20780

LOGOS

Doctrine, debates
Accounts, arguments,
Monthly minutes
Notes and News

35 Natal road,
Thornton Heath,
Croydon, CR4.8QH
653.7546

Christian
Anarchist

March 11th

Deliberations & decisions, disputations and dialogues, documents and discussions.

Dear Friends -

The meeting decided - though not very enthusiastically - that I should call these minutes LOGOS; (I had not then received a letter, which was in the post, from Brian McGrath suggesting ANARCHRISTO, and offering a woodcut of this;) though perhaps he will do one of LOGOS - and save my wife having to try and write it on the stenci stencil each time. (I am having to retype this one, after ruining the first stencil when adding the title.) Fr Andrew's suggestions of Cross Purposes and Cross Words were (I think unfortunately) rejected.

I begin this mailing with Gresham's talk introducing the discussion last Saturday and after these minutes there is also a "Liberation Mass" from Brian McGrath for which I hope he will write an introductory note, as also Will Warren's essay on non-violence.

As will be seen in the minutes proper, the discussion following Gresham's talk was somewhat inconclusive, and the subject will be continued at the next meeting, Ian Lewis introducing it, and I hope his contribution will arrive in time for inclusion in these minutes. In fact we will be discussing points arising from the Church-State Commission for some time.

.....

The basis of a memorandum on disestablishment

First we are grateful to his Grace for the opportunity (the rare opportunity) to express our opinion. We confess that we share the general ignorance as to what in fact is meant by the establishment of the C. of E.

We assume that in general establishment means the recognition by a state of government, of the predominant religion of a country or region.

Without prejudice to our views (later stated) on states and governments, we would suggest the establishment is so valid only where there is a predominant religion and where the people are in fact religious.

Such is a situation which may be true in certain places and in certain times, but is hardly the case in the present English situation.

We assume (again without prejudice to our views on the state) that it is held to be right for the state to encourage whatever is for the good of all; we assume that it is salutory to give cultural movements the opportunity to aid the well-being of the community.

History.

We assume that Christianity was established, in the sense of being recognised and priveleged, throughout the Roman Empire; by the conversion of Constantinge.

We recognize three important gains in this:-

1. The ending of three centuries of persecution.
11. The abolition of crucifixion as a means of capital punishment.
111. The institution of the first day of the week, as a day of rest from labour.

We see in these not merely advantages to the Church; - but steps forward for all humanity.

However we suspect that the price paid by Christianity was high - interference by the Christian ruler (who was in fact the state) in the life and worship of the Church. e.g. the appointment of bishops, (or the passing over of independent minded men); influence on doctrinal development, (i.e. the divisions over the equality or inferiority of the son to the father in the godhead; concepts which were very definitely related in the minds of the Church then, to the equality or the inferiority of the spiritual to the secular powers;)

<u>We should show our Archbishop ou r awareness of the political relevance of the political relevance of schisms, with for instance an essay on the Athanasian Creed.</u> This should be stated rather boldly.

We recognize that Christianity has in fact had a civilizing effect on Western Society, that it helped to preserve civilization in the Dark Ages, and that it created what is known as Christendom.

But we believe that this civilizing influence depends on a balance which was always difficult to maintain, and has in fact long broken down.

We are therefore of the opinion that Christianity has for many centuries been fighting an unsuccesful rearguard action, to preserve certain remnants of healthy social life, and in doing so has been rendered increasingly impotent.

This is the futility and evil of establishment and the evil of concordats between Church and State.

We believe most firmly that Establishment in its origins is based on a fatal confusion of sac red and secular. ((- Here we are in deep water, and as a group we need to think this one out and over before submitting report,

Look at Pagan, Jewish and modern cultures.))

(Again this is a point to stress political-theological connections.) Stress to Archbishop the necessity of a revolutionary understanding of Christianity.

While the Church wishes to influence society for good it is saddled with an escapist attitude to the World. And the answer to bad theology is not No theology.

The present Church is uncertain of its beliefs and therefore uncertain of its function in the world. It wants to help the World but does not want to save the world.

We note with gratification that Prophetic Christian Leaders, in the C. of E., in the past, such as Charles Gore, consistently advocated Disestablishment. ((point to be enlarged))

We have a strong feeling that what is indeed evil, is also in fact foolish, and based on no sure foundation. We have yet to discover when and by whom the C of E was by law established.

We have been taught that the venerable Convocations of Canterbury and York are older than the "Mother of Parliaments", that the Church of England in fact united the English people when they were still politically divided into several Saxon kingdoms. We look for the day when the most important provision of Magna Carta is fulfilled: - "The Church of England shall be Free".

.....

Before giving the attendance and detailed minutes a few records of things of interest to Christian Anarchists.

The CHURCH Conference - about which I was rather rude in the last minutes was in fact extremely impressive. I was only there for the first half, and so Joanne has done a report-cum-minutes of the meeting which she is sending me for inclusion.

Valerie Bickers's demonstration was very small, but I gather not unsuccessful (I had to miss it in order to go and speak in Leeds to the Student Christian Movement on Christian Anarchism), - and some impact was gained.

Apart from the demo the correspondence before it with the bishops should have done some good, I hope but don't know, that Valerie has kept the correspondence up and there will be more to relate in this field at a later date.

David Mumford debated (the official term was a dialogue - and it was in fact two parallel papers rather than debate or dialogue) against a Dominican Slant theorist, at Friends' House, Oxford, before our Christian Anarchist meeting last Saturday at a meeting arranged by the Oxford University FOR, (broadly the Oxford University Christian Anarchist group.)

ACROSS the CNA paper which Dave Poolman edits is being expanded by taking CHURCH supporters onto its editorial board and coopting one or two others and is to be a monthly paper with a sellable format. All potential sellers please contact.

St Paul's Vicarage (Bow Common) Leopold St., E.3.

Valerie Bickers, Diann Barrett, Kathy Dancy, Andrew King, Ian Lewis Robin Percival, Gresham Kirkby, Ian Annett, Dave Mumford, Laurens Otter; apologies Joanne Zuckermann, Dave Mayers, Dave Poolman.

A letter had been received by Gresham arising from a mention of us in Msgr Paget King's circular-bulletin.

Robin Percival reported on the debate-dialogue in Oxford and it was agreed to contact Fr Laurence Bright and suggest a similar discussion here in London.

Andrew had contacted the Vicar of Kennington (Oxford) after a letter-~~x~~article he had had in an insert magazine for parish papers; Andrew had known him formerly but this article suggested that he is very nearly if not definitely a Christian anarchist.

A further sum of money was collected for Pat Arrowsmith, - we had also had through Andrew) an appeal for help with the Medical Aid for Vietnam Youth March, and had requested fuller details (which may or may not mean that copies of their leaflets will be enclosed herewith) Ian Annett it appears is on the committee of the youth section of M.A. for V.

Before reading his paper, Gresham read a leaflet by the late Dr Ryle, as an example written from a position that he himself did not in the least share of prophetic christianity, designed to show what the Church-Establishment lacks it can gain not only from the Gores and other such leftist atholics but even from Conservative Evangelicals, who still have fire in their bellies and are prepared to challenge the state and status quo.

~~x~~ Andrew on a point of clarification wanted to know why we were asked to witness in the first place, and Dave Mumford explained that CHURCH had been asked and that Viv and he had agreed that it was more in the nature of the Christian Anarchist group to try and work out together an agreed statement.

Dave and I put it that our reply - which no doubt will be published down page near the end of the Commission's addenda to its report, can nevertheless be published by us as a pamphlet arguing the case for Christian Anarchism and unfortunately such is the way of publicizing things that it would be easier for us to get publicity for a pamphlet on Christian Anarchism allegedly in the form of a report to the commission than simplay as what it is.

