



35 Natal road,  
Thornton Heath  
CR4. 8QH Surrey

Christian  
Anarchist  
Bulletin

653.7546

Minutes of monthly meetings,  
Accounts of arguments and actions  
News and Notes

The Christian Anarchist group meets monthly; - other things being equal - on the second Saturday in each month. All alterations to this, are bnotified here. Also all meetings are advertized in Peace News, and given in the Roadrunner.

Meetings are held in the Vicarage of St Paul's Church, Bow Common. The Church is in Burdett road, the Vicarage is behind and adjoining in Leopold St., both are near Mile End tube station, on the Central and District lines.

Meetings begin at 8.00 P.M. - or have done until now. Prior to ~~the~~ the meeting, at 7.30, there is a service in the Church; meetings end at 10.00, and when transport is available we adjourn to the Gunn public House in Millwall.

The service takes the form of a short form of Vespers followed by what can either be considered meditations in the monastic manner or a meeting for worship after the manner of the Society of Friends,

Last meeting:- June 14, 8.00 PM  
Next meeting:- July the 19th - repeat  
July the 19th, 8.00P.M.  
service 7.30

As supplements to this LOGOS there is an appeal on behalf of a Portuguese radical which most of the groups contacts will have come across anyway. After a letter to the Portuguese students Association, their secretary wrote agreeing that letters to embassies are not often very productive, and promising to notify us if more positive action is planned.

After the MCC had made its final decision and while a council meeting was in progress a letter from Jean Sargeant warning of Church's intention to stage civil disobedience was handed in along with more influential letters from Sanroc and other Anti-Apartheid bodies.

Anne Vogel pins onto the discussion of Will Warren's paper a critique of our organizational forms which seems somewhat optimistic if it is distinguishing between CNA-CHURCH and ourselves, and which assumes that federalism of necessity must have the basic units organized geographically.

In the last LOGOS I asked for volunteers to take over the secretaryship as I think I have held it too long for the health of the group - as of now - June the 11th - Anne is the only candidate and a very good one! so I hope this is my last LOGOS

The PPU is publishing a pamphlet of Ronald Sampson's the Anarchist foundations of Pacifism - they are doing this as part of the Stuart Morris Memorial which might be thought inaposite but which is nevertheless very welcome.

The demonstration in solidarity with Bishop Helder Camara was small but it was heartening to see it attended by nuns, - it seems logical that it should be the special vocation of radical christian groupings to reach the christian in the pew and in the monastery; but we seldom see such evidence of having so done.

I apologize for the state of the woodcut-Logos as in the last issue, I have never previously handled one, and did not for instance realize that they need to be left to dry for about three days - as I had run the first page off a week before I had finished typing the rest, it would have been easy enough to have had them dry in time had I realized this. I hope this issue will be better, but I shall not know until it is done, and as I do not at the moment whether or not we will be having the July the 12th meeting I cannot have them finished until after Saturday.

Please note again next meeting July the 19th

Attendance on June 14:- Jean Sargeant + Kathy Dancy; Frs Gresham Kirkby + Andrew King; & Frank Marmoy + Laurens Otter. Apologies: Anne Vogel & David s Poolman, Mayers + Mumford.

The meeting though small was fairly successful; - we decided to go through Will's paper point by point and leave aside Anne's and my prior contributions.

Before this Andrew told us that the Church Commissioners have thrown out tenants in Sussex Place, Paddington, for a variety of reasons it would be better that a squat there be organized by a specifically christian group than any other. Anyone interested please contact.

The Archbishop's Commission on Church and State wants evidence at latest by the

at the end of August. (They want 30 copies.) So we are rushed for time, with our evidence. (In case anyone wished to know the Commission convenor's 'phone no. is OWA.087.224, if anyone is thinking of giving evidence independently.

Ann cannot attend on the 19th of July - or on any other July date - and does not feel she can do her paper in advance; on Maurice, so I will try and do this before the next meeting and also try to circulate the paper in advance so as to allow discussion at the meeting to concentrate directly on what we want to say to the Commission.

I shall be at the Anarchist Camp in August - ~~wh~~ so will miss the August meeting - and this will presumably need to make the final draft. If Anne has not by then taken over the secretaryship, not only will someone else have to take the minutes at that meeting, but if we are to get the document done in time, as I get back only the week that the evidence should be in (it is already two months overdue) I shall have to rely on someone else having typed the stencils.

.....  
Meeting of the 14 June.

The collection was £1 and it was agreed to send it to the East London Squatters, Fr Hart had thanked us for the cheque to him.

