

For the 'Liberation' of Africa?

THE Summit meeting of 31 African States which completed its deliberations in Addis Ababa last week-end, seems united at least on the question of ridding the African continent of the last three bastions of old-style colonialism: Angola, and other Portuguese colonies, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. In the words of the *Observer's* Colin Legum "they took the last step short of war". The idea of a united Africa supporting and implementing their struggle against the colonial rulers should raise their morale and hopes of success just as it will have the effect on the colonial powers concerned of tightening up and increasing the measures they take to defend the privileged white minorities. The "liberation" armies and underground fighters would be

trained in various parts of "liberated" Africa. Algeria's Ben Bella, told the conference that but for the Congo government's opposition, 10,000 Algerians would now be fighting alongside the Angolians.

We have no doubt in our minds that the white minorities' grip on these countries can only be broken by a counter-force which the people do not possess, and which it is doubtful that they would be able to acquire unaided. In the circumstances, African nationalism, violence (from organised armed-resistance to acts of terrorism), aided and supported from "friendly" neighbouring states is inevitable. If after 400 years of Portuguese rule the Angolians have still not managed to shake off the white-man, what grounds are there for supposing that

they ever will, unaided?

We are only too aware of the fact that the pattern of nationalist movements has been to replace one set of masters by another. We anarchists and some socialists have been saying this *ad nauseam*; events have proved us right, a very poor consolation compared with the sense of frustration we should feel at the failure to introduce our ideas to even a tiny minority of literate Africans over the past thirty years or so. The conference last week in Addis Ababa of 31 "heads of State" was described by James Cameron in Monday's *Daily Herald* as the end of an era: "From today Africa can never be the same again". We agree, but for quite different reasons! Africa will never be the same again because the revolutionary potential

of 240 million people has at last been canalised, neutralised, taken-over by the political machine. Men—brave men—who up to yesterday had faced exile, persecution, prison and torture in their pursuit of an ideal, an ideal or an ambition, today enjoy real power over the lives of millions

of their fellow beings. It may well be short-lived, but today in terms of *real power* these men have more power than a Kennedy or a Khrushchev, a Macmillan or a de Gaulle. These new leaders, like the kings of the past, have powers to create a

Continued on page 3

Marham-and After

THE Committee of 100 demonstration which began on 11th May, 1963, continued on 18th May. On the 11th, about 300 people went to RAF Marham to reclaim it for peaceful purposes, and nearly seventy were arrested and charged under Section One of the Official Secrets Act (as reported in *FREEDOM* on 18th May). When they appeared at Downham Market magistrates' court on 16th May, they were remanded until 25th May—on bail if they undertook not to take part in any further demonstration, in custody if they refused. On the 18th, about 300 people went to RAF Marham again to show their determination to challenge the Warfare State and their solidarity for their seventy comrades.

We arrived at Marham village at about 1.0 on the Saturday afternoon. Our plan was to re-enter the base and, if we failed, to re-enter some other base in East Anglia. Most of us came from London, but there were groups from Brighton, Bristol, and even Scotland. Many of us had been there the previous weekend, but there were several welcome new faces.

We moved off at about 2.0, not past the main gate as the press said, but round the east side of the base. At about 2.30 we reached a point where there was just a ploughed

field between us and the end of the main runway. The field was a "prohibited place", but the real perimeter of the base was about 300 yards from the road.

The direct action began at about 3.0, when about 100 of us set out across the field. Unfortunately we had taken so long getting there that by the time we were at the boundary fence the RAF were there too. We should have attacked the base sooner. Some people managed to get into the base, but only a few were arrested. We spread out along the fence, had a look at the bomb dumps which were guarded by high fences and fierce dogs, and then moved round past the Bloodhound missiles to another vulnerable point.

Again some people managed to get into the base, and again only a few were arrested. By about 5.30 it was clear that we couldn't re-enter the base in force, so some of us formed ourselves into informal commando groups. We got into various private vehicles, rushed round the base, and made lightning attacks at various weak points. We managed to get inside several times, but they had vehicles too, and radios as well, and less distance to travel, so they managed to get us out again without too much trouble. The first group who got in were just dragged out again; the second group were arrested.

By about 7.0 we gave up trying to get into the base, and moved on to Shouldham village, where they had set up a temporary magistrates' court again. About forty people had been arrested on the base, but this time they were just charged with obstructing the police. Another couple of dozen people who sat down in Shouldham to obstruct the authorities' activities were also arrested and also charged with obstructing the police. The threat of the Official Secrets Act had failed, so the Official Secrets Act was not used. A few people were tried at once, but most of them were remanded until 25th May as well, many of them in custody.

