Dysophia
Green Anarchism

<www.dysophia.org.uk/dysophia/dysophia0/>

theanarchistlibrary.org

Green Anarchism

Dysophia

Contents

Polyamory: anarchist perspectives (Dysophia 1)

Poverty, Privilege and Immigration (Dysophia 2)

For more information email ***dysophia@riseup.net*** or write to ***Dysophia, c/o CRC, 16 Sholebroke Avenue, Leeds, LS7 3HB***

No subscriptions or website, but may be someday. In the meantime find us at bookfairs, infoshops and the like.

For further reading we suggest

"*Anarchism: a beginners guide*," Ruth Kinna "*Tyranny of Structurelessness*," Jo Freeman

"*Making a killing: the political economics of animal rights*," Bob Torres an the many texts available at www.theanarchistlibrary.org or libcom.org

For current debates check out the following magazines:

Shift, Turbulence, Black Flag & Anarchism, A Journal of Desire Armed

About Us

Dysophia is a new imprint for publishing pamphlets and zines exploring issues around green anarchist thought in a way that makes the issues accessible to everyone. We try to avoid dense theory, but give the knowledge to empower and make up your own minds.

For us green anarchism is a powerful tool for analysing much of the world around us, from interpersonal relationships to how we take on the big problems standing between us and our ideal society. We want to educate and encourage debate, to question everything then bring it together with solutions that take us forward. We are not interested in prolonged bickering over moot points, but celebrate our diversity and our common ambitions.

It is okay to challenge each other, it is okay to disagree. Knowledge does not have to be unified, but through honest and open discussion everyone can benefit and make up their own minds. Anarchism, innit.

We are always interested in feedback, suggestions of topics to cover or even ideas of articles you would like to write for us. We will try to respond to all emails, but we cannot promise, and as much as we like debate what we ideally want are direct responses we can put into future publications.

Currently available issues are

Green Anarchism: a political toolbox (Dysophia 0)

The Crisis of Crises Pt1: The Financial Crisis (CC1)

The Crisis of Crises Pt2: Peak Resources & Climate Change (CC2)

In preparation:

powered by g.r.o.a.t.s...
grumpy ranting old anarchists talking sense/shite*
*** delete as applicable**

Introduction & Editorial

Welcome to Dysophia, a new and occasional 'zine that looks to explore what it means to be a green/purple anarchist. Don't expect dense theory or in-depth historical backgrounds here. What we are about is looking at what it actually means to be an anarchist in the 21s century UK, in particular how the theory of anarchism affects our campaigns and our lives.

In the next few issues, we hope to explore particular topics in greater depth. However, in this, the first in the series, it makes sense to explore concepts of anarchism so as to lay the foundations as we see them.

At this point we need to be clear that this is simply our concept of what anarchism stands for. It is often said that there are as many versions of anarchism as there are anarchists. This is not a bad thing, but if debate is to be had it will progress much better if the conceptions which underlie our anarchism are clearly laid out.

The standard approach is to consider it less as a political philosophy and rather to examine it how it is expressed – that is, through anti-state protest, in statements of non-hierarchy and rejection of leaders, in radical union movements and more often than not in its confrontational approach to the current mainstream.

We shall take a different starting point and instead following the approach of Irving Horowitz[1]. Horowitz noted that the historical strands of anarchism were expressions of more fundamental principles that were applied to the political situations the anarchists were in.

[1] Irving Horowitz, "*The Anarchists*", 1964.

face up to the challenges of being an anarchist in a society whose economic system is based on environmental exploitation.

manity and its needs are clearly placed at the center of political thought, or at least given precedence.

Many strands of philosophy within green anarchism challenge this inherent hierarchy. They place just as much value on the environment and animals, and point out how the abuse of resources have lead to the problems facing people globally on both economic and social levels, so that one mirrors the other effectively.