Andrew told us of the Sussex Place, houses in Paddington which the Church Commissioners had emptied and left empty. It was felt obvious that a Christian radical group has a particular vocation to act here; that a Christian group would be in a better position to make its case, that when secularists attack the Church, they almost invariably do so for the wrong reasons and ignore the real issues. It was agreed to start exploring the position of the houses and future sale, and contacting homeless Christians.

On Will's paper.

Looking at the section labelled "Why Non-Violence?"

It was felt that the whole would have been improved if section (d) had been the main burden of the whole of this part; with c incorporated therein and (a) and (b) omitted.

It was not agreed that (a) could go unchallenged, while all those who were present were Christian pacifists, none of us accepted that pacifism was the sole possible interpretation of christianity. To say all the world's greatest leaders were opposed to killing begs the question of who were the greatest and the choice made by pacifists of those who conform to a pacifist ideal is as subjective as the choice made by war mongers of Churchill and his ilk.. Also though most of us agreed with the communist and capitalist world must go (some question was voiced as to whether such a blunt statement should apply in the Communist case); it was felt that this needs greater substantiating.

(It is perhaps unfair that we were treating an article which is essentially a personal statement as a peg for this type of group analysis, but it is the measure of its importance that we should feel a need so to do.)

If in (b) the term "less violence is used" is a tautological statement that the demonstrators use less then it is insufficient comment; if on the other hand it means that the people against whose actions the demonstration is being held, then it may well be totally untrue. Non Violence makes patent previously latent violence, in order to take it on the bodies of the unresisting demonstrators.

excellent (c) but needs to be stated in greater detail.

.....  
Turning to "What is.. all was considered excellent, except the point about it being impossible to use non-violence for evil means; reference was made to various occasions when non-violence has been resisted by non-violence, Kashmiris on both sides of the India Pakistan divide fasting for the integration of the Kashmir in Pakistan ~~and~~ or India; non-violent invasion of Goa, resisted non-violently; and the Ahmehkhdar/Ghandi fasting duel over representation of the Harijans, all proved that as long as both sides were convinced of their case, they did not necessarily have to be right as two opposed people cannot both be.

On the question of openness, Andrew made reference to the Greek Embassy here in Britain and to the Norwegian and Auschwitz inmate resistance under other conditions, I referred to gas chambers on the question of sabotage; it was not generally agreed that in all circumstances openness and refraining from sabotage were matters of principle though generally agreed that there were usually very sound tactical reasons for these.

Other wise there was little disagreement on matters of technique though these were considered tactics rather than invariable principles. (CF the distinction between Satyagraha and Duragraha.) It was also pointed out that informing the authorities in advance that one will obstruct them over something does not of necessity involve specifying place or time.

.....  
Please note the next meeting is the third Saturday in July! That the subject's is F.D. Maurice's views on the state with the particular intention of producing a document giving our own views to the Archbishop's Commissioners on Church and State on the relations there betwixt.

Please also remember that people have been asked to contribute ideas for this report before, and are still asked so to do.

I apologize in advance if the Logos does not come out well at the top of these - the two colour experiment is a little ambitious a question of trying to run before I can walk.

fraternally

Laure 13

P.S. The spelling of the Gun Public House should have only one n - I am sorry if this has caused anyone to lose us. I was wrong in thinking the publican who was refused a license was the same one as had been there 6 months - this was a new one. Mea culpa.

P.P.S. Anne is sending the "Kingdom of Christ" off to me today; so I shall keep this open - and this will allow me to include extracts. (So far no additional delay as I am waiting for the woodcut ink to dry on the LOGOS titlepiece. - Still not well done but less badly than last time.) Meanwhile I find I still have some notes I made in prison some years back on the chapter (no. 5.) and can begin the article before the book arrives - illustrating it when it does.

This will also allow me to bring up two other points I previously forgot.

1. The invitation for Gresham to speak at Hockerill Coll. did come and since the last LOGOS he has spoken there.
2. ~~2~~ 4 people were recently trapped in a pit collapse in what is supposed to be a safety conscious mine; after undue speed-ups; one was killed. That same day with supreme lack of tact another pit was told that unless record production was achieved on all four of its coal faces the mine would be closed.

Obviously a miner's work is so unpleasant that it ought to be a matter for congratulation that he no longer has the job; and it is the measure of the inhumanity of society that miners should wish to keep working in mines.

Several times in the last year the rumour has been spread of some mine in the Midlands is going to be closed as unproductive. The miners flog their guts out achieving record targets and then when they have done so the N.C.B. has turned round and said the mine is now nearly exhausted and however hard it is worked cannot be productive economically so the miners have been cheated.