Ian (Lewis) disagreed with Gresham on the church in the fourth century - he thought that Gresham should have been more critical. He tied up doctrines on the Virgin Birth with clerical celibacy, and believed that since the Church would have to disappear with the Parousia, that we must set about making it disappear now, must attempt to show priests and seminarians that their vocation is false.

I quarrelled with his history: clerical celibacy was only enforced in the late 12th Century - until when the Archbishopric of Lyons was hereditary ((In fact an 11th Century synod at Toledo attempted unsuccessfully to enforce clerical monogamy)); The Council of Nicaea was quite clear that the Just Struggle was invariably revolutionary struggle which did not testify to total apostasy by

the anarchist society (Kingdom of Heaven on Earth) means that there will be no more need for the ecclesia which will have performed its allotted task, and while till then one may want worker-priests; it is a non-sequitur to suggest destroying the body which ought to be the revolutionary instrument before the revolution.

Diane took up the concept of an anarchist believing in a revolutionary institution, (which was put down to my syndicalism.)

Ian's other point had been a suggestion to aid the Euthanasia Society which is now pushing for a parliamentary Bill to allow fathers to seek medical and other sanction for the mercy-killing of deformed babies. Most of the rest of the discussion was taken up with this.

Ian it later emerged does not favour euthanasia. He does favour allowing it - on a state level, since the Church obviously has no right to force people to accept Christian ethics.

While all of us (Robin with some reservations) agreed thatthat the Church had no right to ask for the imposition of Christian ethics, (though others of us besides Robin held that in an anarchist society, there would be minimal codes of conduct - and some fairly coercive action would be taken to get psychopaths and such to seek mediaal aid.

The only real agreement was that we should make it known that we do not think the Church has any right to interfere and that "Christian" opposition to

the Bill was altogether miscoceived and unjustifed.

But whereas most people were inclined to oppose Euthanasia anyway but sympathetic with many of the intentions of the reform ((I think I was the only person who favours it -(and then not in the case of children)-)) it was generally held to be unjustifiable to involve an anarchist group in a campaign for a parliamentary Bill.

It was agreed however that Ian should contact the Euthanasia Society and get fuller details - of the terms of the Bill, of the arguments used for it, of the campaign, and of "Christian" obstruction.

Generalized discussion however then went off at a number of tangents and it was agreed that Ian should introduce the newt meeting's discussion so as to continue on the same topic.

That is April 12 - as usual at St Paul's Bow Common vicarage at 8.00 PM.

I have also to announce that on May the First as last year - the May Day Committee (anarchists and others) is organizing a May Day demonstration, this time to end as a festival on the basis that May Day is intended as a radical action a token general strike where in all countries the workers' organizations plan an unofficial holiday and leave the bosses to do the work.

It is probable that Gresham will have a mass to tie in with this in the evening - announcement next month - (his church's rededication festival is anyway on the eve of May Day - he wasn't able to have it on the day.)

Doug Kepper - Peace Action.

A meeting has been called for 27 March (Thurs.), at 7.30 PM, at 6.00 Endsleigh St., London, W.C.1., by Doug Kepper and Dave Walsh; to discuss:-

1. The possibility of holding regular meetings in central London to discuss various aspects of the Warfare State;
2. Whether or not a monthly duplicated News-Letter can be produced, giving news of the warfare state, and coordinating the activities of the non-violent peace groups, squatters' group etc.
3. launching small scale-non-violent peace action; with particular reference to Porton, Nancekuke; and what can be done at Porton during the "Open Day" in June.

All welcome donations also welcome by Doug Kepper, 21 Vernon road, Leytonstone, E.11.

Doug asked me to notify people of this meeting - though I fear the mailing may not go out in time, and there will be a danger of Doug duplicating on a secular plain much of the activity of CNA and CHURCH; still as he has gone on this mailing list this will help to keep him informed of christian non-violent actions.

.....

Bank of Bilbao.

Alan Barlow and Phil Carver have been arrested (March 15) and charged with maliciously damaging the Bank of Bilbao. I have no idea whether there is any evidence against them, whether they are charged on any other basis than appearance, or the fact that they were the first people the police encountered after hearing of the destruction who looked as if they might not have lawyers to help. Or indeed if there is any particular reason to suppose that this Bank more than any other might be the target of political rather than vandal attack. (It's Spanish.)

There is a committee for their defence - c/o Freedom (84a Whitechapel High St., E.1.) [illegible] what line their defence will take.

.....

Now that marshall Amir is being overthrown it seems to be forgotten that not long ago he was Mao Tse Toung's major ally in Asia - indeed in the world. This is particularly interesting as Tariq Ali says on his return (Pakistan was too dangerous for him apparently) that the Muslim mullahs are all CIA agents. (The National Awami Party which Tariq supports is not only pro-Peking but intensely Islamic).

Of course this suggests a danger that Russia will start to justify her nuclear threats against China by saying that as the major ally of Mao's regime is now known to have been a regime dominated by the CIA, it stands to reason that.....

There could well be soon a need for us to consider our duty to intervene in demos against a Sino-Soviet war - possibly a nuclear war.

.....

Inserts from Ian Lewis and Brian McGrath not yet received so this may have to go out without them.

What ought we to have done over Anguilla?

Church Day-Conference

The Church day-conference took place, as announced, on February 22nd, and began, as expected, about an hour late: if one might register a protest within protest, could such meetings not occasionally start on time? The following is a very inadequate summary from the twenty-four pages of notes I took on this occasion (Stop thinking and start taking notes!)

Morning session

Steven Green in the chair. The meeting opened with music, a reading from God is for Real, Man, and a prayer, led by David Hart: brief, and most people seemed to find it very valuable.

Steven Green opened the discussion by calling upon Laurens to summarise the paper which he had contributed (circulated with the last Christian Anarchist minutes) since most people had not had time to read it in advance. This he declined to do, on the grounds that it could not be adequately summarised.

Viv Broughton: Laurens is making two points:1) Good theory is necessary for good action:2)Given this fact, some kind of creed, or manifesto, or statement is necessary for Church.

Laurens: I would not press the second point as much as the first. But it follows that one can't have an organisation to oppose abuses, which, for lack of a creed, admits to membership the perpetrators of those abuses. Some minimal agreement on beliefs and aims is necessary to an organisation which exists to change society. No group can get on with its business if it has to be constantly debating whether its tactics should be violent or non-violent, for example.

John Stott: Christians are not expected to know where they are going. What we need is 'a commitment to set us free to act.'

Andrew King: Christians need a commitment, but to what? They need to be set free to act, but how?

Laurens: A precise plan of where you're going, precise details of the Christian society are neither necessary nor possible.

John : Surely it's not where we're going that matters: it's with Whom we're going. (John and Laurens then spent some time in discussion as to whether Powell and Paisley claim to be acting with Christ, a factual point which could not be settled).

David Hart: I am very taken with John's position, because so many people use thought as an excuse to escape action. But in fact many courses of action are not really open to John: he could not, for example, go out and kill someone. And this is because he is already working from a long and well thought-out position.

David Poolman: Many speakers are reacting from previous groups to which they have belonged, which never did anything but talk. But at the moment we are 'talking about not talking.' And in fact we must have some kind of list of agreed priorities.

Robin Percival: We are setting up a false dichotomy between theory and action. We must have some kind of criterion of what constitutes valid action.

Don Bickell: Perhaps you really should be in an organisation like this with people (e.g. Powellites) with whom you couldn't join elsewhere. Perhaps the whole question is how you can learn to love your enemies within the Church.

Laurens: In the Church one should be able to join with anyone: but in Church, which is supposed to be radical Christian and not all inclusive, it is important to have common beliefs on certain social issues.