After about 8.0 the demonstration began to peter out. Some people went back to Marham, but although fewer airmen were visible there were still hundreds on duty, and although it was possible to get into the base it wasn't possible to get very far or to stay very long. Some of us made some practice feints, which alarmed and annoyed the defenders, but didn't get us anywhere. Some people went instead to RAF Honington, 30 miles to the south, where we had demonstrated last October, but it was guarded as heavily as Marham. Thousands of airmen and hundreds of police must have been out all day and most of the night. Some of the airmen at Marham were very rough, and a few of them attacked some demonstrators in Shouldham later on in the evening. By midnight it was all over.

On 25th May, nearly 150 people were tried at Downham Market magistrates' court. Our show of determination and solidarity had worked: the charges under Section One of the Official Secret's Act had been withdrawn and fresh charges made under Section Five—in other words, the seventy people who were arrested on the 11th were accused of *obstruction* with a maximum penalty of £50 and/or 3 months, instead of being accused of *entry* with a maximum penalty of life! A few of them asked to be remanded

IN BRIEF

IN AUSTRIA. Austrian police are considering action against officials responsible for life sentences imposed on two innocent men. The men have been released after serving 14 years for murder. The men, Hubert Renneth and Josef Auer, of Linz, were sentenced for robbing and killing three men. An expert inquiry has now found that their guilt was not proved.

IN HAITI—where 90 per cent of the population remain illiterate—a new cock-fighting arena has been built costing one million dollars. It is named Duvaaliville after the country's dictatorial ruler.

so that they could prepare cases, but nearly everyone was fined and bound over, or imprisoned for a few weeks. The forty people who were arrested on the 18th were treated in the same way.

This is hardly a famous victory, but it is certainly a victory of a kind. Something like 300 people have deliberately entered a prohibited place—and sabotaged a military base for a few hours—and less than half have been arrested and no one has been seriously punished. We have not only broken the Official Secrets Act—we have conspired to do so and incited others to do so, and we have also broken (and conspired to break) the laws of Disaffection and Sedition. We have taken the initiative again, and gone back on the offensive.

The events of the last few weeks have shown that the radical wing of the unilateralist movement has come to life again. The people who

have produced and reproduced the "Spies for Peace" and "Scots against War" pamphlets, the people who sat in their aeroplane at Düsseldorf and raided the RSG at Warren Row and filled the streets of London at Easter, the people who have raided the RSGs at Edinburgh on 21st April and Preston on 27th April and Cambridge on 28th April and Dover on 5th May and Brecon on 18th May and will raid the RSG at Hope Cove on 3rd June, the people who have entered security establishments and obstructed security telephones, the people who went to Marham on 11th and 18th May and will go to Porton on 29th June—all these people have been leading a new guerrilla campaign against the Warfare State, and it is up to all of us to support them (especially when *Tribune* and *Peace News* are hostile or equivocal, and only *Solidarity* and the *Socialist Leader* are standing firm).

What can we do? First, we can help our comrades who have been heavily fined; private solidarity is as important as public solidarity. Second, we can support the Porton demonstration; the London Committee of 100 is planning to visit the centre for biological and chemical warfare near Salisbury on 29th June. Third, we can continue to break the security surrounding the Warfare State; telephoning FEDERAL 0101 every now and then is better than doing nothing. Fourth, the most important, we can do whatever we can do; you don't have to follow the anarchists or the Committee of 100—just work out what to do and do it yourself. N.W.



ANARCHY 28

DISCUSSES :
**ANARCHISM—
 PAST, PRESENT
 AND FUTURE**

ANARCHY is Published by
 Freedom Press at 1/6
 on the last Saturday of every month.

Still more on

DEAR EDITOR,

The depressingly passive tone of most of your correspondence in this week's *FREEDOM* (May 11), under the general heading of "The People in the Streets", just shows how successful the CND and allied organisations have been in propagating their views of almost total non-violence; many of those who have spent several years in the CND seem to have had their minds fixed in one direction, much as those do who spend several years in the British Communist Party.

It is futile for Ian Vine, self-appointed "Convener, Bristol Federation of Anarchists", to draw a distinction between violence and force—let's face it, for our purposes they are one and the same thing; to attempt to do so is just a means of proving to himself that violence is not the wicked thing he has always been told it is, and to try and give some respectability to violence—in his mind at least. With all the respect I am able to give to Mr. Vine, all his talk of violence implying hatred, sadism and vindictiveness, as opposed to "force" being constructive and being "used with love", is to all intents and purposes, pure shit, and there seems little reason in dwelling any further upon it.

