Petersen, Helge (2017) *'Because we dared to demonstrate' – a critical analysis of state repression, institutional racism and anti-racist mobilisation in the context of the Mangrove Nine trial in London, 1971.* [MRes]

http://endeavour.gla.ac.uk/293/

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author(s)

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author(s)

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, institution and date must be given

Enlighten Dissertations
http://endeavour.gla.ac.uk/
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

‘Because We Dared To Demonstrate’ –

A Critical Analysis of State Repression, Institutional Racism and Anti-Racist Mobilisation in the Context of the Mangrove Nine Trial in London, 1971

by

Helge Petersen

A dissertation submitted in part requirement for

the degree of

MRes Sociology and Research Methods

The Graduate School

University of Glasgow

August 2017

Contents

Acknowledgements ……………………………………………………………..... 3

Abstract ………………………………………………………………………….. 4

1. Introduction …………………………………………………………....... 5

2. Theoretical Perspectives ……………………………………………....... 9

2.1 Racism and Anti-Racism ……………………………………………….. 9

2.1.1 Racism, Nationalism and Postcolonialism ………………………….. 10

2.1.2 Anti-Racism and Political Blackness ……………………………….. 12

2.2 State Power and Political Struggles ………………………………………. 16

2.2.1 The State, Hegemony and the Public Terrain ………………………. 17

2.2.2 State Racism …………………………………………………………. 20

3. Research Design ………………………………………………………… 23

3.1 Methodological Framework ……………………………………………. 23

3.1.1 Critical Discourse Analysis ………………………………………….. 23

3.1.2 Neo-Gramscian Context Analysis ………………………………...... 25

3.2 Research Procedure …………………………………………………….. 27

3.3 Ethical Discussion ……………………………………………………….. 30

4. Research Results ……………………………………………………….... 32

4.1 Background: The Emerging Crisis of Post-Imperial Britain ……………… 32

4.2 Prelude: Black Power Politics, State Repression, and the Rearticulation of British Racism in the late 1960s ……………………………………….. 35

4.3 Confrontational Episode I: The Mangrove Rally, August 1970 ………….. 41

4.4 Confrontational Episode II: The Mangrove Nine Trial, October – December 1971 ………………………………………………………… 45

4.5 Aftermath: The Mangrove Nine's Success, the Decline of Black Power, and the Consolidation of Racialised State Repression in the early 1970s ... 49

5. Conclusion …………………………………………………………….. 55

6. Bibliography ………………………………………………………………. 57

7. Appendices ……………………………………………………………….. 64

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my dissertation and prospective PhD supervisor Satnam Virdee as well as my prospective PhD supervisor Sarah Armstrong for their great support and guidance during my first year of study and research at the University of Glasgow. Furthermore, I would like to thank Sarah Garrod from the George Padmore Institute Archives, Victoria Northridge from the Black Cultural Archives, as well as the staff from the National Archives for their helpful assistance, as well as for the permission to use their archival documents for the purpose of this research project. Finally, I could not have written this dissertation without the support, affection and patience of Jill Pöggel.

Abstract

This dissertation provides a critical analysis of the political struggles around the Mangrove Restaurant in late 1960s and early 1970s London, focusing especially in the Mangrove demonstration in 1970 and Mangrove Nine trial in 1971. Most notably, it provides a socio-historical contextualisation of the Mangrove Nine case within the broader constellation of repressive state power, (neo-)racist discourses, and anti-racist mobilisation in the British post-imperial conjuncture. Drawing on the methodological paradigms of critical discourse analysis and neo-Gramscian context analysis, the Mangrove Nine trial is anaysed as an institutionalised condensation and episodical culmination of the increasing political confrontations between British state authorities and Black Power organisations in late 1960s London. Based on extensive archival work, this dissertation not only develops an in-depth analysis of these confrontational dynamics but also shows how they were embedded in hegemonic discourses in which Black Power activism was delegitimised and stigmatised as a "threat" to the British social and political order. In this regard, it makes an innovative contribution to critical socio-historical research on the relationship between (neo-)racist discrimination and anti-racist mobilisation in 1960s and 1970s Britain, with an explicit focus on the political role of state repression as well as political struggles in the state terrain.