Chris Duncan: We seem to be working from a wrong concept of the openness of the Church. Christ didn't say:'Come and be a fascist inside the Church. Many people live comfortable bourgeois lives whilst holding radical ideals. But what is needed is commitment to the reality of Christian ideas. Action, and the analysis of the meaning and value of action, the development of beliefs, go together.

Viv : Of course, no-one's actually saying we must have action for action's sake.

We all agree that action and theory must grow together. But how do you go about drawing up a manifesto for Church? Either you get it done in an authoritarian way, by a committee, or else you circularise everyone and take six months about it, and come up with something watered-down and vague, but still basically authoritarian.
Peggy Denny: I feel an attempt to devise a manifesto would be a mistake. As a founder member of the Committee of 100 I was very grieved to see it split and destroy itself in an attempt to get a manifesto.
Laurens -- gave us a history of the Committee (from the vantage-point of its last full-time secretary) designed to show that a split was inevitable from the first, since it was made up of genuine radicals and those who thought the Labour Party would achieve their goals for them. The London Committee split because of a faction that saw Ho Chi Minh as perfect.
Anne Vogel: (There having been, included among the previous debate, some discussion, which I have not reported in its place since it would have distracted from other issues, as to whether the word 'radical' in the description 'radical Christians' implied primarily political radicalism or a radical kind of Christianity) Radical Christians are those who go back for their ideas and modes of action to Christ and to the first Christians -- but they are necessarily, as a result of this, socially and politically radical. The Bible is our manifesto: but we still need discussion and statement of beliefs, to clear up the misinterpretations of the Bible which have occurred during the centuries of the Church's co-operation with a corrupt society.
John Stott: At least we're all here and trust one another without any manifesto. We have talked about the possible need for a statement of beliefs in order to exclude or force into the open people with whom we cannot co-operate because their beliefs are fundamentally opposed to ours -- but no-one is reallyaafraid that there are any fascists in the room at present. The Holy Spirit seems to have been able to use the idea of Church. What may be needed now is a number of discussion groups, making intensive studies and reporting to one another, not as a preliminary but after each demo.
Roger Numm: Christ said: 'By their works ye shall know them.' He acted and then interpreted the meaning of his actions to those around him. The question is, how do you get over to people the meaning of your actions.
Satish Kumar was then called upon by the chair, as one long concerned with the working together of theory and action, to make his contribution. He described the Bhandian movement, with its 12,000 'peace soldiers', all paid from direct contributions, sometimes in money but more often in kind, from local villagers, and working together with these villagers, who all accepted the same ideals. This movement, he said, had discipline, but no manifesto -- many unwritten ideas constantly circulated for free discussion within the movement.

Satish also asked us what we mean by 'action' and challenged the notion that demonstrations of any kind really constitute 'direct action'. He said that to demonstrate, march, go to prison etc., whilst living one's normal life as a pillar of bourgeois society, was to be in total confusion. Why, he asked, go on confronting authority through demonstrations, instead of getting on with making our own new society: 'There is no point in caressing the darkness.'
Andrew King: was then called upon to make a point which he had asked to have time for some time before half past twelve. It had been announced before the meeting that David Hart would celebrate the Eucharist before lunch, for all who wished to take part. Andrew pointed out that if this were done, a number of people would feel obliged to leave, so that whatever the intention, the effect would be divisive. He found this most regretable, especially since the simple form of opening prayer had been uniting and most valuable. A discussion ensued, to which

many people contributed, and it was finally decided not to hold the Eucharist, but to treat the lunch, for which most people were staying, as an Agape. The tact and charity shown throughout this most difficult and delicate discussion were very great.

It was then announced that the food for our agape would, unavoidably, be an hour late. The discussion on administration which followed was obviously the work of those whose lunch had been twitched from under their noses, and very little was concluded. The basic trouble was that Viv is receiving letters in connection with Church at the rate of some seventeen a day, and would like to hand over the work of answering them to several people, each covering his own region. He suggested that people could use the Church poster (Radical Christians go to Church) with their own address at the bottom. A few offers were made, and Dave Poolman said that he was working on a list of people throughout Britain who would act as centres or contacts, not forming groups, but acting as a liaison for people in their area. Any other suggestions or offers of help would no doubt be very welcome to both Viv and Dave.

Lunch -- Macrobiotic, very good, and surrounded by a mysterious theory about Yin and Yang which didn't spoil the flavour at all.

Afternoon Session

Bob Overy was called upon to present a prepared ~~xxxxx~~ This was really excellent and the following summary comes nowhere near to doing it justice. I am writing to Bob for a copy, and hope it might be able to be circulated with some future Christian Anarchist minutes.

Bob started with the idea that supporters of non-violence constantly allow themselves to be put into positions where their practical proposals of non-violence are made to seem impractical and utopian; this, he said, happened because they allowed the 'good feeling' generated by the idea of non-violence to take over, instead of ~~xxxx~~ atempting to define non-violence. As a result of this, people tend to see non-violence as a question of tactics; thus, on the one hand supporters of non-violence assume that if any movement emerges which uses tactics which we call non-violent, we can ~~xxxxxxxx~~ necessarily identify ourselves with it and make its cause our own, whilst on the other hand political leaders and the like tend to approve of non-violence, and to contrast it with hooliganism, rioting etc. Both sides see non-violence as the opposite and alternative to violence, a mere absence of physical violence, whereas in fact non-violence is much greater than violence, and to compare the two is wrongly to reduce non-violence to the level of violence. From this mistaken equation we develop a number of false ideas -- for example that if non-violence doesn't work we can and should attempt to achieve the same ends by violent means, or that we must show that non-violence is a more effective way of achieving goals which could also be pursued by violence, or that all movements using violent tactics are automatically to be condemned, or that a training in non-violence could be used as a scheme of national defence.

Non-violence is not a neutral technique to be used in the pursuit of any type of goal; it is an attempt to resist evil with good. It involves, in every situation, trying to develop the best in ourselves and in the other people involved. If it fails, then the failure is our failure, any violence in the conflict is our violence, which we have failed to contain or absorb or convert. But we cannot turn in frustration from this failure to the use of violence, since this would defeat our aim, the aim to resist evil with good.

Bob went on to say that although all violence is regretable, some uses of violence are to be condemned less than others. The violence of the oppressed is more justifiable than the violence of their oppressors, and in considering the violence of

many people contributed, and it was finally decided not to hold the Eucharist, but to treat the lunch, for which most people were staying, as an Agape. The tact and charity shown throughout this most difficult and delicate discussion were very great.

It was then announced that the food for our agape would, unavoidably, be an hour late. The discussion on administration which followed was obviously the work of those whose lunch had been twitched from under their noses, and very little was concluded. The basic trouble was that Viv is receiving letters in connection with Church at the rate of some seventeen a day, and would like to hand over the work of answering them to several people, each covering his own region. He suggested that people could use the Church poster (Radical Christians go to Church) with their own address at the bottom. A few offers were made, and Dave Poolman said that he was working on a list of people throughout Britain who would act as centres or contacts, not forming groups, but acting as a liaison for people in their area. Any other suggestions or offers of help would no doubt be very welcome to both Viv and Dave.

Lunch -- Macrobiotic, very good, and surrounded by a mysterious theory about Yin and Yang which didn't spoil the flavour at all.

Afternoon Session

Bob Overy was called upon to present a prepared ~~xxxxx~~ This was really excellent and the following summary comes nowhere near to doing it justice. I am writing to Bob for a copy, and hope it might be able to be circulated with some future Christian Anarchist minutes.