Your other correspondents are even more naïve than Mr. Vine. Olive Markham in fact is even optimistic enough to believe that it is actually possible to persuade the population of this country to accept anarchism at all; "there are no short cuts to Utopia". Olive says, actually believing that a Utopia (in our time?) is possible in this country. I feel that it is time that many people realised that revolutionary anarchists here are a minority, and a very minute one at that, always have been, and, as far as anyone can tell at the moment, always will be. To think of Utopias, or anarchist revolution, as Gabrielle Charing does, is to be completely out of contact with present-day realities. The anarchist must realise that he is not living in pre-war Spain, revolutionary Cuba nor ancient Peru, but in Welfare-State-England, and must therefore adjust himself correspondingly.

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

Problems of Parents Benjamin Spock 18/-
Oscar Wilde: the Aftermath H. M. Hyde 42/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Our Developing World L. Dudley Stamp 8/6
The Dreyfus Case Guy Chapman 14/-
Man Against Himself Karl Meninger 12/6
A New View of Society and other Writings Robert Owen 10/6
Go Tell It on the Mountain James Baldwin 3/6

SECOND-HAND

British Soldier in India Clive Branson 3/- One Step Forward, Two Steps Back (damaged) V. I. Lenin 2/6; Letters to Dr. Kugelmann Karl Marx 3/6; Josef Stalin (soiled) David M. Cole 3/-; Lectures and Essays R. G. Ingersoll (wrps.) 4/-; Letters from Afar V. I. Lenin 3/-; The \$30,000 Bequest, etc. Mark Twain 5/6; The Shadow of Stalingrad Count Heinrich von Einsiedel 5/-; As He Saw It Elliott Roosevelt 4/6; A New Way with Crime A. Fenner Brockway (1928) 5/-; The Rolling of the Thunder William Gallacher 3/-; Can Parliament Survive? Christopher Hollis 4/-; From Moscow to Samarkand Y.Z. 5/-; The Suffragette Movement E. Sylvia Pankhurst 8/6; The Complete Plays of Bernard Shaw 35/-; Plea for Liberty Georges Bernanos 3/-; The October Revolution Joseph Stalin 3/6; The Crisis of the Human Person J. B. Coates 4/-; Notes for a Journal Maxim Litvinoff 7/6; War or Peace (1950) John Foster Dulles 5/-.

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays.)
17a MAXWELL ROAD
FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

'The People in the Streets'

The point of violent action is not to just have a revolution when we feel in the mood, but to undermine the authorities that try to control us. The only value of non-violence is that it can persuade a certain number of people to believe in our ideas, not as "the only method of achieving an anarchist revolution" as Gabrielle Charing believes. She says that the State cannot be overthrown by force—if that is so then it is here to stay, for if it was ever seriously threatened by non-violent action it would react just as violently as if it were being threatened by anything else. To save its own skin, if it ever came to that, it would not quibble about mowing down a few thousand people—however non-violent they may be, in fact that would merely make it all the easier.

Jeff Robinson too, seems to believe that by "violence", the editors, and anyone else come to that, mean revolution. No one has ever stated this, or would be idiot enough to do so. Violence has many faces, revolution is just one of them, riot, subversion, sabotage and assassination are others. He states that if a "hiring" of the State is offered an idea he may perhaps accept it—but Mr. Robinson, he may perhaps not.
London, N.W.2. JOHN HENRY.

DEAR COMRADES,

I have evidently failed to make my meaning clear. I do not divide the political and the private life into hard and fast compartments. Before embarking upon a non-violent demonstration I make up my mind to behave non-violently and to suffer for it if necessary. This is an artificial situation, since the natural human impulse is to defend oneself or to run away.

In everyday life one cannot, or I cannot, live like this, under strain. I am rarely in a violent situation, and I try to act non-violently, but if I did happen to resort to violence to protect myself or someone I was fond of, or indeed anyone, I would not consider this a grievous sin. It seems to me that to defend oneself is every person's right.

As far as anarchism is concerned I think that the situation is not quite comparable. The impulse to dominate is a less fundamental one than that of self-protection. It is an impulse which is much more of an indulgence than a natural reaction. I am not sure how far it is innate in human nature and how

far a creation of authoritarian society, but I should think it is very largely the latter. It is, I believe, largely an artificial thing.