1. Introduction

The 1960s and 1970s had a significant impact on the long-term rearticulation of racist discrimination and anti-racist mobilisation in contemporary Britain. In the wake of political episodes such as Powellism, the 1962, 1968 and 1971 Immigration Acts, racist discourses about "black criminality", "mugging" and "repatriation", and the increase of repressive state measures and violent attacks against racialised communities, the racist climate in post-war Britain was significantly intensifying since the early 1970s (Sivanandan 1982c; Gilroy 1987; Hall et al. 2013). But the tempestuous changes of the global political constellation in the 1960s also strengthened anti-racist mobilisation in the British context. Inspired by anti-colonial struggles, the US civil rights and Black Power movement, the 1960s and 1970s witnessed the formation of new anti-racist organisations such as the *Campaign against Racial Discrimination,* the *Black People's Alliance,* or the *British Black Panther Movement* (Sivanandan 1982a: 12-37; Shukra 1998: 9-49). As the scholars from the *Centre of Contemporary Cultural Studies* put it,

> 'there is little doubt that the seventies was a period of major changes in a number of areas, not least in the political field, which will have profound implications for the position of black people in British society.' (Solomos et al. 1982: 13)

Among other things, this changed constellation led to the intensification of political and legal confrontations between state authorities and anti-racist groups. One of the most imporant episodes was the so-called Mangrove Nine trial which took place in London in 1971. After a wave of police raids against the Mangrove Restaurant – back then an important black[1] community centre in London –, a group of black activists formed the

[1] I want to highlight that by using racialised categories such as "black", I do not want to put forward an essentialist notion of racialisation processes. Furthermore, I want to emphasize that there exists a highly complicated history of the self-representation of racialised communities in post-war Britain, including identity categories such as "black", "brown", "Carribean", "Afro-Carribean", "African", "Asian", "South-Asian", "Indian", "Pakistani", "Bengali" etc., but also "British". Since it is not my intention to claim authority over this process of self-representation, I decided to mainly draw on the signifier "black" because, as we will see further below, it was the primary identity category which was used by the anti-racist

Action Group in Defence of the Mangrove, and, supported by the *British Black Panther Movement*, organised a demonstration in order to draw public attention to the enduring police harassment against the Mangrove Restaurant and the black communities at large. After violent altercations in the aftermath of the demonstration, the Metropolitan Police responded with another repressive intervention: A group of nine activists – Frank Critchlow, Darcus Howe, Althea Jones-Lecointe, Barbara Reese, Rupert Boyce, Rhodan Gordon, Anthony Innis, Rothwell Kentish and Godfrey Millett – was arrested on charges of incitement to riot. In the following proceedings at the Marylebone Magistrates' Court and the Central Criminal Court, the Mangrove Nine turned the courtroom into a site of anti-racist struggle. Supported by various Black Power and other anti-racist organisations, these activists actively defended themselves and used the trial as an opportunity to tackle public, institutionalised and everyday racism. After several months of legal dispute, the Mangrove Nine group was finally successful: The incitement to riot charges were dropped in all cases.

Although some authors highlighted the political importance of the Mangrove Nine trial (Goulbourne 1998: 65; Sivanandan 1982a: 33; Bunce/Field 2015: 93), it has nevertheless received little or no attention in sociological, political or historical research. One of the reasons for this blind spot might be a more general lack of academic interest in the British Black Power movement[2]. Although various scholars made impressive attempts to (re-)write modern British history from the perspective of black people and their practices of self-organisation, resistance and solidarity (Fryer 1984; Olusoga 2016), the legacy of the Black Power movement in the 1960s and 1970s is rather neglected. This is also true for major studies on British racism and anti-racism with an explicit focus on

organisations and authors which I dealt with during this dissertation. For the political implications of this identity category, see also chapter 2.1.3.