Some authors emphasize social impacts as of primary importance, citing the increasing alienation of humanity from the environment as a root cause of the problems. Others focus on how anarchism can inform a society where resources have become scarce.

The three principle strands of thought (but not the only ones) are:

Social Ecology

The starting point here is that the earth sustains all life, but that ecological problem result from the problems in society, thus to solve the environmental crises requires radical social change.

Deep Ecology

This goes further and argues that as the earth sustains all life, the well being of ecosystems should have priority over humanity.

Primitivism

A belief that the only truly sustainable way forward is to live as close to nature as possible, and thus has a very critical view of technology and its attendant civilisations. Furthermore, that the alienation of humans from the environment is at the root of the many problems in our society.

There is no consensus on them, but they are still being actively discussed and dynamically intersecting with each other as people

That is not to say that Horowitz identified these principles – mutual aid and solidarity, freedom & equality go as far back as the first theorists, but he pointed out that they were often being simply considered within particular contexts, that each group applying them focused on the issues that exercised them the most. Thus, as analysis changed from group to group the same words took on different meanings. However, the process and aims remained the same.

Understanding this means that it is possible to start from these principles and to bring together everything commonly referred to as core anarchist beliefs, such as anti-hierarchy, free association, etc. As we will see they are remarkably consistent and informative and the wider analysis that can be developed from it remains powerful and accessible, so making them just as useful in every day life as they are in critiquing states, bosses and wars.

Variations on Black

Traditionally, anarchism has been loyal to its roots in the social struggles of the 19th century, which saw the principle home of the politics as being in the workplace. For a time it vied with marxism to be the dominant philosophy of the left, taking a more radical approach to what any postrevolutionary world would look like.

After the defeats in the Spanish Civil war, it sank into the doldrums from the 1930s to the late 1960s. However, in the latter third of the twentieth century it was revitalised by the radicalisation of other political movements, in particular the environmental and human liberation movements (based on gender, race and sexuality), and by other groupings such as situationists, insurrectionists, illegalists, etc.

Following on from its roots in the early socialism movement and class struggle, the dominant form of anarchism is often referred to as red-black anarchism. Those whose analysis starts from an ecological starting point are called green anarchists, while those coming from a liberation perspective often are given the colour purple. These are not just *ad hoc* differences, but emphasise the various approaches by which people have come to anarchism; they bring with them additional principles which distinguish them from other strands of anarchist thought.

An important effect of integrating the thought of liberation movements has been to take anarchism out of the workplace and demonstrate that it is just as important in our personal lives. Through the concept of self-determination it has helped re-establish the importance of creative personal expression within the concept of anarchist freedom.

well. International solidarity, often mentioned by the Left, does not mean we pay sole attention to the needs of the factories of the industrialised west which support our standards of living. The whole global system becomes under the microscope, and if the standards to which we believe we are entitled to live to are part of the problem elsewhere then we should accept that, and change our expectations accordingly.

Nor can we abdicate responsibility for it by simply blaming society as a whole. This is particularly hypocritical as we are actually seeking to change the society itself. There is a responsibility to set examples.

This is not saying that we should change overnight and retreat *en masse*, but that we need to recognise our own culpability in global issues. There needs to be a critique to our consumerism, and a willingness to work towards making a difference, even if that means a less comfortable life than our governments and society have lead us to expect.

Freedom without economic freedom is worthless, as was pointed out by Martin Luther King. Green anarchism extends this to considering not just the economy but to access to the environment, to water, land and air, to food supply and long term sustainability so political self-determination is an economic reality, not just empty words.

Thus two key characteristics of green anarchism are:

> (a) confronting economic system involved in exploitation of resources;
>
> (b) linking environmental and animal abuse with the abuse of people.

There is another important effect of the intersection of green politics with anarchism: the questioning of the anthropocentric viewpoint. In much of traditional and liberationist anarchism, hu-

a diversity of tactics, from setting up organic farm collectives to battling the police. Both are expressions of trying to reclaim resources and power from those who would deprive us of them, or use them to maintain inequalities. The point is to actively challenge the hierarchies we have rejected in all their forms.