In South Wales in one case not only are the miners working record shifts but they have hired a PRO firm to aid them in their fight. The Miners' Union has just declared that 67 (I think it was) for which the figures have just been published was a black year for closures. A Belgian professor has predicted that with the increase of natural gas production by the year 1980 mining will be a dead industry.

Mining communities are more cohesive than most Industrial groupings. Some years back (in the early 50s in South Wales in the early 60s Midlands one had examples of mining communities saying to the N.C.B. if you can't make our mine pay and don't want it - so it is of no value to you whatsoever, why can't you give it to us to manage as a cooperative. Naturally with no results.

By and large this makes the mines the industry wherein there would be the most chance for Dolci-type reverse strikes (the only likely alternative seems to be where they are closing industries down in Coventry in order to break the Collective Contract system.) But by the same token it is the industry which it is hardest to influence from outside with radical ideas.

The Squatters have greatly advanced non-violence by making it a social form of political action, as distinct ~~xx~~ from a liberal humanitarian propaganda technique; and they have been able to use durgagraha techniques rather than satyagraha ones because of the widespread sympathy for the homeless; - but making it an industrial issue will be even more significant. Has anyone any suggestions as to how?

Maurice argues against Pacifism - equating this with Quaker arguments for the most part, and arguing in such a way as to allow ~~xxx~~ those who quote him to assume that all Christian Pacifist exegesis stems from the Sermon on the Mount.

Against this Maurice poses Matthew V 17 & 18 (referring to this as being at the beginning of the Sermon): - "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For Amen I say..." and he deduces from this that Law and Love are complementary - which in the sense of divine law is obvious but which has allowed others to interpret this to refer to civil law.

But from this statement of the obvious he argues that Love must be delimited by Law; which does not follow; indeed it should surely be that Love is broadened by Divine Law and this is no mere semantic difference. For Maurice seeing that Law is tangible and love not proceeds to subject love to law.

Maurice whose logic elsewhere is unimpeachable fails to give that close analysis of argument that one finds through the rest of the book at this point and his deductions appear slip shod.

If two things are complementary they are either agreed, or they qualify, and whichever is the more important subordinates the other. It is contrary to the whole tenor of the gospels, - to the plain statement of the Pauline epistles, and to the usual thoughts of Maurice that the authority of the Mosaic Law is equal to or superior to that of Love.

Shall love be subject to the law, spirit to the letter, the child of the bondswoman to that of the free - in the Pauline idiom?

So that if Law delimits Love it must be in a sense only of defining it not making it conditional on the provisions of the law.

The whole of Catholic theology depends on the belief that the greater comprehends the less, and if so then the Gospel contains the Decalogue in its entirety while the Decalogue contains the Gospel only in embryonic form. Indeed since in one version the Summary of the Law was-cited by a scribe in answer to Christ's question what readest thou in the Law? and since the Jewish text the Book of the Twelve Patriarchs gives the summary as also do the scrolls of the Qumram sect this understanding of the Law predates Christ anyway - after all even in the Mosaic texts the initial severity is later modified.

Earlier Maurice justifies national "Christian" states as the heir of the Judaic. Admitting that Samuel held the state and the king to be impermissible and blasphemy and admitting that the early church fought against the emergence of states and preached universal community, but the Church failed and Maurice argued that this must have been the Will of God, and that to continue to demand universality is to blaspheme. But this argument denies man's free will, and would make God responsible for Auschwitz, Hiroshima etc., thus making the Cross a sado-masochist blasphemy.

I shall give extracts below - please anyone who wished to contribute to the report to be sent to the Commission please, please let me have it by the end of the first week of July, so that I can get it duplicated in advance of the next meeting - I shall also want to prepare as much as possible of the next LOGOS before the meeting.

pp. 190 - But on what authority do these institutions (The Decalogue & Jewish law) rest? Here begins another difference of opinion. The ordinary statesman answers, "They are national provisions of more or less importance, deriving their sanction from the legislation of each particular national society, invested with a factitious and useful sacredness in the eyes of the vulgar by the tradition that they had a mysterious origin. The ordinary religious man answers: "They have nothing to do with the ~~ordinary~~ mere political or national life of any society; they are religious ordinances appointed by God himself, binding upon all because he has appointed them."