Although violence can be used as a means of domination, there is a self-defensive violence that consists of driving off the assailant. True, you are coercing him to this extent, that you are preventing him exercising power over you. But once he leaves you alone you leave him alone also. And of course non-violent resistance is also coercive. If one sits in an air-base one is trying to compel the airmen to abandon it, using moral force instead of guns.

Yours fraternally,
London, May 18. ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

DEAR EDITORS,

In your careful study of Tony Weaver's letter as an epitome of middle-class pacifism, you leave it open to any non-middle-class non-pacifist to point out to you that the job of fighting, violently, the forces of capitalism buttressed by the weight of "the law, the police, the army... *et alia*" is one which can be taken on only by a rather strong revolutionary force (as you admit: "Supposing that the revolutionary forces and those of reaction are both strong").

Whether we marched 20 abreast down Whitehall or not, we are a fair way off having the necessary massive backing for successful violence. Tiny outbreaks of violence also delight Authority by providing the excuse for using "justified" force, this "justification" salving the consciences of the large number of people in England who are upset by any threat to their world with its what they call Law and Order. It may be that *FREEDOM*'s editors despise or despair of these people—who will not demonstrate, never mind revolt (they are the majority of any CND Supporters List)—but these are the *Masses*, who must be the basis of any new society. It is our job to convince them that the threat to "law and order" is from the State and the State's Defence Files.

The non-violent supporter is not (as you maintain) merely using "reason" against his opponents: he is actively showing what he believes. He not only says he does not approve of police-like force to back arguments; he does not use it. As for others; he probably hopes they will be either disturbed or inspired

by his overt morality (and by Authority's "unjustified" force): for himself, having watched the parades of butchery in this (and other) centuries under one creed or another, he has decided that it is no use trying to attain human brotherhood by kicking policemen in the crotch, any more than it is any use trying to attain universal peace by manufacturing a Workers' Bomb.

There is much to be said against this. Arthur Uloth has pointed out what has happened to the non-violent in Nazi Germany or Stalinist Russia, and he might have added that non-violence of the most inspiring kind in South Africa has got its practitioners nowhere—except for mobilizing spectacular, but inactive, moral support elsewhere in the world. But perhaps England, now, is a place where non-violence is the most practical method of winning support for change. Change is the hurdle: apart

Questions and Answers

1. Olive Markham:— "Once you decide to use violence, how can you draw the line at any particular weapon?"

Answer:— When violence entails one in more than self-defence the line between self-preservative violence and authoritarian violence has been crossed. It must be left to the judgment of the individual as to when he or she must resort to violence.

2. Brian Richardson.— "What sort of revolution would it be if these people (policemen, soldiers, business men, politicians) were not so changed (to lay down arms, stop desiring power, etc.?)"

Answer:— Agents of the State will not usually be open to conversion, if however the policeman is disobeyed, the soldier is disarmed, the business man is expropriated, the politician is ignored they have no power. The middle class ceases to be divided from the workers when the workers have control, then the middle classes will have to work!

3. Tony Weaver:— "Why do you revel in scuffling with the police and imagine this to be some kind of achievement?"

Answer:— To illustrate the fact that the police shall not be allowed to frighten and coerce people they need to be made aware of the humanity—the aliveness—of the people they are dealing with.

from those with tangible power interests in preserving the present State—and there are many of these—it is fairly natural in a man to feel he has a stake in a society where he has a niche and a family and enough food, however wrong-headed an Anarchist may argue he is: I think there are more people in England who would, in the last resort, defend their capitalist and over-governed State against revolution than many comrades care to admit. Do you, Editors, want to take up arms and force all these people into what we maintain is a paradise—"for their own good"?

How do we, as a militant minority, distinguish our arms, our force, our paternal knowing-best (for, you say, it is useless to wait for mere reasoning to win over people in our society today), from other minorities' arms, force, and authoritarianism? Is it part of Anarchism, as it has been of so many religions, that the end justifies the means?

I don't pretend that non-violence has the answers to all the questions. But it is foolish not to admit the even greater questions which violence raises.

Fraternally,
Finland, May 24. JOHN ROC.

Having answered the pacifists, might I ask them a thing or two?

1. Tom Barnes writes:— "Surely we want our Anarchists as individuals, to have a strong sense of self-preservation?" Does this tally with these views of Adam Roberts in *Peace News* (10/5/63): "Non-violent defence works on the assumption that the most effective means of countering the organised violence of an enemy is not by superior organised violence, but by confronting violence with human beings"? Furthermore is not this an irresponsible advocacy of martyrdom, even perhaps suicide? Again, is the assumption verified by the example of Sharpeville?

