and sincerity is considered to be the highest public virtue?

In the post-Pentagon Papers era, the soul of leadership cannot reside in hollowing posturings, patronizing charitability, or even skillful broken field running. Barber's concluding remarks hint at the necessary quality of modern statesmanship:

"The [sic] active-positive presidents did not invent the sentiments they called forth. They gave expression in a believable way to convictions momentarily buried in fear and mistrust. From their perception of a basically capable public they

drew strength for their own sense of capability."

In a democracy, a leader's perception of the public's decency must do more than heighten his own ability. He must go beyond simply giving expression to public convictions. The president must somehow cause people to believe in and act upon their own best instincts. In an article about Adlai Stevenson, our most perceptive president watcher Murray Kempton puts the matter most succinctly: "The Republicans ask us to trust a man, he asks us to trust ourselves."

## The Revolution in Angola: MPLA, Life Histories and Documents by Don Barnett and Roy Harvey

(Bobbs-Merrill; 312 pp.; \$7.95)

### Isebill V. Gruhn

There is today, among a small number of committed citizens of the Western world, a very genuine concern about, as well as ideological commitment to, the struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America which seek to liberate their peoples from external control. There is, in addition, a good deal of Westernized romanticizing connected with liberation struggles in distant lands. Contemporary Western political rhetoric is well peppered with the words "revolution," "liberation" and "guerrilla," and frequently too little is understood about the complexities of . the slow and painful struggles that small, ill-armed and schism-ridden liberation movements undergo. Americans are perhaps all too aware of the struggles in Vietnam, and here some of the rhetoric has been displaced by a certain level of clear thinking. Less is known about the struggles of the peoples in Africa seeking to overthrow Africa's oldest and most enduring colonial power, Portugal, but the evidence suggests that concerned and interested students of America's world role should take a more careful look at these struggles.

Portugal, unlike Britain, France and Belgium, continues to cling to three territories in Africa, referred to as its overseas "provinces." These so-called "integral parts" of the Portuguese nation are today challenging Portuguese rule with a complex and confusing array of nationalist movements. These liberation movements, which often act at odds with each other, operate clandestinely within Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau, pursuing independent rule and freedom from Portugal's oppression. These three territories are of considerable import to the student of African affairs, but there are very good reasons for Americans generally to acquaint themselves with the Portuguese colonial wars and the territories themselves. America's involvement in these struggles is quite extensive. This is so because the United States renders aid and assistance, directly and indirectly, to Portugal, which in turn

directly or indirectly diverts such aid to Africa to enable it to sustain and maintain its presence in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau.

The most recent and alarming manifestation of American-Portuguese involvement is a large \$436 million American-aid package which included among other things: Export-Import Bank financing; free use of an hydrographic ship; a grant for "educational reform" programs sponsored by the Department of Defense; a two-year waiver of Portugal's annual support payments for the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory group stationed in Lisbon. All this was granted to Portugal as recently as 1971 as a quid pro quo for a two-year extension of U.S. base rights in the Azores. Such American aid, even if not used by Portugal to fight in Africa, frees other funds which are then employed in the African wars. In addition, as a member of NATO, Portugal finds it possible to divert NATO equipment for use in Africa. Regardless of the rationale behind it, it is difficult not to conclude that America's involvement in Portugal's colonial wars is considerable.

In the case of Angola, a territory of some importance given its economic potential and location, the interested reader should go to John Marcum's excellent and detailed study, The Angolan Revolution, which deals with the complexities and intricacies of competing liberation movements (and to Volume II soon to be published). Marcum traces and introduces the reader to the reasons for, and the confusion of, competing Angolan leadership, their efforts to organize inside and outside of Angola and Africa, and the internal and external factors which fostered and/or deterred these movements. He also presents the reader with rigorous and careful analysis of the Angolan liberation struggle.