Environmental Politics

In much of this pamphlet we have repeatedly mentioned resources. All resources are ultimately planet based, and there is no credible reason why everyone should not have equal share and access to what we need to live and enjoy creative expression of our lives without exploitation or being exploited. Likewise, anarchism requires that our actions do not negatively impact on another. For this reason climate change, GM crops, etc. are all important issues that anarchists need to integrate in their political standpoints, and not just fall for propaganda which puts the interest of one group above another.

Yet, how do freedoms and consumer choices we take for granted compare with the need to show others solidarity? If our lifestyle comes at the price of oppression of others, can we then say that we are all then equal?

Green anarchism points out that the workspace and society are not self-contained units, but dependent on the wider network of resources that supply them. Thus we have to consider the wider implications of acquiring those resources, in particular the effects on social justice and the environment that can have. Solidarity says we cannot ignore international effects of our society's aspirations and living standards, though there are awkward challenges for all of us from such a global perspective.

It is not sufficient to be anti-capitalist, etc, for underpinning capitalist economics is access to energy and resources: coal, oil, iron ore and so on, and issues around this access need to be tackled as

It also placed on a firmer basis the roles of anti-racism, feminism, queer politics and so on within anarchism. Being a feminist does not make you an anarchist, and there are many self-professed anarchists who do not adhere to feminist principles, but we will show that the two sets of politics overlap strongly, and that anarchism requires us to pay more than lip service to liberationist politics.

Earth-centred analyses bring in sustainability and shifts the political focus away from anthropocentric (human-centred) view points. Green anarchists argue that we must consider the environment as a whole, with decisions to take into account resource consumption, living in harmony with ecosystems, and human and ecological health and well-being. It introduces wider questions regarding our relationship with people who live under very different social and political regimes, arguing that our privileged view-point is based on a level of industrialization that comes at a cost to others.

The Basic Principles of Anarchism

The basic principles of all anarchism we believe can be summed up in two statements:

1. That all shall be free and equal.

2. That we shall extend mutual aid and solidarity where we can.

Of course, we have to define what freedom, equality, mutual-aid and solidarity actually mean. However, before delving deeper, note that the core principles of anarchism are all dependent on each other. It is not sufficient to talk about respect and solidarity if some aspect of it violates mutual aid or autonomy of the individual, and so on. None of the principles can stand on their own, but together they simultaneously narrow the definitions and strengthen each other.

It should also be said that these are not the only possible definitions of anarchist principles. However, we believe that other definitions are simply reflections of each other and will produce the same analysis in the end.

There is also an unstated assumption in the principles is that are intended to be pro-active. To be an anarchist is to not be a passive consumer, but to actively create the society you desire. It is not sufficient to say that someone is your equal. Anarchists believe in challenging hierarchies in our relationships, especially where matters of access to power and resources are concerned, and this goes for both those at the bottom of the imbalance, and those at the top.

forces and armies; both are political tools when needed, and will be used to suppress any challenges to their overall authority.

Even so called non-authoritarian states, such as those embracing western democratic models, are dependent on the myth that surrendering powers to politicians, police and others is for our own good. These well established hierarchies have been embedded in our collective psyche which presents us with further difficulties if we are to convince people that anarchism provides a realistic alternative.

For some the mere act of maintaining their private freedoms will bring confrontation from the state and society itself, especially where laws are built into the system specifically to keep a disadvantaged or disapproved of group where they are. The history of the struggles for ethnic, gender and sexual rights is a testament to this.

Whether it is for ourselves, or in solidarity with others, the act of redistributing power and resources is a challenge to the State. The more power is distributed vertically, the more those at the top prefer to see it become aggregated in them and the more they will resist its distribution, using both coercion and persuasion as necessary, usually simultaneously.

