The Choice Before Us

The question is no longer whether broad anti-authoritarian unity would be desirable. The question is whether democratic and left forces can build it in time, at the necessary breadth, and with the seriousness the moment requires. History does not tell us that unity guarantees victory. It tells us something both more modest and more urgent: without it, authoritarianism advances more easily.

That is why the Popular Front remains a useful term, even now. It reminds us that there are moments when the defense of democracy requires more than coordination among familiar allies. It requires a wider political alignment, built without illusions, grounded in necessity, and clear about what is at stake. **We are in such a moment now.**

Please share this essay with organizations, colleagues, and others who may find it useful.

We welcome your thoughts. To respond to something you've read or add to the discussion, contact us at defend4demo@cbpr.org