Bob started with the idea that supporters of non-violence constantly allow themselves to be put into positions where their practical proposals of non-violence are made to seem impractical and utopian: this, he said, happened because they allowed the 'good feeling' generated by the idea of non-violence to take over, instead of ~~xxxx~~ atempting to define non-violence. As a result of this, people tend to see non-violence as a question of tactics: thus, on the one hand supporters of non-violence assume that if any movement emerges which uses tactics which we call non-violent, we can ~~xxxxxxxx~~ necessarily identify ourselves with it and make its cause our own, whilst on the other hand political leaders and the like tend to approve of non-violence, and to contrast it with hooliganism, rioting etc. Both sides see non-violence as the opposite and alternative to violence, a mere absence of physical violence, whereas in fact non-violence is much greater than violence, and to compare the two is wrongly to reduce non-violence to the level of violence. From this mistaken equation we develop a number of false ideas -- for example that if non-violence doesn't work we can and should attempt to achieve the same ends by violent means, or that we must show that non-violence is a more effective way of achieving goals which could also be pursued by violence, or that all movements using violent tactics are automatically to be condemned, or that a training in non-violence could be used as a scheme of national defence.

Non-violence is not a neutral technique to be used in the pursuit of any type of goal: it is an attempt to resist evil with good. It involves, in every situation, trying to develop the best in ourselves and in the other people involved. If it fails, then the failure is our failure, any violence in the conflict is our violence, which we have failed to contain or absorb or convert. But we cannot turn in frustration from this failure to the use of violence, since this would defeat our aim, the aim to resist evil with good.

Bob went on to say that although all violence is regretable, some uses of violence are to be condemned less than others. The violence of the oppressed is more justifiable than the violence of their oppressors, and in considering the violence of

the oppressed, we must remember that we all, to some extent live off the fruits of violent oppression. He then proceeded to three definitions of non-violence:

1) Non-violence is the assertion of the truth withour prejudice to one's opponent, and attempt to discern and express the will of God. This means that we must seek to know the truth first, including the detailed truths of specific facts of injustice.

2) Non-violence is the refusal to abandon the ideal, the refusal to hurt or to kill in the process of challenging injustice, the willingness to take all the potential violence in a situation upon oneself.

3) Non-violence is the refusal to tolerate violence, oppression, manipulation and injustice. Any non-violent group must exist as a group which is trying to control its own tendencies to violence, and any group always contains its own ends in embryo. Our revolution is to show how man can create change without killing.

Bob ended by reminding us, with a quotation from Thomas Merton, that a spiritual attack designed to coerce and humiliate is also a form of violence.

Peter Lumsden: It is important to understand how men come to avoid violence. This can be seen by studying animal behaviour(Excuse my ignorance, but I don't know about the book he was quoting here: I think the authors were Lawrence and Ardrey). Animals avoid violence by the development of culture: for example, elaborate dances and rituals are used to enable two animals who normally could not approach each other without violence to come together for the purpose of mating. The whole purpose of Church should be to understand, with this in mind, that as Toynbee says, the basis of culture is religion. It was very disappointing that we could not hold a Eucharist this morning, to set the seal on our resolution to create a Christian community.

Some rather inconclusive discussion then ensued as to whether the book Peter mentioned was of any value to students of non-violence or not. Dave Mumford mentioned a collection of reviews of this work, Man and Agression, ed. Ashley Montague, which convicts its authors of using a biased selection of examples and working only with caged animals, and Dave and a number of other speakers expressed doubts as to whether such studies of animal agression were really helpful to an understanding of human situations.

M.Jameson: Bob's paper didn't mention specific examples of non-violence. Maybe this movement must be prepared to use some kind of violence to support good against evil. Our purpose is to show people the good in man instead of merely exploiting people.

John Papworth: It is not clear what the theme of this meeting is supposed to be, but I want to talk about practical action in terms of what Bob was putting forward. We live in a world in which vast stock-piles of bombs are building up, the population explosion means that there will soon not be enough food to go round, there are terrible crises in Vietnam, Biafra and other places, the atmosphere is being polluted to such an extent that this planet may become unable to support life within the next hundred years, earth's resources are being squandered with mindless abandon, the biotic potential of the soil is being destroyed, and the drift of population from rural to urban areas is creating vast areas of urban death, in which men live half-lives. What can we, as members of a radical Christian movement but as limited human beings, do about all this? If we imagine that we can somehow amass power to ourselves and solve all these problems, we are crazy: all we would do in the attempt would be to get involved in mass movements and bureaucracy.

The answer lies in the community -- but not in founding the kind of communities that Laurens was knocking this morning. We must achieve identity with

our neighbours on small issues: if we can't, we haven't a hope of doing anything about the big issues. We must meet, in a Western urban context, the challenge that Ghandi met with the village community. And the essence of community is that you communicate. The control of the media of communication is falling into fewer and fewer hands. What is needed is for each street to have a printed sheet or noticeboard for news, opinions, ideas on local issues. (John later came forward with a definite plan for these street notice-boards, and a the end of the meeting collected names of those willing to help. Anyone interested in this idea should contact him).

David Hart: What must happen to you before you are willing and able to knock on your neighbour's front door.

Peggy Denny: Ask the Lord to help you.

Chris Duncan: This sense of community will come: it's happening now, even in London, mammfesting itself in things like the squatters' associations and the magazine Community. But it requires extreme patience, and a willingness to refrain from manipulating those members of our communities who lack the educational advantages that most of us have. We must try to help people to achieve real neighbourhood power, a responsibility for those decisions which affect their lives.

Andrew King: You can get people to take direct action about those things which actually affect their daily lives. Mothers of young children, who wouldn't dream of taking direct action in an anti-war demonstration, will go out and block a dangerous road with prams. How can we encourage this kind of thing, and how can we persuade people to act on wider issues? We must explain to those people who say :'You can't do anything about it.'

Jean Serjeant: We must remember that this idea of community action is neutral: it can be used for the valuable things that people have been talking about, but it also mammfests itself in such forms as the banding together of the mmbers of a cpmmunity against the admission of coloured residents to their area. I agree with Bob that we must be humble in our assessment of violent movements: if we were living as negroes in South Africa, we might see nothing open to us but the violence of the liberation movements.

Viv: was then called upon to produce the record of Church actions as a basis for the discussion of future action. He recalled how Church began in Bromley, as an experiment to see what one or two people could do in their own area. They experimented in the communication of ideas, trying to create a climate in which minds could change. Ruislip was the first major step forward from the level of purely local action. Church then took up the cause of the writers and Baptists imprisoned in the Soviet Union, first with a demo at the Russian Embassy, and then with the Moscow demo. Messages have since been received from Moscow to say that the Underground there was much encouraged by this manifestation of support, and that an underground magzine published a large part of the pamphlet which the three demonstrators distributed. The next action was at the Lambeth Conference, where it was seen that the Bishops are the classic liberals, and far more difficult to talk to than anyone else who had been approached. This whole action was probably a waste of time. Then followed the steet thetra in Newbury, anx action which should have ~~fxllxwx~~ been followed up. We should have formed a permanent street theatre, but the idea fell through for lack of know-how. The latest action was the take-over of the American naval chapel, St.Mark's North Audley Street, to hold a requiem for all the dead in Vietnam.

Neil Jameson was then called upon to present the report of the Church-type, Church-inspired group in Bristol called 'Starve.' This group recently held a forty-eight hour fast in Bristol Cathedral. They had originally been told that they would not be permitted to stay in the Cathedral overnight, but when they got in and announced their intention of doing so, they were permitted to go ahead. They gave out 2,000 leaflets and made plenty of cpntacts. They chose the Cathedral for the purpose of

...ing the contrast between the apparent affluence of the Church and the plight of the starving millions.