To strengthen their control over society, those in power will accept only those freedoms that are granted through them, rather than recognising the right to self-determination by each individual. They will further legitimize their authority through claiming control of resources, especially land, water, etc. Economic necessity becomes a tool of oppression, thus putting access to resources such as land or the means to making a living at the centre of anarchist struggle.

Facing up to this is the politics of confronting hierarchies, from the domestic sphere to the State to systemic capitalism. It takes many forms, whether setting up viable alternatives and demonstrating that anarchism works, or equally validly it can be directly challenging the sources of oppression. Anarchists will not always agree on particular strategies, but anarchism embraces

Groups are generally open to all who want to join and who are prepared to accept the criteria the group has established. A group can have specific criteria, but as long as there is not conflict with the general anarchist principles, this is fine. What matters is that it is not used as an excuse to perpetuate other oppressions or repressive systems. As we live in a non-anarchist world there are sometimes a need for closed groups, but this is a way of dealing with the existing system rather than our ideal society.

Saying that, there is more to being an anarchist than simply adopting the label. Solidarity, respect, mutual-aid, etc, are all requirements that cannot be ignored. A group of drunk activists having a shindig that is pissing other people off is not anarchism. Anarchism is not about doing what ever you want, but about taking responsibility for your actions and participating in your community with respect for all others involved.

Temporary Hierarchies

All this is not to say there are never hierarchies in green anarchism. They exist, but the different is they are temporary in nature, in place to deal with a specific situation and dissolved afterwards. While some people have specialist knowledge, what matters is it is readily shared, not hoarded.

Confrontational Politics – clawing back power

Power is addictive, it bestows benefits on those who have it, and it is easy to create a system which allows a few to exploit others for personal gain. Such systems are not going to vanish overnight, and massive systems such as states are adept at using alienation and coercion to maintain themselves. This is why states have police

How we challenge imbalances will depend very much on the context. Sometimes it is through discussion and education; other times it demands a much more assertive or confrontational approach.

That all shall be free and equal

This sounds self-evident, even trite, but in the anarchist analysis it becomes a very powerful tool. Often freedom and equality are only discussed within narrow parameters. For instance, the freedom to vote in a modern democracy, equality before the unforgiving power of the law, or through illusory concepts such as the "American Dream", or the freedom to be a wage slave. Anarchists question why these parameters need to exist.

In most political systems freedom and equality are qualified rights, bestowed and removed at the whim of the elite who govern. Anarchists on the other hand consider them inalienable, and that it is the social systems that must be curtailed rather than freedom and inequality.

On Freedom

In anarchism, freedom is not a right that is bestowed by other individuals; rather it is something intrinsic to the society we wish to live in.

What does it mean to be free? The Oxford English Dictionary definition says it is not being under the control or power of another. Most political philosophies will run a mile from this concept, placing all sorts of restrictions so as to render it meaningless. However, for anarchists the starting point is that they should be unfettered as far as possible. There are other philosophies which place the freedom of the individual at the centre of their theory, and this approach is referred to as "libertarianism".

When applying the notion of freedom we consider power relationships between one person and another; or an individuals relationship with government, corporations or a group in society.

When anarchists proclaim their desire to be free, it is asserting that no other individual, corporation or government should be able to coerce us as to what to do, what to think or what to say. There is still the possibility that we can be persuaded that their point of view is the correct one, but in being free we have the option to reject it as well.

The forces of compulsion are essentially blackmail and fear, enhanced by turning them into social pressures, which are not supposed to be questioned, or received wisdom that cannot be overturned without a struggle. Co-opted religions is also used to keep people in line, effectively using a fear of damnation and social rejection, as well as maintaining the standing of powerful elites connected with them. Other tools used by states use include economic pressure, such as control over jobs, and fear of criminalisation, linking both to social standing. Mainstream media in turn constantly re-enforces all these norms, and actively scorn those who chose not to conform.