..... (note earlier on pp. 186:-

The historian declares that both proceeded from the Lord; it is not on the grounds of the difference of their authority (the rules laying down the Sabbath and those laying down the cities of refuge) then that you can distinguish them, neither can you distinguish them by their character.

pp. 200: - Had the bishops of the Church acted according to their own notions of what was best, they would of course, have reduced Europe into one great society having a common language, scarcely acknowledging any territorial or political distinctions. Such a dream would have seemed to be a most pious one, carrying out the ideal of the divine commonwealth. That they entertained it, and at different times strove to realize it, and that they found the old Roman jurisprudence an helpful aid in the experiment the history of the Middle Ages abundantly testifies: but how was it defeted? I answer: by the influence which they themselves when acting simply as churchmen in their appointed vocation, and not as the agents of a preconceived system, brought to bear on the tribes. The ecclesiastical society was the main instrument in creating within each of these tribes a distinct national organization, altogether different from the ecclesiastical organization, though acting in concert with it; by the ecclesiastical or catholic spirit peculiarities in the character and intellect of each one of these tribes were developed.

(regrettably the rest of this para. pp. 201 - tracing the growth of nationalism in the impact of the missionary bishops on the invading barbarians is too long to include; though it ought to be considered.) But pp. 202:

Under differnt modifications this is the history of the formation of modern society. The modifications are very inter sting and very important, because they illustrate another point to which I have alluded the way in which the characters and institutions of the nations received their distinct form, so that tthere should be vastly more difference between Englishmen, Frenchmen and Germans now, than there ever can have been between Saxons, Franks and Burgundians twelve hundred years ago.....

Consideration of Quakers and references to the Sermon on the Mount begins pp. 204.

pp. 206 I am anxious to make this remark, because it is my object to show how carefully our Lord preserves the characteristics of his Kingdom and its rewards from all secular mixtures; how he transports men into a region entirely unlike that which they are ordinarily conversant, and yet their own native region, the region of their own true and proper being. - /. But how is this distinctness preserved? Is it by denying the existence of the lower outward region? Is it by setting aside that lower outward region as being itself evil and impure? ...Or is it precisely by taking the opposite course to this, by recognizing the fact and reality of that outward world, by showing how it is provided for in God's economy.....? ... "Think not that I am come..."

pp. 207: - 4. Thus far everything in this sermon of our Lord would seem to negative the opinion that he came to repeal one set of rules and establish another. Everything would seem to show that he came to confirm rules existing before: to show the ground, the inward righteousness, of these rules; and to lead those who were willing to be his disciples into the possession and enjoyment of it. The next words greatly strengthen the conclusion: 'Verily I say unto you, except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of heaven.' There are but two ways of interpreting this passage. The one treats the righteousness required of the disciples as something different in degree....; the other as different in kind. ((-Alas poor Hegel thy dialectical leap was never thus.)) 10) If the former notion be adopted, then indeed, it will follow that our Lord came to set aside the Mosaic Law, and to establish another set of stricter decrees.... It is so common to believe that the Christian economy is a system of mitigations and allowances.... that it is no wonder honest men should be startled into a violent reaction against this notion, and should be eager to press all Scripture into a proof that the requirements of the perfect dispensation are really higher and severer than those of the imperfect.

(Again one cannot reproduce the whole of the section - though one must acknowledge that one does injustice to Maurice by omitting it - but I cannot physically reproduce 101 pp. and all omissions are distortions.)

"Ye have heard... of old time... thou fool shall be in danger of hell fire." - What consequences would follow if we supposed that the formula, "It has been said by them of old time, but I say" meant in this case, "I am about to tell you something which annuls or abolishes what has been said of old time" -? In that case the expressions, "he that says to his brother Raca", he that says "thou fool" must be taken in just the same formal and legal sense in which the words, "thou shalt not kill" are taken. Words which are meant to supersede and abrogate other words, must be construed as they would be construed. If the command, "thou shalt not kill", points to a definite specific proceeding, the words, "thou shalt not give this name to thy brother, must point to a specific definite proceeding also.....

pp. 222: I maintain then, that the principle, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth", is a principle which lies at the foundations of a state and, perhaps more than any other explains to us what a state is. It is a righteous principle. I had almost called it the righteous principle; for it is that which presents to us the most complete image of the order and moral government of the world.

(If I may recap at this point: pp. 212: 7.: "And now we are come to one of the points of dispute between us and the Quaker. It has been said of men of old time thou shalt not forswear ~~thyself~~ yourselves.....