Mike Jameson: We have just finished a twelve-day campaign on world poverty, which included a four-day fast. Earlier there had been collections for victims in Vietnam and Biafra, neither of which were presented as Christian activities. The rganisers of this latest campaign let it be known that they were Christians, and because of this it was virtually boycotted. The lesson to be learned is that we run the risk of cutting ourselves off from people in such activities by letting on that we're Christians. People think that Christians are just people who go to chirch, and don't appreciate more. Perhaps Church should be a little less churchy. We should not lose the opportunity of identify ourselves with other groups, such as socialist organisations.

John Papworth: We shouldn't lose the opportunity of identifying with the industrial workers. In Place of Strife attacks the right to strike, and nobody is speaking for the workers. It would not come amiss if a body if Christians made it their business to speak on this issue. (John also collected names of people prepared to do something about this matter).

Robin Percival: What is the aim of direct action? Is it merely to publicize the issue involved? If so, we face the problem of devising ever more dramatic and newsworthy things to do. Or to we hope to open up a dialogue? Viv said that only the Lambeth Conference action was a dismal failure, and that because the bishops were mainly classic liberals. But we all are or have been in some sense liberals. We must think what will work with them.

Roger Numm: The bishops are facing problems similar to our own. They need ideas to get grass-roots action going.

An unidentified man: If the bishops are so concerned about world problems and feel that they can't do a thing about them, then they should resign.

Viv: We're worrying too much about the bishops. We shouldn't take them or any other authority too seriously.

Robin Percival: But the bishops are symptomatic of an important problem. The rank and file Christian, the ordinary hypocritical bourgeois liberal has to find a place in the new society: we can't just annihilate them all.

Viv: I don't mean that we should ignore them as people: only as authorities.

Neil Jameson: We were protesting about the affluence of the bishops, and it rather took the wind out of our sails to find that the bishop lived in a tiny flat in one corner of his palace, and drove a mini.

Dave Mumford: Martin Luther King found through his experiences that he needed to build an attitude capable of dealing with widespread evil. Let's go back to Andrew's point about the mothers blocking the street with their prams. We can't formulate large-scale solutions. We can only try to get people to take small actions, and through these to realise the nature of the real problems they're up against.

Bob Overy: I don't agree with Satish that a demonstration is not radical action. By its very nature a protest asserts something positive in you which has been offended. But Church and the peace movement as a whole move on from demo to demo, and in some sense we use the immediate object of the demo to build up Church. Those who took part in the Nonvac action at Elliot Automation were criticised by people at Elliot's for using Elliots to make their demo -- selecting them arbitrarily and not really caring about them. They have now decided to do a really thorough project on Elliots. Most of us, as Christians, find the connection between the Church and the military a relevant issue, so why not do something long-term and concentrated on something like the American naval chapel?

Eric Lowe: I always take it as read that we're always doing something in our own areas. But our joint actions so far have been largely symbolic: they register our protest, but alienate the large section of people immediately around the protest.

Viv was then called upon to present a plan for the next Church action. He said that Church, which originally started as an experiment by a very few people, had now

reached a crucial period, and must move on from sporadic actions to a long-term project. He suggested that we should attempt a permanent take-over of the US naval chapel, as a centre for experimental worship, an arts lab., etc. We should move in to create an experiment with the people already there. We would build up slowly and conventionally at first, but it would eventually lead to tremendous conflict.
John Papworth: We've gone through a generation of protesting against war and getting nowhere, because if we get into communication with people and they join us, what can we actually offer them to do? We need to maintain a tradition of public witness, but we also need to construct a real alternative to the present state of society. As a measure of how much you're doing, how many of the 'lonely ones of God' in your own street do you know?
Robin Percival: Has Viv really conceived how this action he suggests might develop? Direct action should come only when dialogue is exhausted.
Joanne Zuckermann: The terms in which Viv has presented his plan suggest that we should go into this action with an attitude bound to alienate people, and that we would not anticipate peaceful and successful co-operation with the people there. He speaks of the action building up to 'tremendous conflict.' And I'm not quite sure how you could make a planned action to 'take over' somebody else's church in any other spirit.
Alan Diamond: It sounds as though we're going in there with the premiss that they're all devils. Why not just go and join in, become regular members of the congregation, and try to change hearts?
Robin Percival: Surely anyone considering going should become a member, even get confirmed.
Don Bickell: Is Church, the anti-establishment, becoming pre-occupied with buildings? The squatters' associations have real motives for concerning theselves with buildings, but this pre-occupation with the bricks and mortar of a church seems suspect.
Dave Mumford: Action against a building is useful for symbolic purposes, but not for real. I have not yet been able to think of an action, involving large numbers of people, and not purely symbolic, which Church could take.
Steve Green: To do anything valuable about buildings, you must be involved in the community which uses them.
Eric Lowe: Most buildings are occupied by people, who must either be absorbed by any movement such as the one we are speaking of or go. If the people at St. Mark's stay put and resist us, do we admit failure and leave.
Peter Lumsden: Church must progress from a purely negative attitude to protest. We must build up local communities, as alternatives to the structures that exist. We tend to speak as though the people we're protesting against are wicked: they aren't, they simply have no alternative -- and we're offering them none. We should aim to recreate the parish as a Christian community on the basis of the Eucharist.
Jean Serjeant: was then called upon to outline a plan for an action. She suggested the disruption of South African cricket matches with the MCC. This plan came out of a community setting -- it arose from Notting Hill local feeling. The South African Cricket Association is a discriminatory, non-representative body. Sport is important to the white S. Africans: it helps to whitewash their international image, and to maintain contacts which they use to obtain arms. Those interested in the issue of race in sport have decided that the time for talk is past. We have a responsibility to S.Africa as a country where non-violence has been tried for a long time. The proposal is for leafletting this cricket season, to prepare the way for direct action during the next.
Fr.Simon Tugwell spoke of the 'anti-Christmas' organised by the Swedish underground last year. They set up places for the tramps and dossers, where they could go for the two or three days over Christmas, for warmth, company, cups of coffee etc. He

~~Church~~ would be prepared to organise this in Oxford, and hopes that other people might do so elsewhere.

Peter Jones brought forward a request from a Frenchman living in Austria for volunteers for an international action by young people against the concept of a French nuclear force, in direct confrontation with De Gaulle. Apparently France has one of the worst records in Europe for not allowing any kind of peace action.

Simon Fisher announced that they are following up the fast in Bristol Cathedral with a twenty-four hour fast at the beginning of Christian Aid Week. They have written round to local congregations to try to get people to do it in their own churches.

Neil Jameson: Cambridge Radical Action is trying to educate church congregations for a project in May to write to the government about aid to underdeveloped countries.

Larry Law raised the question of how much we try to influence people and take part in community affairs by attending trade union meetings. Jean Serjeant said that she felt that the action she had been talking about was particularly valuable precisely because most ordinary people, who couldn't be touched on other issues, were very interested in cricket, and ~~xxxxxxx~~ a number of other people mentioned organisations through which we might be able to reach working people.

Steve Green: Much talk has been going on about a periodical of some kind, through which dialogues such as the present could continue.

Dave Poolman was called to speak on this subject. He said that people had decided there should be some kind of radical Christian publication to pass on ideas, although local action should be the main thing. News reporting was also needed. The publication which he started, Across, caost £60 for the first issue, and was felt to be dull. At the same time, unknown to him, Barry Brown has started a magazine in Clacton, called Church, which reaches five churches and which is free. Dave and Barry have agreed that there shouldn't be two such magazines, and are planning a newspaper, which is apparently easier to sell than a magazine. A printer has been found who could produce a good quality eight-page newspaper, in colour, at half the cost of Across. Dave suggested that a group should be set up after the meeting, to bring out the first edition

A certain amount of general discussion was carried on, in which it was mentioned that such a magazine could take the place of Sunday, Help and Breakthrough, all of which are dying, and that although articles on basic general ideas can be published elsewhere, a publication is needed for certain types of news, ideas for local actions, etc.