2. The Oxford anarchists maintain that "violence by its very nature is authoritarian". Would they not distinguish between the organised violence of the State and the spontaneous violence of people flinging the rulers from their backs?

Is it not true that such spontaneous violence is in fact healthy, and that the repression of such natural instincts is likely to lead to either unhealthy violence or to suppression?

3. Will pacifists admit to a masochistic tendency among their following which actually enjoys suffering, and do they not consider this tendency should be opposed?

J.W.



if present trends continue "man's freedom and ability to make progress in the study of the universe from earth will be in jeopardy." Mr. P. Gordon Walker, Labour's "shadow" Foreign Secretary said that Labour would not "simply throw away weapons that we possess. What we propose is that our nuclear weapons should be allowed to run down and not be replaced. This should be done as an integral part of a radical reorganization of NATO. US Navy tested a Polaris "A3" missile which travelled 1,000 miles across the Atlantic. Radio-active atomic waste from Wind-scale is affecting shellfish and seaweed, but says *Nature*, "the safe levels are seldom exceeded." According to *The Observer*, the American Defence Department contracted for a study by scientists of America on the possibility of employed by the Geophysics Corporation punching holes in the ozone layer surrounding the earth which would expose the territory below to a lethal blast of ultra-violet rays from the sun. The *Express* defence reporter wrote, "Worries that British anarchist and pacifist groups might sabotage the emergency Government system in the event of war lies behind a Ministry of Defence plan to earmark the Territorial Army for internal security duties." The plan means

that in a war crisis, Territorial units would be moved well away from obvious target areas and stood by until after the attack to quell plunder, sabotage, and panic if necessary. . . .

THE SWISS Defence Minister said that the Swiss Government had no intention of denying itself nuclear weapons unless there was an effective international agreement prohibiting their use and providing for the destruction of existing stocks. He said that the Swiss Government had so far not authorized any negotiation for the acquisition of nuclear weapons. At Geneva, Sweden warned the two nuclear sides at the disarmament conference that the time for concluding a test ban "is now or perhaps never", and told them bluntly that their propaganda speeches were wasted on the neutrals. The United States conducted an underground nuclear test in Nevada. The Atomic Energy Commission announced that the test had an intermediate yield, equivalent to between 20,000 and 1,000,000 tons of TNT (how vague can you get?). A cheap and easy way has been devised of removing radio-active strontium 90 from milk; the method which "might be needed after nuclear tests or a blast", is to add calcium phosphate to the milk. This attracts the strontium 90 to it. The combined chemical is then separated out by physical methods. Dr. Martin Luther King said "We will learn to live together like brothers or we will perish together like fools."

TED HILL, general secretary of the Boilermakers' Society spoke in support of a motion demanding the withdrawal of the Polaris base in Scotland said, "If possible, we must get back to the bow and arrow stage. After all, you can always dodge . . . We were a great nation in the past when we were fighting with bows and arrows, fighting with rifles and even with Tommy-guns."

Earlier in the week Mr. Hill had threatened Union reprisals against firms which placed orders with foreign shipyards Putney's Labour Party is the subject of an enquiry by Transport House because in defiance of a ruling by the national agent they took their banner on the Aldermaston march, they even unfurled it when they saw another dozen party flags showing. Mr. Hugh Jenkin, their candidate and a CND supporter, says that the organization within the party to which he belongs, Victory for Socialism has decided to suspend its activities. Mr. Anthony Howard of the *New Statesman* says of this Putney incident, "Canon Collins and his allies among the founding fathers have been fighting a rearguard action to keep CND loyal to its original objectives (many of which, ironically, would now be achieved by a Labour victory at the next election). But for the people who have moved in on the movement . . . that is far from being enough . . . For CND's new revolutionary recruits—who are not by and large communists, but predominantly anarchists and Trotskyists—means have come dangerously near to taking the place of ends. The real struggle being fought out within CND now seems to lie between those who still believe in normal political activity and those who dismiss it as being purposeless and irrelevant . . . Electorally the least dangerous thing that could happen from the Labour Party's point of view would be for CND to purge itself and revert to its original role of democratic persuasion."

JON QUIXOTE.

INTERNATIONAL business interests are said to be concerned by the announcement that a Japanese manufacturing firm has produced a device which enables home movies to be shown direct on any TV receiver. It is said that the do-it-yourself TV device can be adapted to any known make of set.