Maurice treats this in the light of an earlier assumption made on pp. ... the ninth (commandment) presumes the existence of tribunals before which one may give witness respecting another. (The commandment against theft is also held to presuppose property, which while true begs the question of whether it means property as Maurice understood it in his day.)

pp. 229:- Our third corollary affirms, that the revelation of God as universal Love is not inconsistent with that prior revelation of him as the being who is carrying on continuous strife with whatever in our world resists and opposes law and order; and that, consequently the duty of loving our enemies, which is grounded upon the one revelation, must be in some way or other compatible with that duty of hating our enemies, which is grounded upon the other. Only think



to what the idea of a Being of perfect love reduces itself - to what it has actually reduced itself - when men have contemplated these two divine attributes as contrary to each other. What does love become but a weak contemptible tolerance of what is unlovely, a merciless mercy, which now and forever can permit the creatures it has formed to be as sinful, that is as miserable, as they will? Does not every man's conscience vehemently resist the decree of his carnal understanding?.....

End 29:-Do we not feel that love of good is a very paltry thing which is not accompanied with a hatred of evil? And do we not feel that hatred of evil is a mere name, if it is not willing to go forth in acts for resisting and extinguishing evil? And do we not feel that that man has a very poor love of his kind, and of each individual man as a member of that kind, who does not regard as his enemies those who hinder the good and help forward the evil, and who does not in that character and capacity hate them? .....

pp. 230: Our Lord says: "Love your enemies, for your Father in heaven causes his sun to shine upon the good and evil and sendeth his rain upon the just and the unjust", Here is a fact of his providence introduced as an illustration of his character. But there are other facts of his providence existing side by side with this not interfering with it. He who gives rain and sunshine, sends also plagues and pestilence. These come not indeed to distinguish between individuals, not to determine which are good, which evil; but yet, certainly for discipline; certainly to teach the nations the effects of indolence, intemperance, sensuality; certainly to lead them gradually to distinguish truth from falsehood, the good from the evil.

pp. 231: - And the only remaining question is, how can both these forms of character be at once preserved? How can these two sets of duties apparently so opposite be at once fulfilled? Clearly, there is the greatest danger of omitting either; there is the greatest danger in confusing them. What weak ineffectual lovers we are when love is separated from law we have hinted at already; what monstrous perverts of the divine law, when we set the law up against love, it requires no words to explain. But do we fare much better if we try to keep up a balancing system in our minds? Not too much love! how can there be too much if dying for love was not too much (Sorry an emphatic repetition was overlooked there) Not too much law! How can there be too much, if the destruction of cities and empires, yea, of a world, for the sake of it was not too much?

pp. 233: For whoever translates the holy name 'Peace' by carnal security or luxurious ease, desecrates it, and makes every scriptural application of it unmeaning.

it is necessary to see these quotes as much as possible in context so

pp. 211: 6: The next two passages refer to the marriage bond; one to the prohibition of adultery by the law (passages all those of the Sermon on the Mount) the other to its toleration of divorce. In the first case the meaning is evident. Our Lord comes not to destroy but to fulfil. He leaves the precept against adultery as he finds, and stamps it with a new authority. Still it belongs to the 'Old Time'. He has a message to the inner man. He aims not at the crime but at the sin. "Look not to woman to lust after her" - if thy right eye offend thee pluck it out... Be willing to sacrifice the exercise of powers that God meant thee to exercise, the enjoyments of senses which God has given thee, if thou findest them to minister to thine inward corruption.

It is vain to say that Jewish precedents will only justify oaths administered, punish-

ments fixed or wars undertaken, under the express command of God. I have maintained that every nation ought to look upon itself as having God for its king. That if we do not recognize this principle the commandments mean nothing to us, the institutions of which the commandments speak have no authority but that which they derive from human convention.

The judicial oath belongs ((sorry pp. 193) ) to the religion of the Jewish state; every Jew would have understood the the third commandment in reference to it. Still more was the Jew instructed to look upon war, in certain cases not as a permitted license but as a solemn duty, to be undertaken in the full confidence that it was God's will that he should engage in it.

When we speak of what is commonly called the moral side of the Jewish economy, the controversy assumes another shape. One set of Christians strongly affirm that the precepts of the kind in the old law are of permanence in obligation and validity; others say they have no authority except so far as they are reenacted by, or involved in the Gospel law of love. ....bottom of page...."The historian declares that both proceeded from the Lord; it is not on the grounds of a difference in their authority, then that you can distinguish them. Neither can you distinguish them by their character. The Sabbath is as much a positive institution as the cities of refuge; if you admit the distinction between that which is moral and that which is positive you must acknowledge both (D calogue and the rest of the law in the Mosaic texts) to be transitory; if you reject that distinction neither.

This is all a mere sampling of the first half of the chapter - but the half that concerns us most nearly - the argument here is waged as against Quakers who Maurice pays the compliment (not always deserved and not intended as such) of assuming that they are anarchistic. The rest of the chapter tackles advocates of theocracy, of separated church and state, modern statesmen and Romans; and I could not begin to illustrate these arguments by extracts without unduly lengthening this piece.