The conference ended with announcements of three other planned actions. One of these is already past. The second was Dave Poolman's plan for a medieval style street pageant on lorries this summer. The third was an announcement of a restaging of the Peterloo massacre in Brighton on May 8th.

Summary. This kind of thing can't really be summarised, but I doubt that anybody has actually waded through all these notes. Perhaps the most significant thing was that there was so much feeling against the kind of single demonstrations that have formed the staple of our direct action in the past. There was much questioning both of the value of such demonstrations and of the spirit behind them. People were more interested in developing a sense of community on a local level, in the kind of actions that could grow out of this, and in intensive, long-term projects. Many proposals for this type of action are mentioned in this report, especially in thenlast section: each is given with the name of the proposer, whose address can be found in the Church mailing list.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF NON-VIOLENCE

WHY NON-VIOLENCE?

Because

a) it is morally right. See the teachings of Jesus, Buddha and other religious leaders, Tolstoi and Thoreau and other ethical leaders. Most of the world's greatest leaders have declared that it is morally wrong to kill, torture, enslave or ill-use your enemy or your neighbour. Today everyone pays lip service to this ideal, but still we see people exploited, colour prejudice, anti-gypsy feeling, strikes and lockouts and disharmony. Clearly something is wrong. It is clearly impossible to have both the methods of, say, Jesus, and the warfare state. One must go. If we accept the teachings then we must accept the practice and the consequences. It may, certainly will, be difficult, but not an impossible task. Indeed it is essential that both the communist and capitalist worlds should go, for a peaceful world cannot depend on the profit motive ... it is a contradiction in terms.

b) By being non-violent less violence is used.

c) When successful it leaves less anger and resentment behind.

d) By its very nature it offers opportunities for communication between opponents and tends to create a synthesis. The dialogue that results from non-violent action is that of a deeper quality than that found at the normal conference table, for in the latter case both sides are aware that there is a possibility of the use of force to back a losing argument, whereas if one of the disputants has ruled out violence (and preferably has previously shown that it will do so whatever the situation) then both sides know that a common decision must be arrived at, else naked, unprovoked aggression will ensue, resulting not in a victorious, if bloody, campaign with the home country supporting and encouraging their representatives, but rather a humiliated and ashamed body of people who will eventually undo that which has been done by force, as far as lies in their power.

The vision held by most thinking people is of a world community living in peace and harmony. Long gone are the days when one could say with any assurance that if you wish for peace, prepare for war. Thus it seems certain that, desiring a peaceful world, it is essential to go about achieving it in a peaceful fraternal way.

WHAT IS NON-VIOLENCE?

Firstly, it is not non-resistance. For example, the Jews' going unresistingly to the gas chambers was not being non-violent.

Secondly, it is not being non-partisan. A non-violent action is definitely partisan, inasmuch as it states that a certain course of action is evil, or good, as the case may be.

Thirdly, it is not opting out of a situation, but stating quite clearly that it is possible to resolve it in a reasonable manner.

It is not negative, as it seems to imply, but the positive side of violence. In a scene of conflict there are three possible alternatives one can adopt: be neutral; be violent; be non-violent. To remain neutral is to be ineffective, an abrogation of human dignity. This course achieves nothing but the degradation of the human spirit. The end is clearly worse than the beginning. To be violent may result in imposing your will on unwilling opponents, or having their will imposed on you, or, more likely, coming to a compromise, which is essentially unsatisfactory to all concerned. To be non-violent is to present a new situation to the opponent. One has to say "No" very firmly to a course of action one considers wrong, but to affirm a unity of purpose, of humanity, to the wrongdoer. This must not imply that you think yourself superior, still less to give that impression to the other man. Rather, one says, "That is a thing I cannot do. It may be right for you, although I do not think so. If you are sure, you should proceed, but I will not co-operate and will strive to make you change your mind. I shall

offer you no physical or moral violence, but I can, and shall, oppose your action by persuasion and if I fail in that you must proceed over my body."

Having arrived at this situation the way may very well open for a discussion of viewpoints: if it has, you are halfway to success. However, it may very well be that the opponent is either too well disciplined, too drunk, or unable to understand your language. Then comes the moment of truth. To place your body unresistingly in front of the other man is the inevitable step. At this point it becomes apparent that non-violence cannot be used for evil ends. The other man must then make up his mind whether to proceed with his aims, having to arrest, wound, or kill you. And herein lies the power of non-violence. It is certain that no one could kill a physically passive opponent light-heartedly. He could not calm his conscience with the thought, "it was either him or me". Unlike the non-resister, a point has been made, and demands an answer. To walk submissively to prison, to concentration camp, or to the gallows is passive and could be construed as cowardice. To walk to meet an aggressor and then to quietly challenge him with non-violent action forces him to reconsider what he is doing and to ask why anyone should be willing to die rather than submit, to be hurt rather than hurt.

Essentially, then, non-violence succeeds in making an aggressor meet you on your own ground of reason and reconciliation, rather than on his of aggression and violence.

TECHNIQUES OF NON-VIOLENCE

It is seldom that any large body of people is suddenly placed in a position, without warning and preparation, where they can usefully employ non-violence. One recent exception to this occurred in Czechoslovakia where the people had a long history of patriotic use of violence and had an army capable and willing to fight, but the government and people realised that in the Soviet Union they had an opponent of overwhelming military strength. Added to this was the understanding that both countries believed in socialism. Finally they had the example of Hungary to consider. Taking all things into account, it must be conceded that the Czechs put up a fine show, but owing to their lack of preparedness in un-armed, non-violent mass resistance it is scarcely to be hoped that they will continue for long to be non-violent.

In theory, at all events, to be successful a non-violent campaign must have its roots in the people - roots that are well established. Long before any action is contemplated the protagonists must carefully consider how deep their convictions are, and how far they can reasonably expect themselves to go. Having decided that non-violent resistance is a viable philosophy, then preparations for putting it into practice are necessary. Firstly it is essential that the procees is not that of an "armchair revolutionary". As Lenin once remarked, "It is far better to be in a revolution than to write about one." In other words, the best teacher is experience. But there is, nonetheless, a place for theory. A number of books have been written on the subject, but it is necessary to exercise discretion in the choice, for some are written in the belief that non-violent action can be organised by the military and executed by military minds. This is far from the truth. An army man cannot conceive how a civilian with no discipline but self-discipline could work with others, in a free association, for a common purpose in a common way.

Having read a little theory, it is wise to turn to historical examples of non-violence. These are certainly not wanting. Examples are available of activities carried out by humanists, religious people of all kinds and people of all races, men and women alike. Perhaps it would be wise to read in more detail about the campaigns of Gandhi, Martin Luther King, the Black Sash movement in South Africa and suchlike. Our own country can provide some useful examples, e.g. the Quakers, the Diggers, the Levellers, even the Luddites, C.O.'s in two world wars, the Dockers' Strike in [illegible], the Tolpuddle Martyrs, the Hunger Marches and [illegible] the activities of people like Harold Steele, Canon Collins, Olive Gibbs, Michael Randle, Pat Arrowsmith, April Carter and George Clarke.

When non-violent action is decided on everyone should be involved, there should be neither leaders nor led. This does not mean, of course, that division of labour is not essential; for example, some people can make banners better than others who are more able speechmakers.

Openness and honesty are the outstanding criteria of non-violence. The case for secrecy can be apparently very strong, and the Czechoslovakian radio is a good example. The people of that country could most certainly have acted as they did without the secret radio, but as explained above the Czechs were not prepared for non-violent action. Had they been, the resistance would have been far different.