A recent addition to the literature on Angola is the book under review here. Whatever the merits of Barnett and Harvey's study, and it has some special merit, it does not delineate a framework within which to understand the struggles in Angola's various liberation movements. It is an openly biased account of the authors' visit with the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), one of several Angolan liberation movements. It is true that in recent years the MPLA in particular has been the most successful of Angola's liberation movements, but the uninitiated reader has no way of determining a framework within which the MPLA operates, either within Angola or internationally. Clearly committed to the cause of the MPLA, the authors make no effort to analyze their evidence. The reader is not able, therefore, to examine the MPLA's propaganda in the context of the possible, the feasible or the already accomplished. There is little critical evaluation of the material presented and no analytic framework. These omissions lend the book the tone of a propaganda pamphlet. They also make the book less useful and less convincing than it might otherwise have been,

Despite these serious shortcomings The Revolution in Angola has worth and value. Its single most important contribution is the life histories of various liberation fighters-men and women, leaders and followers. These portraits take on a dynamic and force of their own, not merely for those interested in revolution but for anyone concerned with Africa and Africans. In these portraits we get lively and interesting accounts of how individuals grew up in villages, became socialized into an awareness of, and ultimately dislike of, the Portuguese, and of how through different sets of circumstances became recruits of the guerrilla movement. How these people became politically conscious and why they are willing to risk their lives for the struggle makes fascinating reading. In their own way these life histories have the kind of impact and provide the kind of understanding which Gerard Chaliand achieved in The Peasants of North Vietnam.

Unfortunately their total effectiveness does not match Chaliand's, simply because the latter wisely placed his interviews and sketches of people in a framework of events. At a time when peoples in distant lands frequently appear faceless, and liberation movements, especially in distant lands, appear romantic and bigger than life, it is exceedingly important to recall the humans who are part of these struggles. To this end *The Revolution in Angola* makes a contribution.

# The New Communes by Ron E. Roberts

(Prentice-Hall; 144 pp.; \$5.95)

## A Name for Ourselves by Paul Potter

(Little, Brown; 238 pp.; \$6.95)

### William J. Stevenson

Everyone knows what the anti-Establishment youth in America want -more personal liberation and a greater sense of community. We hear it frequently. The more difficult question, however, which few seem able to answer, is how this combination of increased individualism and expanded communitarianism is to be realized. Can we have infinite freedom to "do our own thing" and still develop some semblance of unity and solidarity? Can a new radicalism magically emerge from the American liberal environment? Ron Roberts says yes. It's easy. Communes are beautiful. Paul Potter says no, recognizing that radicalism involves personal struggle, a struggle necessitating hard work and creative involvement.

Ron Roberts's book on the communalist movement is maddeningly simplistic and represents, still more maddeningly, the kind of "quickie" thrown together to explain the counterculture to the American public in easily digested clichés. What are "the new communes"? For Roberts, seemingly everything and everyone. While purporting to study specifically "utopian" and "communalist" subcultures, we get much more. We get, in fact, a maze of irrelevancies. Roberts's short chapters on religious communes of the nineteenth century,

John Humphrey Noyes's Oneida community, various contemporary hippie groupings in Colorado and California are pleasant, at times instructive, and certainly within the framework of his original theme. But the inclusion of chapters (approximately half the book) on T-groups, the self-defense "urban collectives". of the Weatherpeople and the charity clinics of the Catholic Worker are hardly utopian and communalistic as he, and we, customarily define the terms. We get a mishmash, with faulty research to boot. (To identify Michael Harrington of The Other America fame with the Catholic Worker is defensible; to place him alongside the new communards is, at best, questionable; to describe him as a congressman from Massachusetts is downright embarrassing.)

Roberts's own accounts demonstrate the pervasive atmosphere of bickering and boredom among the commune members he encountered. To say, therefore, that the individualized freedoms of the subculturalists have resulted in a sense of community and brotherly-sisterly unity is nonsense—as is the assertion that large numbers of communalists have found an "authentic" self. For the general public this kind of analysis is misleading; for the sensitive counterculturists seeking new