So that I shall not be the only person at the next meeting who will have recently read the whole chapter, I am sending the book on to Gresham - I hope that Anne is not going to find herself chasing us all to get the book she got out from the library - but if we are really going to tackle this report thoroughly others should get hold of the book too and work out their answers.

It will be obvious from what I have said that Maurice obviously underestimates the pacifist (and a fortiori the anarchist case) neglecting the cross and neglecting non-violent resistance which is after all an attempt at the way of the Cross - not entirely forgiveable for the fact that he lived so long before Ghandi as not only had the Quakers to whom he addressed the book practised Non-Violent Resistance, but also so had the Anglican Church under the Cromwellian period as also the Non-Jurors whom he considered tainted with theocratic beliefs.

The (pp. 187) early parts of it (Scripture) were necessary in this point of view because they discovered part of the meaning which each sign embodies, enabling us gradually to attain to a perception of its full import, and to look upon it as connected with the life of man. When therefore we meet in these early records with customs, institutions, ordinances which God has not been pleased to preserve to us, we presume that they are to be contemplated historically by the light of what has been preserved to us

## A POINTS of DISAGREEMENT

with Will Warren on: Some thoughts on the theory and practice of non-violence of non-violence.

(It is only fair to mention that Will's article was written just after a long exchange of letters between us, arising from the launching on NONVAC on the need to state "why non-violence" before considering what non-violence is, and how it should be applied in contemporary demonstrations. Therefore in stressing points of disagreement, it is only intended to open up the discussion to others, but these points are outweighed by the points of agreement.)

what? ~~what?~~

A lot of confusion results from associating under the heading of non-violence, several distinct concepts. The words Ahimsa, Satyagraha and Duragraha are all equally translated into English as non-violence. But Ahimsa is a way of life and Satyagraha and Duragraha are techniques of struggle. Add to this that all sorts of other concepts are added in English and also lumped in as non-violence and the word is rendered meaningless.

Ahimsa includes for the Hindu vegetarianism and may be best translated by the concept "Respect for Life" even if the originator of the concept was not himself particularly consistent. Into Ahimsa Gandhi worked his puritanical views on sex and this is still the custom of the Bhoodan Movement.

Satyagraha - is attempting to convert people by taking their violence on one's self. It is very coercive in its way, it forces the person resisted to consider deeply the arguments of the resister and it goes below the conditioning and the psychological barriers of custom found in the culture of the resisted. Most theory about NV direct action is only concerned with this; but except in small group actions the only practice of it seems to be Dolci's and the Sicilian peasants!. Satyagraha makes patent the violence that is latent in a previously existing state of affairs. So on the surface it is not true that less violence results from its use than before.

Outwardly a system wherein a minority (or even a majority) has become so used to accepting injustice - segregation or whatever - is not a society riven with violence; but use non-violence in this sense there and all the hidden violence comes to the surface. Men will be lynched. Similarly a worker building nuclear weapons do not see their jobs as violent, they may well decide to beat up those who interfere, and so outwardly violence is created by the act of non-violence.

Duragraha is mass resistance that does not involve violence but is not necessarily made in a spirit of charity, and is designed to defeat an enemy. Most of the Gandhian campaigns in India were of this order and bear little relation to any of the theorists of non-violence found in Gandhi, less still to those of Western pacifists.

Finally many people use the term for actions that are little more than publicity stunt, or for any demonstration where one does not

of non-violence as a temporary substitute for violence.

Then So why Non-Violence?

Will gives reasons which can apply to Duragraha but his arguments are almost all concerned with Satyagraha, the aim to convert, yet he would not be opposed I believe to a mass movement obstructing an evil in a spirit which lacked much of his requisite non-violent characteristics. He makes opposition to sabotage a principle but would not be prepared to say that if he had been in Germany and had had the chance to sabotage a gas chamber he would not have done this, - certainly it would not have been in the best spirit of satyagraha, but it would have been basic human charity, and to have left it unsabotaged would have made one responsible for the lives of future victims. This then is duragraha.

So the question needs to be rephrased, not why non - violence but why a particular interpretation on non-violence.

why persuasive non-violence in a spirit of empathy? Why obstruction by means other than violence? Why non-violence as a way of life? or even why this publicity stunt, which breaks the law but avoids using violence.

If we are - as in the case of the Bomb, a small minority opposing the wishes of the majority and if we are opposed to minorities imposing their will on majorities then we have an answer to the first.