Of course this does not mean that one person's freedom can come at the expense of others. Great freedom comes with great responsibilities, and how our freedom is tempered by social and environmental needs is a real strength of the anarchist approach. The interplay of mutual aid, solidarity and ecological sustainability with the demands of freedom and equality make anarchism a rich and rewarding approach to life.

It also throws out many challenges. We have been raised in a society that bombards us with messages all the time, and whose attitudes we have absorbed without ever really having a chance to question them.

Thus to be an anarchist requires more than just adopting the label, or shouting anti-government slogans. We have to face up to our own behaviour and our relationships with each other and

There is a similar rejection of the traditional left for its centralizing and authoritarian approach. Indeed, it is common in green anarchist thought to emphasis the decentralised approach as the most non-hierarchical.

Decision-Making and Groups

A distinguishing feature of many green anarchist groups is the flat nature of their organising and the inclusivity of decision-making. Given the natural rejection of internal hierarchies, there is a focus on more horizontal structures, such as networks and coalitions. Likewise, groups do not have leaders and members are hopefully empowered to take responsibility for themselves and the group as a whole. Networks formed out of groups who take autonomous actions is also a common feature.

Decisions are made collectively, and as far as possible on an equal basis through encouraging participation and engagement by all those involved. A common process adopted is the use of consensus, around which many tools have been developed to facilitate making discussion open to all.

The aim is to prevent domination by cliques, or for some voices to be always heard above others. It provides frameworks which prevent hidden hierarchies of seniority or personality. It also allows groups to prevent either the tyranny of the majority, whereby a section may disagree with a decision by the majority of the group, or tyranny by a minority, where a small group manipulate or disrupt the process for their own ends.

Voting is generally avoided as the choices are rarely nuanced enough, leaving parts of the group disenfranchised and their opinions disregarded. It does not allow for synthesis of different approaches in the same way that consensus decision-making encourages.

no matter how much western culture dresses it up as such. Where there is a threat of losing your job, where your sexuality or skin colour is used to keep you in a weaker position, where you have less determination over your life or access to resources, then there is a hierarchy.

A starting point to challenge this is to call for equal opportunities, for anti-discrimination policies, for equal pay. But it is just a starting point, as a system or society that permits this sort of inequality in the first place is fundamentally flawed. We need to be careful that we do not replicate structures that will allow this sort of oppression to re-establish itself in a different form (e.g. right of women to work, but only within a patriarchal system), or simply create a slightly less discriminatory society.

Anything which denies freedom or equality, economic or otherwise, sets up a hierarchy through the tool of discrimination. Often the hierarchies are insidious, built into the fabric of our culture.

This is why saying that you are not homophobic or racist simply because you subscribe to anarchism is not sufficient. It does not deal with the wider context of the society in which you have grown and developed and whose norms you have been constantly exposed to. It takes great arrogance to believe that one is completely free of society's influence simply because one has declared it. Self-examination is required, and that includes being continually being open to the demands presented by less powerful groups.

So, anarchy is against hierarchy. From this starting point it is not hard to make the leap to anti-capitalism, anti-government and antiauthoritarianism. Militant anti-fascism is also an expression of this approach by anarchists, who recognise the dangers inherent in allowing extreme right wing politics to get deeper footholds in society.

Organised religion is included in this critique, as it tends to be authoritarian and proscriptive, especially in regard to religious leaders.

society in general. We have to undo the conditioning and question our own positions of privilege.

On Equality

In the anarchist approach, equality means having the same access to resources and rights, to power, education, decision-making and so on.

Where freedom is how able an individual is to make decisions and voice their opinions, equality is how external factors affect that freedom. It is how much capacity that person has, as affected by social pressures, access to education, resources, etc. It is also about seeing individuals as individuals and not pre-judging them because of some aspect about them they cannot change, about being open minded to let them be as they are.