In this country, in peacetime, to organise a demonstration of any real value, publicity is necessary, and inevitably the police will hear about it. This is the utilitarian argument for informing the police. At a deeper level it seems to me essential to discuss with the police, and other authorities, what is proposed, and details of procedure, route, time, objectives, both immediate and ultimate. It is obvious if, for example, one wishes to persuade the Americans to remove a military base, by peaceful means, then to antagonise the British authorities is to set off on the wrong foot. Right from the beginning of preparations for an action everyone must be clear in his mind that the object of opposition is not a man (dressed in blue, khaki, grey, or civilian clothes) but the actions of that man, often directed and controlled by remote bodies. Having decided what, when, and where, and explained to as many people as possible, particularly the type of person involved in the action (in particular the workmen of a factory manufacturing military material, and the neighbouring civilian population) and having enlisted the active or passive support of local groups, such as Trade Unions and Churches, details have to be looked to.

Primarily, the strength of such a demonstration lies in the integrity of those taking part. It is an exhilarating experience to find that when in a non-violent demonstration the strength of the combined conviction erupts and overflows, so each person is capable of a quietness of mind and a non-aggressiveness of body totally impossible were one alone and unprepared.

From this moment on, tactics are of minor importance to those who were mentally deeply involved in the preparation of the action. But there are sure to be some people who come along, possibly out of curiosity, possibly for some fun, possibly for some police-baiting. These are the people who present problems. Each situation must very largely be played by ear, but a few generalizations may be made.

Never, on any account, run. To run forward raises emotions in the police the reverse of those desired. To run backward is to retreat in more ways than one. In essence it means an abandonment of a non-violent attitude. To try to dodge the police or military is the beginning of violence. It is almost impossible for a policeman to stop a running person without using violence. One, if perhaps minor, objective is to act so as to restrain violence being used against you.

Some people need the support of some physical contact. Accordingly it is becoming the custom to link arms. The danger of doing this is evident to anyone who watches a demonstration in progress. This technique is being increasingly used by the militant left to form a human battering ram, and is quite effective as such, but has no place in a non-violent project. At North Pickenham, near Swaffham, whilst the demonstrators were sitting and being dragged off one by one, two of us linked arms with the intention of making it harder for the police to remove them. Directly two policemen caught hold of them, they gripped each other firmly and sat tensed up physically and this tension rapidly included mental and emotional tensions. It is essential that demonstrators should be as relaxed as possible; anything that hinders this should be avoided. It was interesting to hear the two demonstrators concerned say they realized the increased tension and decided to abandon such methods in future. If physical contact is deemed essential (and I personally feel that close proximity is sufficient), possibly linking little fingers might provide all that was necessary. The advantage of this, of course, is

that little or no physical rigidity is required and the contact can easily be broken.

The question of noise is one that invariably comes up. To march in meditative silence is easy for those, such as Quakers, who have a traditional knowledge of a living silence, but to most people it is almost impossible. The shouting of slogans has something to commend it, but the disadvantages are overwhelming. Slogan-shouting, to be really effective, has to be strictly regimented, everyone shouting in unison and clearly. Even if this were accomplished, the meaning of the words is frequently lost to the bystander. A more serious drawback, however, is that a multiplicity of slogans are used, taken up here and there by various groups. This causes confusion and often results in nothing being understood at all. When you add to this that slogans inevitably become more and more strident and provocative as time goes on, it is readily understood that slogan-shouting is best avoided. Singing certain songs, such as "We shall overcome" is preferable, but even here there are pitfalls.

Banners are, of necessity, briefly worded. Quakers tend to have posters with several paragraphs of clear type which it is possible to read if the holder is not walking too quickly, but brevity is the art of the poster. Banners carried by two or more people should be held firmly, so as to ramain readable, or else a light strut top and bottom, running from pole to pole, will ensure that the wording remains legible. A good plan is to have wording on the back as well as the front, for the benefit of motorists passing in the same direction. Wind vents are a help in carrying large banners.

Try not to be divided into small sections by the police. It may be necessary to be divided occasionally on a large march for the convenience of traffic wishing to cross the route. To refuse to let them do so at reasonable intervals serves but to antagonise car drivers and passengers, which is a thing to be avoided if at all possible. It is important not to run to catch up with the people ahead - this for a variety of reasons: first of all, the march loses in dignity and impressiveness: secondly, old people cannot possibly keep up with the young, and therefore the procession becomes ragged and more easily divided by police or unsympathetic bystanders. In any case, having run and caught up, the group has to wait at the next crossroads while traffic gets across. Once a suitably sized contingent is formed, it is easier and better to keep a space between it and the adjacent ones. This often aids in impressiveness.

If the police or military give orders contrary to the planned arrangements, which the authorities will know of well in advance, and probably agreed with, then politely but firmly refuse to be diverted. It is better to stand quietly face to face with the police than immediately to sit, or worse still to move away from the planned route. To sit at once gives the impression that the conclusion has been reached, which is not the case When standing in line, the opportunity can arise of talking in a friendly way with the police and to try to get over more clearly than the leaflets have done the purpose and spirit of the action. Once the police start to push, then sitting is much to be preferred. If pushed when standing, one either steps back or falls over. To step back is undesirable and to fall gives the often erroneous impression that the police are being unnecessarily violent, and thus makes the non-violence of some of the protesters harder to preserve.

Horses are often frightening animals to the townsman, who is unaware that horses will not tread on a quiet body lying in its way. In addition, police horses are trained to lean sideways on people. It is impossible to remain upright and still in such circumstances, and quite difficult to remain on friendly terms with the horse and its rider. Possibly it might be worthwhile to have a few cubes of sugar handy and try a bit of fraternization.

Having got as near your objective as seems likely to be possible, it seems sensible to sit right away, thus giving the impression of determination to remain. Should the police withdraw, it is a simple matter to advance. If the police try to move forward, they cannot do so without walking on or over the bodies of the people, who, [illegible] able to advance a little further.

This juncture is the nub of the whole operation. This, more often than not, is where calm is lost, tempers are frayed, fighting breaks out and non-violence lost, perhaps irretrievably. All demonstrators must be made completely aware of the object of the action. It seldom is the actual arrival at a particular place, or invasion of a rocket site, although, of course, this may be a secondary objective. One's point can be made just as well a hundred yards or so away from the object of protest. To shout slogans at this stage only serves to aggravate the situation. It will certainly not persuade the police or military to retire: the only result is to raise the tension, the reverse of what is needed. To sit, or lie, quietly has far more effect. If arrested, the simplest thing is to remain mentally at ease and physically limp. Anyone having to remove a person automatically uses a little more strength than is strictly necessary, so a struggling person can be hurt quite unintentionally. A limp body keeps force at a minimum and tempers down. Once in the Black Maria, opportunities arise for conversations with the guards - conversations that can be quite rewarding. A barrier is between arresters and arrested, but it is surprising how quickly these can be broken down if no resentment is felt and good-natured attitudes adopted. After all, the guards do not want any trouble if it can be avoided, and will not look for any if the previous minutes have been calm.

The question of behaviour in Court is not clear cut. There is obviously no need to be rude to the magistrate or Judge, even if one does not accept their authority. One should try to get through to them, but admittedly this is an almost impossible task for they invariably avoid discussion, claiming they are there to enforce the Law, not to question it.

To agree to a binding-over seems to be an unacceptable compromise. If one feels strongly enough about a problem to demonstrate and land oneself in Court, if follows, surely, that one is not in a position to promise not to do it again. Fines are usually imposed and this raises the question, "Should I pay the fine, or go to prison?" Each must decide for himself. To pay a fine adds money to the Exchequer and to go to prison costs the country about £19 a week, which then cannot be used for purposes demonstrated about. It is true that, having paid the fine, one can proceed to organise and demonstrate again. One must weigh up the pros and cons of the value of imprisonment, considered in terms of influence on the movement, on the public, on the police, prison staff and fellow prisoners, and the amount of work one could put in if free. The tactics of non-violence can certainly be carried out in prison. One's attitude to the staff and fellow prisoners is an object of interest and it has been well established that the conduct of prisoners of conscience has a profound effect on all who encounter it.