But if you came across a racist lynching party you would not stop to ask whether the majority of those present were in favour of killing this man, and whether it was ethically permissible to interfere with this majority decision, and if a method other than persuasion looked more likely to succeed few if any pacifists would argue that it should not be used.

So the case for abstaining from violence at such times - when there is a case, and the case for not using violence in a revolution is not just the same case as that for using persuasive non-violence.

It may rest on a different view of the nature of revolution. If one believes that efficient violence (especially in a nuclear age) can only be used by a state, then it stands to reason that an anti-state movement cannot use efficient violence, and that one can remain agnostic as to whether it was ever permissible or practical - its not now; for as a tank cannot be fought with a peashooter, so nuclear, biological and psycho-chemical weapons cannot be fought with tanks and the self-liberation of the proletariat cannot be achieved with weapons of mass destruction.

But having got to the point whereat we are asking not why not violence and why non-violence; but why the particular form of non-violence equivalent to Ghandi's Satyagraha aimed at the conversion of those who are engaged in acts we consider immoral; we have almost as soon as we so pose the question answered many of the problems Will sets out to tackle.

There are of course other trivial differences - the role of Olive Gibbs and Collins, the invariable rejection of sabotage and secrecy in duragraha, the permissibility of recognizing courts in satyagraha & he still underrates fasting.

Anne Vogel - on Will Warren - on Non-Violence

I think Will Warren's paper is good. I would like to concentrate on what he said in the section headed Techniques of Non-Violence (pp.2) especially, the second para, beginning: "In theory at all events, to be successful, a non-violent campaign must have its roots in the people...." I think that if we are going to carry on with these Christian Anarchist meetings we shall have to relate them more closely to our experience working in local groups, whether in industry, squatters' and tenants' associations ~~or~~ or groups of local Christians and others taking social action to fulfill local needs..

I have a hunch that we have got as far as we can go as a purely theoretical discussion group. For one thing few of the people who are most active locally come along regularly if at all, so we are not really fulfilling our function of providing the theoretical basis of the movement; - for another, I think it very doubtful whether a purely theoretical discussion group like this is permanently useful - as Will Warren points out there is a danger of remaining armchair revolutionaries, and armchair revolutionaries will be attracted towards such a group, and inevitably distort the discussion away from reality.

My personal experience, in trying to start a local group, is that one has to give it all one's time and attention, at least in the early stages, and I have more free time than most at the moment, so it must be even more true for others; if one has to keep dashing off to distant meetings and demos one becomes detached from the people one is trying to influence at home, - because they have not yet reached a stage of agreeing with the various complex actions going on over a wider area.

I am trying to think of some way of linking up group and local action with the wider whole - London, Britain, - the world.

I think the most healthy basis is similar to the soviet system: - ie we should all work primarily in our local groups and individuals should be encouraged ~~xxx~~ either to ~~start~~ start one or join the nearest one to them; the local group and not the individual should be the local unit - recognized unit; anyone who is too immobile and too isolated to do this must be kept in contact, helped to maintain contact by visits and correspondence, etc., but this should be regarded as exceptional; there should be regional meetings of local groups - preferably at least one permanent delegate to maintain continuity from each local group.

I would suggest we turn the Christian anarchist group into this kind of regional committee for the London area - by committee I don't mean a group of people deciding what the rest should do, but a group meeting for the purpose of reporting on what they are doing and their experiences.

I think therefore these regional meetings should be longer - so there is time for both reporting and theoretical discussion - I am sure, if this is done, our theoretical level would rise and at the same time people would be drawn into theoretical discussions.

Anne Vogel

.....  
If the groups were our groups there would be a danger that we would be building a structure paralleling CHURCH-CNA on the one hand and the Anarchist Federation on the other. A thing we have agreed to avoid. L.O .

PORTUGUESE STUDENTS COMMITTEE

45, Fairland House  
36, Masons Hill  
Bromley BR2 9JJ Kent

Dear friend,

From the enclosed joint statement you will realise the gravity and importance of the situation of Eduardo Cruzeiro.

We would be most grateful if you would send a letter or telegram of protest to the Spanish Embassy, 24 Belgravia, Square London S.W. 1 .

We would appreciate it if you could forward us a copy of your message.

Yours sincerely

*José Laranjo*  
(José Laranjo-Secretary)

A SPANISH COURT DECIDES TO RETURN A PORTUGUESE DESERTER TO THE FASCIST  
GOVERNMENT OF LISBON

Eduardo Cruzeiro, graduate of the Lisbon School of Fine Art, did his military service in Guine-Bissau. He was corporal in charge of the Commando Instruction Centre and took advantage of his leave to desert. In agreement with the principles of the portuguese anti-fascist and anti-colonialist organisations, Eduardo Cruzeiro deserted in order not to take part in the war of repression and extermination of the people of the so-called "Portuguese" Guine.