Generally it is applied to gender, race, sexuality, age, etc. For an anarchist it goes beyond these, to be applied in all situations where there is discriminatory access to resources or power. All individuals should have equal access to their share of available resources and share equal responsibility and participation in all decisions made in their name

Equality is the basis of passive social relationships, that is, how we relate to all members of our society, strangers and friends alike. It underpins the society that we want to live in. If notions of equality are superficial, then the society itself will be hollow, allowing the oppression we sought to be rid to continuing in subtler forms.

It demands that you do not see yourself as more deserving or more important over another simply because of who you are. It tempers the selfishness of pure libertarianism, and ensures that asserting our freedom does not come at the expense of others. The logical conclusion of is a tension between self-interest and society's interest.

Equality does not require that you have to like everyone, but it does imply that there has to be a basic respect for the needs and

freedoms of other people in your community. That means sharing power and resources, ensuring they are distributed equally, not acquiring them in order to protect individual freedoms. The needs of the wider community are just as important. Thus, it imposes a need for awareness of the impact of our actions and ambitions.

For example, when we talk about discrimination it is essentially about different people not having access to jobs or equal pay simply because of something about them over which they have no ability to change. It requires us as anarchists to look people in the eye and deal with them honestly and as individuals with their own needs and desires, such as talking directly to disabled people instead of their carers.

Discrimination implies there exists a justification for an inequality.

Anarchism resists this as a fundamental betrayal of principle of equality.

This analysis can be extended beyond individuals to considering relationships between different communities and even different cultures.

That we shall extend mutual aid and solidarity were we can

Anarchism is pro-active in its outlook. It is not sufficient that we as individuals or our particular group in society are free and equal with access to the resources desired; we see ourselves as part of a wider whole and take on the extra responsibilities that brings.

On Mutual Aid

Mutual aid is helping each other to achieve individually and mutually beneficial goals. Already it is the glue that holds society together. In an anarchist world it would form the basis of any

logical exploitation. A factory depends on access to resources in order to maintain its output. Yet what if the production of those resources is causing pollution elsewhere in the world? What if it is using so much water that it is affecting farmers in the locality? Who gets to benefit first – ecosystems, farmers, workers?

There are no clear-cut answers as each situation will be case specific, but the questions are central to the approach of green anarchism.

Furthermore, they demonstrate that it is not possible to ignore wider local and global issues around particular struggles if a consistent analysis is to be applied. For if by supporting the existence of a factory we allow oppression to be facilitated elsewhere, are we really showing solidarity in the broad sense? How can we show solidarity simply on a local, immediate level without thought to the wider consequences?

This approach, inherent in anarchism, gives rise to many potential conflicts, that are for the most part ignored. It is of course not possible to change everything at once, but there is a need to develop a deeper analysis of the implications of what is being supported or demanded.

Against Hierarchies

A hierarchy is a power relationship; that is, where someone has more power than another, whether through some notional authority, a forceful personality or through access to information and resources. This imbalance is used to dominate, whether it's an abusive partner, a boss in a workplace, or imperialism. Society also has many hierarchical power relationships founded on discrimination and prejudice.

Even when hierarchy seems benign, there remains the fact that someone has the power to deny someone else access to self-determination, resources, jobs and so on. This is not freedom,

Extending the Principles

Traditionally the above principles have been applied to the workplace and the notion of class struggle. Indeed, when defining anarchism it has been common to talk about class solidarity and the revolutionary workplace as being its core principles, because this is where anarchism found its strongest expressions for much of its development.

However the principles stand alone and can be applied to all sorts of situations. If one is arguing for an anarchist society then it must be a society that is anarchist in all its aspects, not picking and choosing when to apply the principles and when not, according to personal whim.

We argue that there are few aspects of society and behaviour that cannot be put under the anarchist spotlight and be challenged. Furthermore, doing this is just as important as any other aspect of the anarchist struggle. Some criticise this "lifestyle" approach to anarchism precisely because it removes the workplace from the heart of the anarchist struggle.