Reflections on FED 0101

OUR first reaction when we read the original Spies for Peace pamphlet was to try and phone up the numbers given therein and see who answered. Who wouldn't? It now appears that a more or less organised campaign of "unauthorized" telephoning has been taking place which in the words of the *Guardian's* Defence correspondent (13/5/63) Clare Hollingworth is "endangering the efficiency, albeit temporarily, of the British Secret Services". The front-page "revelations" provoked an editorial comment in the best traditions of the gutter press, which the *Guardian* has always been so loud in denouncing.

This action is not inspired only by misguided idealism. It is outright sabotage. Behind [the idealists] almost certainly stand organisers with a less innocent purpose... [with] professional intelligence training... Probably someone else has seized on the opportunity presented by the "Spies for Peace" and is doing so with directions from Moscow... The majority of CND supporters may feel dismayed to learn of the uses to which their movement is being put, just as most people in Britain will be disgusted by the attempt to sabotage the security services. This kind of action, far from helping towards disarmament, makes it remoter.

We would be delighted to feel able to believe that the British Secret Services could be endangered by so simple an expedient as blocking their telephones. Our "respect" for MI5 is not based, however, on a recognition of any superior intelligence among its personnel, but on the almost unlimited financial and technological resources of which they dispose. We have no doubt that as we write these lines, MI5 has already scotched the telephone-blockers, which does not mean that this, in the words of a *Peace News* editorial, "minor guerilla tactic" served no purpose. All actions which help to break down the mystique of an unassailable permanent Authority are valuable and, to our minds, should be supported by anarchist propagandists. And let there be no misunderstanding on this point: on the present scale of activity its value must be assessed as *propaganda*, and for this reason weighed in the balance against efficiency and efficacy in terms of *propaganda*.

It seems to us that the recent (May 17) *Peace News* editorial "The Telephone Guerrillas" and the angry letter it apparently provoked Bertrand Russell to address to the Editor (May 24)—both, incidentally, newsworthy items for the *Guardian*, and for obvious reasons!—is a case of making a mountain out of a molehill (assuming that it is not just a private war between would-be "leaders" of the peace movement which our spies-for-peace have not told us about!). The *Peace News* editorial as a whole deserves the Russell stricture:

I appreciate that your purpose is to seek personal holiness. No doubt you will all go to heaven. Unfortunately, for us lesser mortals, who have no such hopes, it is not possible to contemplate the prospect as calmly. Personal holiness is an aspiration which has very little to do with either the danger of nuclear war or the possibility of preventing it...

On the other hand *Peace News*

makes a valid point when it declares:

Over the years the peace movement has been bedevilled by short-term strategies which have put into the background the main task, which is to persuade the majority of people in this country that unilateral disarmament is a realistic policy.

What *Peace News*, unlike a growing number of supporters of the peace movement, cannot, publicly at least, see, is that not only is unilateral disarmament an *unrealistic* policy, but is also the reason for the "short term strategies" which it now deplores. For years *Peace News* has been warning its readers and supporters that nuclear annihilation is round the corner. It is to the credit of those who have taken them literally that they have done whatever they felt able in an attempt to halt the catastrophe. They have marched, and sat, they have sailed boats and picketed embassies. And if *Peace News* approves when they seek to immobilize airfields or board Polaris submarines, why suddenly get all holier-than-thou when they try to immobilise MI5's telephone network by exercising what Russell calls the "legal right" of any citizen to make a telephone call to the powers that be to find out what "arrangements are being made for their survival"? For those with a sense of humour the "telephone guerillas" have got something. After all, MI5 taps our phones at will; it would be poetic justice if the citizens could return the compliment and block MI5's lines!

But this is the lighter side, yet valuable for all that, of the struggle against Authority. Its value depends on retaining a sense of perspective. There are those in the peace movement who declare that the "spies for peace" should publicly reveal their identity; there are those who believe that by breaking down the whole system of official secrecy one will remove basic causes of war.

One of the valuable aspects from our point of view, and disquieting from that of the authorities, of the Spies for Peace revelations, has been the lack of "leakages" as to the sources of information. We would like to think this indicates a more discriminating, more mature attitude to the problem of secrecy or openness (a subject we were discussing in *FREEDOM* in connection with the sit-downs eighteen months ago*). It is on this problem that *Peace News* should be expressing itself and not wasting its precious space on arguments about the pros and cons of revealing "all official secrets", which lead nowhere since they are hypothetical questions anyway. If the State apparatus is so undermined that a minority body can have access to all its "secrets" then long before this situation arises all kinds of more important things happen which would make the revelation of "secrets" superfluous!

As we have already indicated, we sympathise with the impatience expressed in the *Peace News* editorial; we disagree however with our contemporary as to what are the important issues on which we should all be concentrating our efforts now.