Lead to Spain by his militant activity, Eduardo Cruzeiro was arrested and imprisoned by Franco's police on August 19th 1968. Tried by the fascist spanish courts, he was condemned to 18 months in closed prison, for using a false identity and carrying arms illegally.

In December 1968 the Portuguese Government presented a plea for extradition to the spanish Government on the grounds that Eduardo Cruzeiro was a military deserter. On the 9th April 1969 the Madrid High Court accepted to deliver Eduardo Cruzeiro to the fascist Portuguese authorities. According to the existing fascist laws in Portugal Eduardo Cruzeiro risks the DEATH PENALTY for desertion.

This is not only a matter of concession to a demand for extradition of a political militant. It is also a decision by which Franco's Gov., which was unwillingly forced to recognise the right of so-called "Spanish" Guine to independance and which has just signed a treaty with Morroco concerning the decolonisation of Ifni territory, once more gives its support to the colonial war in Guine-Bissau, lead as in Angola and Mozambique by Marcello Caetano's fascist government, worthy succesor to Salazar. In effect it is amatter of returning to the Portuguese authorities a deserter from the Portuguese army, an army which is continuing a colonial war which has already been condemned several times by the Security Council of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The decision of the Madrid High Court constitutes a grave precedent; if such decisions were taken by other European Governments, it would put the life of thousands of young portuguese in danger. It must not be forgotten that in the course of the single year 1967, 1400 young portuguese did not present themselves to the draft board.

The assassins of General Humberto Delgado and student Daniel Teixeira must not be able to exercise their vengeance and their violence on the person of Eduardo Cruzeiro. Daniel Teixeira was already, in last October the forth victim of the "new" Portuguese regime. Liberalisation follows its course.....

London, 21st May 1969  
PORTUGUESE STUDENTS COMMITTEE  
45 Fairland House\*BR2 9JJ\*Bromley Kent

Jean Sargeant to MCC

I write on behalf of the supporters of the Christian group - CHURCH - to protest against the decision by MCC to invite a racist South African cricket team next Summer.

As we understand the position, the South African Cricket Association represents only a minority of that country's population and so is not a representative body of that country's (South African) cricketing talent. We gather there are something like 28,000 South African cricketers excluded on grounds of colour.

No other country in the world makes considerations other than sporting merit the prime determinant of team selection, and we believe that by continuing to condone South Africa's violation of this fundamental sporting principle, M.C.C. are setting a dangerous precedent. Either sporting teams are chosen on merit - or else the way is open to every kind of discrimination, whether it be racial/religious/political. We imagine there would be an outcry from the British sporting public if England selectors chose an "English" team from a couple of favourite counties only; the principle seems to us the same.

Last Sept. supporters of CHURCH - together with several hundred Christians in the multi-racial area of Notting Hill signed a petition to M.C.C. cricketers asking them not to play South African teams as long as they were chosen on racial grounds. We regret to say that a letter written to M.C.C. on behalf of the petitioners in Jan. was not acknowledged.

Indeed the most depressing aspect of the whole controversy has been the continual refusal of MCC ever to meet the real arguments put forward by those who oppose racist sport. The events of the last year have convinced us that MCC are determined to go to any lengths to preserve cricket with an all-white South African team.

If MCC's policy of sanctioning racist South African cricket is to continue indefinitely, then the injustice to the non-white cricketers of South Africa will also continue indefinitely. In these circumstances a group of supporters of CHURCH have decided to take direct action against the MCC matches with South Africa next Summer, if the latter team is chosen on racial grounds.

We do not intend to use violence of any kind, but our programme of "happenings of an educative nature" at selected matches will inevitably conflict with the normal course of play. We hope to bring home to everyone attending the matches the real situation of the non-white cricketers of South Africa. If this results in our volunteers being arrested then we are quite willing to go to gaol.

We believe that the cause of racial justice demands this. During the coming year we intend to mount a campaign throughout the churches (and among the wider public who use our churches on ritual occasions) so that our action will be understood in advance, and so that others who wish to participate can so do.

We very much hope, however, that a firm decision against racist sport, binding on all members of the I.C.C. will be taken at your conference and our action rendered unnecessary.

.....  
The Young Liberals also handed in a letter warning that they would use NVDA, while Dennis Brutus handed in one from SANROC and there were two other constitutionalist petitions. Something of our discussion of non-violence ought to be applicable for appropriate tactics on this issue.

L.O.