Thus there is an open question, of whether someone can be an anarchist in one aspect of their life but not in others. Green anarchism argues that the wider struggles all need to be incorporated into a more holistic approach. Taking a leaf from radical feminist theory, connections are drawn between the exploitations of capitalism, patriarchy, racism, etc. They are all inter-connected and we will struggle to remove one while permitting other forms of abuse and oppression to continue.

Another issue that green anarchism's approach brings out is the critique of the workplace as a hidden source of human and eco-

economic systems, replacing current dominant models which are dependent on accumulation and therefore encourage exploitation and inequality.

Relationships between people in society would be based around the principles of cooperation and sharing of resources. It becomes in their own interests to help others, in other words, altruism is rewarded.

It can be argued that this must arise if we are to extend equality and freedom to their natural conclusions. Neither can reach their full potential if there exists at all a system where there are those who have all they need and more, while some do not.

On a societal level groups need to come together, big and small, not just for mutual benefit, but for the benefit of society as a whole. We must take on the holistic management of resources by those who use or need them, rather than abdicating that responsibility to others such as corporations and governments.

There are many models for how this would work and no one size fits all, but there are working examples all over the world of cooperative society in action. Organisations such as Radical Routes in the UK, Mondragon in Spain and others across the Global South (Argentina in particular) demonstrate that modern cooperative societies are realistic aspirations.

Economics, however, is probably the least developed part of anarchist thought, even though it is growing in stature. Theoretical developments such as the Viable Systems Model are allowing the principle of mutual aid to be effectively scaled up to larger systems than most of us are accustomed to dealing with. This can answer much of the criticism levelled at anarchists, but there is much work to still be done in this area.

> "*We want to see a world based on equality and co-operation where people give according to their ability and receive according to their needs, where work is fulfilling and useful and creativity is encouraged, where*

decision making is open to everyone with no hierarchies, where the environment is valued and respected in its own right rather than exploited."

From the Aims and Principles of Radical Routes

On Solidarity

Solidarity means actively supporting those who share some of our ambitions, or are striving for basic standards of freedom and equality. Of all the basic principles of anarchism it is the most challenging, as it requires action on all our parts. Unifying our interests demands that we understand the needs of others and that we actively seek to redress imbalances between groups. There is no point expressing solidarity with a group if we are still involved in actions or purchases which aid in their repression, or we continue to promote types of behaviour that contribute to the problem. It also requires awareness of how we in the west live much more privileged lifestyles and take many choices for granted.

It is not just about one-to-one relationships, but about the society we all individually help to shape and about how that society relates to others. In terms of green anarchism it is a powerful tenet, if often unacknowledged, which underpins much of our campaigns and political actions.

Common interest is only the starting point of what solidarity means. Anarchism means demonstrating active solidarity with other groups seeking equality, even though they may have different interests from ours.

Thus it is not enough for men to acknowledge the need of female liberation, but to actively support it and challenge their own prejudices. Likewise, in situations where a group is fighting for self-determination we should generally support their efforts and calls for help, even if there is no apparent link between us and them.

Solidarity helps build the wider networks which keep society strong, healthy and self-examination. Expressing it contributes to letting trust develop and can prevent descent into more selfish groupings.

Unfortunately, the logical conclusions of solidarity are often over-looked in favour of focusing on particular issues or put to one side as being impractical or too difficult. Solidarity is supporting others challenge the inequalities and abuses of power in our society, even though they might not be our struggles or through recognizing our own roles in perpetuating them. It also stops groups remaining single-issue in nature. In it is a recognition that only by us all standing together that we remain strong, even if there are some disagreements.

However, there are problems where the struggle of an oppressed group do not entirely align with our own positions. For example what does it mean to support workers in an arms factory? With such discussions we can explore the nature of green anarchism, and the healthy divergence of opinions in it.

Like much that makes up anarchism, we need to work at solidarity and continually question our concepts of our relationship with the world.