*"Inquest on the Sitdown" *Freedom Selections*, Vol. 11, 1961, pp. 215-20.

The Power Disease

ANARCHISTS have no illusions about government and power, and so we are not surprised when the very people who were the stormy petrels of independence movements in the colonial territories, become their oppressors when they succeed in taking over the reins of power. The power complex manifests itself firstly by the god-like aura with which they surround themselves, and secondly by the firmness with which they deal with any public demonstrations or criticism. The vanity of a Nkrumah is now legendary. Dr. Banda, the new boss in Nyasaland follows him a close second. A BUP report from Limbe in Nyasaland (1/3/63) stated that:

"motorists and cyclists in Nyasaland must now stop when the car of Dr. Banda, the Prime Minister, appears and—the Malawi Congress Party newspaper *Malawi News* says—any plea that they did not know the car was approaching or did not know his car would not be an excuse.

From Georgetown comes news of Dr. Cheddi Jagan the once much persecuted champion of the people of British Guiana. The *Times* correspondent reports (8/4/63) that:

Dr. Cheddi Jagan, the Prime Minister of British Guiana, Mr. C. Christian, the Minister of Home Affairs, and the police are to see that the firmest action is taken from the inception of any violence, to prevent a recurrence of the rioting on Friday, in which one man was killed and more than 20 hurt.

They are also considering the organization of methods by which the business community could assist the police in the protection of property in any future incidents.

During Friday night's trouble armed policemen fought the crowd for hours when looting broke out in the section

of Georgetown near the Rice Marketing board premises where, earlier hundreds of employees had stormed the building because of an alleged lock-out.

Yesterday the rival unions at the Rice Marketing Board, where disputes have been occurring for some months over recognition, decided to merge and become a branch of the National Union of Public Service Employees.

Dr. Jagan, speaking of Friday's events, said the Government would take every step to maintain law and order. He said a simple jurisdictional dispute between the two trade unions at the Rice Marketing Board had nearly resulted in a repetition of the disorders of February last year [which resulted in British ships and troops being sent]. It was becoming increasingly clear that foreign elements hostile to the Government were intervening in trade unionism in British Guiana.

The Government was anxious to develop a stable trade unionism and to have democracy and a full exercise of freedom at all levels. He called on the Trade Union Congress to see that the situation was remedied and a rapid end put to the new trend of gangsterism in certain sections of trade unionism.

One has only to look up the files to see that the same language now being used by Dr. Jagan was directed at him by his British persecutors. We all know what they mean by stable trade unionism; they mean tame workers kept in their place by their leaders!

And from Accra the Minister of Justice has been telling a gathering of civil servants and party officials that "disregard of the party line in Ghana should be regarded as Treason. He said that

Ghana was being ruled by law and it was the party which was behind this rule of law. This was not an arbitrary

statement, as the party organization had its root in every branch in every village and town and reflected the feelings and aspirations of the people.

Party officials and civil servants, the Minister continued, must first understand what the party stood for and assess their judgment according to party policy. It should be regarded as treason if party officials and civil servants departed from the party line of action and allowed their judgment to be influenced by selfish interests.

The chairman of Kumasi city council was recently voted out of office by other party members, and this led to the suspension of the council by ministerial decree. The country, the Minister said, could not afford more political unrest in Kumasi and the Government would use all the means at its disposal to see that the law was maintained. A minority could not impose their views on the majority, he stated except when they are the government and have the power to oblige the majority to obey!

The ingratitude of Nationalist leaders towards those who were their champions during the struggle for independence is another feature of this power disease. That champion of the underdog, Michael Scott, has recently had talks with his old friend Nehru about proposals for a ceasefire in Nagaland made to him by Mr. Phizo the rebel Naga leader in exile. Not only did Nehru reject the proposals but, according to the *Times* Delhi correspondent he told Michael Scott that "he will not be permitted to go to Nagaland to meet Mr. Phizo's associates there", in spite of the fact that Mr. Scott had been specially asked by the exiled Naga leader to go and explain his proposals for Kohima. What does Michael Scott think about the ban, and his old friend Nehru?

For the 'Liberation' of Africa?

Continued from page 1

new "aristocracy" in their respective lands, in return for loyalty and subservience. If we may quote ourselves*

The tragedy of Black Africa, and of India of course, is that when the collapse of the old regime takes place, the new leaders desperately seek to recreate the very system which they sometimes spent a lifetime fighting against.