If the conflict one is engaged in is a national one, such as facing an invasion, obviously the task is harder and decisions more difficult to arrive at. It is extremely hard to know just where reconciliation ends and fraternizing begins. It must always be made apparent to the invader that the resistance goes on, not against the individual soldier but against the occupation they are taking part in.

Inevitably the question of sabotage will crop up, and arguments raised in favour of it, with examples such as the removal of railway lines, blowing up bridges and so forth. It can be agreed, surely, that these actions are not compatible with non-violence. But when it comes to the question of illegal radios it certainly becomes difficult. Czechoslovakia would not have been as successful without secrecy in the matter of radio. To publish the time of broadcasting is essential, but should one state the place and the people concerned? To do so would ensure that the programme would not go out, and a number of the most active resisters killed or imprisoned. Naturally no one imagines that non-violent resistance, if it is at all likely to be successful, will not entail many deaths and more hardships. But there is no need for unnecessary suffering. So the question resolves itself into a practical one. Is the radio service essential to the success of the resistance? If so, how can it be conducted openly? Possibly a lesson could be learnt from the experience of the No Conscription Fellowship during the war years of 1914-18 when they openly proclaimed what they were doing (publishing a news sheet, the Tribunal) and gave the names of the executive, but that of

no one else. Consequently those people were arrested. Immediately others stepped into their shoes and so the paper went on.

In situations such as this the problem of informers is always present. To be open and honest does not entail publishing all the discussions and proposals made, but only those decided upon. The people involved in "underground" non-violent action must to a certain extent be reserved about their organization, else all their activities would come to naught. But the more one can be seen on the street the better, for it will encourage the waverers. In a situation where the whole country is resisting along these lines the need for secrecy would be minimal.

Throughout the campaign every effort must be made to oppose the aggression and not the aggressor. This is truly difficult, but what the Indians achieved against the British, and the Black Americans against the White Americans are surely examples worth following?

To sum up: the essence of non-violent resistance is to communicate as fully as one possibly can with those who are doing the evil thing. Without such dialogue the whole movement is sterile. The whole object of the resistance is to reach out to "that of God" within the other fellow. In non-religious terms it is possible to say that in every human being, however debased, there is some humanity, some spark of fellowship, which, when encouraged, will respond. Always the similarities must be pointed out more than the dissimilarities. Our common humanity transcends sectional interests.

Will Warren, Dove House Place Beccles Road, Belton, Gt. Yarmouth, Norfolk

A Mass is a compendium of concepts, a folk ballad of intellectual confrontation with the ultimate, the ultimate algebraically stated as "GOD". The traditional masses are often clothed in the lovely cloth of Animism. The Modern masses seem to be shorn of much of this, and reflect the quiet statement our grey age murmurs when addressing God.

The Liberation Mass is a distillate, carrying meaning for an anarchist, who is almost not a Christian. And circulated because of the feeling that it may carry meaning for others..

The special aspect of a Mass which sets it apart from a prayer is its centring on the concept "Consecration".

This concept, provides the human with a free choice, to give back to God, a conceptually complete sacred piece of existence.

The following is the PREFACE to the Liberation Mass

UNIFY HUMANS AND NATURE. BRING US TO THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT, THOU WHO EVER DOTH CREATE. HALLOW, BLESS AND BESTOW; SEND FORTH THY LIGHT; ACCEPT OUR LIBERATION AND OUR FELLOWSHIP IN LOVE WITH OUR BROTHERS AND OUR SISTERS OF CREATION. REMAIN WITH US WHEN OUTER DARKNESS [illegible] ATTENUATE OUR FAITH.

Brian McGrath,
27 Arundel Gardens,
London W.11.

Brian will no doubt like comments to be sent to him, and he may care to forward some such to me for inclusion at a later date, - I will leave him to edit - but presuming on the secretary's position:-

The animism as also the invocation of the saints passed over and their identification with those who stand around; The deliberate to fulfill all earlier concepts of the metaphysical, whether Hebrew, Pagan or atheistic philosophic; all of which characterized the earliest masses was all of course dropped by the 16th Century Divines as being unnecessary (and possibly idolatrous) excressences perverting the purity of the Last Supper. Time has made Anglicanism see that it has to restore these, just in time to see Rome copying Cranmer. Brian is obviously tring to anticipate a Roman tractarian tradition.

.....

P.S. to earlier P.S. to minutes - I did not know that there had been pacifist efforts to do something about Anguilla, but I am still not certain what should have been done.

London Squatters seem to have made something of a breakthrough with the ILford (Redbridge) Council forced to make concessions and with the GLC overreaching itself.

Sino-Soviet mutual threats of nuclear annhilation, (which naturally went almost unreported in the Morning Star) not only raise new problems as to what we should be doing on an international level; - there being very little we can do and a Peace Army being a diversion from work here is inadvisable - but also means that we should be orienting perhaps a little more propaganda to puttting the case for anarchism to the varying Stalinist and Stalino-Trotskyist factions.

L I B E R A T I O N M A S S

In the name of the Father, and of the child of God, and of the Holy Spirit.

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end.

I will go to the Altar of God, to God, the joy of my youth.

Thou art my strength. Why hast Thou forsaken me? And why do I go about in sadness?

Send forth thy light and thy truth; for they have led me and brought me to thy holy hill and thy dwelling place.

Why art thou sad my soul, and why dost thou trouble me?

Our help is in the name of the Lord.
Who hath made heaven and earth; galactic infinity, energy and matter; and who hath by these profound acts led to the evolution of biological life and the occurrence of thought.

Thou wilt turn, O God, and bring us to the life of the spirit.
And thy people shall rejoice in Thee.
O Lord, hear my prayer, and let my cry come unto thee.
May we enter with enquiring yet reverent minds into the holy of holies.

Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to people of goodwill.

We praise, bless, adore, and glorify thee. We give thee thanks for thy great glory, O Lord God. For thou alone art Lord. Thanks be to God.

The Lord be in my inner mind and on my lips.

I believe in One God, the Father Almighty, creator of heaven and earth, and of all things, visible and invisible. And in the holy Spirit, Lord and Giver of life, who procedeth from the Father.

Accept our prayer almighty and eternal God.

O God, who has established the nature of man in wondrous dignity, grant that through the mystery of water and wine, we may be made partakers of his Divinity, who has become partaker of our humanity.

I will wash my hands among the innocent, and will walk round thy altar, O God, to hear the voice of thy praise and to tell all thy wondrous deeds.
Lord, I love the beauty of thy house, and the place where thy glory dwells.

Accept, most holy trinity, this offering which we are making in remembrance of the Passion of Jesus Christ, of martyrs, in honour of Blessed Mary, and in fellowship with holy men and women.

Be mindful, O Lord, of the dead, and grant them of thy goodness, a place of comfort, light and peace.

Thou dost ever create, hallow, fill with life, bless and bestow upon us all things. Thy will be done. Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Deliver us from all evils, past, present and to come. And grant, of thy goodness, peace, freedom and justice in our days. May we be always free form sin and safe from all disquiet.

Grant us, O God, fellowship in love with our brothers and sisters of creation, humankind, organisms, matter and thought.

Blessed art thou Mary amongst women. Blessed be the fruit of their wombs.
May the mingling and hallowing of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ help us who receive it to life everlasting.

Lamb of God, who takest away the sadness of the world, grant us Thy peace, now, and at the hour of our death. Pray, Lord, Thy blessing.

OUTER DARKNESS

INNER SILENCE

FRAGMENTS FOR A DIGGER MASS OF LIBERATION