This is possible not because the new leaders are *exceptional* persons. Our personal experience of some of them and the background of most of them, indicates that they are people of average intelligence, and politically unsophisticated by Western standards. But in some parts of Africa even an education obtained through the missionaries, places one in a position of moral authority *vis-a-vis* millions of one's illiterate, hungry, fellow-beings. Couple this considerable advantage, with personal ambition, a "sense of purpose" or whatever name you would put to the tenacity, the single-mindedness, including the acceptance of real hardships, which characterise the careers of these African "liberators", and it is not difficult to understand how when the tide of events is in their favour, they suddenly leap from obscurity and persecution to the forefront of power and the red carpet of recognition.

From the point of view of African emancipation, as we anarchists understand the term, the "liberation" of Africa has been one series of disasters and set-backs. To glibly declare that violence has failed in Africa is to reveal the same kind of sectarian blindness, as those who declare that violence in Africa has succeeded. We say that violence or the threat of violence *alone* has made the colonial powers (as opposed to the "colons") reverse their policies to the African people. The independence of Africa is not the result of a "change of heart" among the colonial powers, but the realisation that to resist their violently expressed demands would make the

colonies into financial liabilities rather than assets. We do not offer this as an opinion but as facts which, beginning with India, can be proved up to the hilt. Now, on the other hand it can also be proved beyond any doubt that "independence" for the majority of the colonial people has made little or no difference to their material and moral situation. To draw the conclusion, as many *FREEDOM* correspondents have done in the past weeks, that the acceptance of a violent "confrontation" is by definition doomed to failure is unfair because it presupposes what this writer would be the first to deny: that the free- or anarchist-society will be brought about by violent means. We invite our critics to comb the editorial columns of *FREEDOM* for any such view. If they find an editorial which can be interpreted in this way, we will publicly recant, not because we have changed our views but simply because we have never entertained the idea that the free society could be *imposed*, *forced*, least of all by force of arms, on an unwilling public! What we have said, and repeat, is that an authoritarian society will never spawn a free one and for that reason will never relinquish its power unless opposed by superior force. We also believe that the prerequisites of a free society are (1) that a sizeable militant minority of society should desire- and be prepared to fight for- it and (2) that the power of the authoritarians has been destroyed. It is in connection with (2) that we envisage that the people will be obliged, by circumstances, to defend themselves with violent means.

★
WE commend to readers an article in last week's *Peace News* by Peter Worsley on a "Bad Start in Africa" which is, in fact a review of René Dumont's recent book on "L'Afrique Noire est Mal Partie" (which could also be translated as "Black Africa has started on the wrong foot"—anarchist readers will appreciate the subtle distinction!). It is too long and thought-provoking to summarise in a paragraph, though

we are immodest enough to suggest that it has all been said before in *FREEDOM*. We would however like to quote the following paragraph for its direct bearing on what we have just written:

Plenty of lessons, indeed. But, says Dumont, far, far too little learning from them. The "decolonisation" of the new states, he believes, requires more seriously than anything else decolonisation of their leaders, teachers, now Ministers of Education, who want French standards of education for their pupils, French standards of living for themselves, and a French content to education; political leaders who flee the villages for the joys of town life and abhor the notion that manual work is crucial. Dumont addresses very severe strictures to the new generation of students—so revolutionary that they never go beyond "politics" to the problems of the life of their people. Are they, he asks, "revolutionaries" in any real sense of the word, as Chinese or Algerian students have been forced to be?

What we have witnessed these past few years in Africa has been a revolution by the middle classes. The people of Africa have still to make their revolution and the longer it is put off, the more consolidated will the opposition to it be. Africa needs food for its hungry millions and technical know-how to raise the general standard of life. But it needs *ideas* just as much. Nationalism united the African people against their white oppressors and paved the way for the middle class black revolutionaries. At Addis Ababa last week they took the first concrete steps to consolidate their power.

The disillusionment with nationalism is already manifest in the liberated countries. If there is to be another revolution by the people something more than nationalism must unite them in their struggle. We believe that only anarchist ideas will explain the trick played on them by their leaders and offer the alternatives which will satisfy their needs and aspirations. How to penetrate Africa with our ideas is a matter which should be high in our list of priorities as propagandists, and one where international co-operation could prove invaluable.

MANY OF OUR COMRADES WERE FINED HEAVILY for the Marham demonstrations. Others chose jail. Some face heavy fines when they come out. MONEY IS REQUIRED URGENTLY!

*The Tragedy of Africa (*FREEDOM*, Aug. 6, 1960), *Freedom Reprints*, Vol. 10, 1960, pp. 157-159).