[2] I provide a more specific characterisation of Black Power politics in chapters 2.1.3 and 4.2.

the 1960s and 1970s (CCCS 1982; Gilroy 1987; Hall et al. 2013). Although this situation has slighlty improved over the past years, we are still left with a rather small body of literature explicitly focusing on Black Power activism in the British post-war conjuncture (Sivanandan 1982a/b; Shukra 1998; Trew 2012; Wild 2015; Bunce/Field 2010b, 2015). This tendency might have contributed to the problem that even in the field of anti-racist scholarship the discussion of the Mangrove case is mainly reduced to brief comments and footnotes (Humphrey 1972: 94-95, 127; IRR 1979: 9; Cohen 1982: 33; Gilroy 1987: 115; Keith 1993: 44-48; Shukra 1998: 39-40; Solomos 2003: 129; Hall et. al. 2013: 281). The only exception is Bunce and Field's (2015) recent political biography of Darcus Howe, an important black anti-racist activist and intellectual who was one of the leading figures of the Mangrove Nine. Through the lens of Howe's biography, Bunce and Field tell the story of the emergence of Black Power politics in Britain, and in this context explicitly deal with the Mangrove case as one of the culmination points of increased confrontations between Black Power groups and British state authorities (ibid.: 93-135). However, there are also crucial limitations to their biographical approach. Although Bunce and Field make continuous references to the broader political contexts of the Mangrove case – their reconstruction of the global anti-racist and anti-colonial connections of Darcus Howe and his associates is especially intriguing (ibid.: 59-91) –, they oftentimes fail to provide a systematic account of this context perspective. Most importantly, they only make sporadic comments on the broader political conflicts and public discourses in which the struggles over the Mangrove Nine trial were embedded. This makes it rather difficult to evaluate whether – and if so, under which circumstances – the Mangrove Nine trial has become, as they claim, 'the most sensational political trial of the decade, which turned Black Power into a *cause celebre*' (ibid.: 93).

The main goal of this dissertation project is such a socio-historical reconstruction and contextualisation of the political conflict dynamics over the Mangrove Restaurant

and Mangrove Nine trial in the late 1960s and early 1970s. More precisely, it deals with the following research questions:

- Which role did the Mangrove Nine trial play as an institutionalised manifestation and condensation of the increased political conflicts between Black Power groups and British state authorities in the late 1960s and early 1970s?
- Which role did the Mangrove Nine trial play within the broader transformations of repressive state power, racist discourses and anti-racist mobilisation in the British post-imperial conjuncture?

In order to answer these questions, I will proceed in three steps: First, I will give a detailed outline of the theoretical perspectives which I used in order to approach the historical, socio-political context of the Mangrove case (2.). On the one hand, I attempted to theoretically localise contemporary forms of racism and anti-racism in the broader context of British postcolonial and post-imperial history (2.1). On the other hand, I used a neo-Gramscian approach in order to grasp the social and political conflicts within the institutionalised terrains of the state and public terrain (2.2). In a second step, I will give an outline of the concrete research design (3.). Drawing on the methodological paradigms of critical discourse and neo-Gramscian context analysis (3.1), I designed a multilevel research process comprising archival work as well as different methods of text analysis (3.2). The ethical advantages, limitations and challenges of my research design are also considered (3.3). Third, I will present the results of my research (4.). Based on a complex periodisation, I will attempt to reconstruct and situate the Mangrove Nine trial played within the overall confrontational dynamics between Black Power groups and state authorities in late 1960s and early 1970s Britain (4.1 – 4.5). I will conclude with some remarks on the current challenges of socio-historical research on racism and anti-racism in 1960s and 1970s Britain (5.).

2. Theoretical Perspectives

It is impossible to grasp the political significance of the Mangrove Nine trial without taking into consideration the broader social and global changes going on in the second half of the 20th century. These include, inter alia, the defeat of European colonialism and the decline of the British empire; the political-economic crisis of British Fordism in the 1970s; the socio-cultural transformations in the context of the post-Windrush migration movements; the rearticulation of British nationalism and racism in this conjuncture; as well as the increased social, political and cultural self-organisation of British migrant communities and racialised minorities. In order to better understand in which ways these different moments were influencing and shaping the political conflicts over the Mangrove restaurant in the late 1960s and early 1970s, it is necessary to further conceptualise them first. For that purpose, I will mainly drew on theoretical discussions about the interplay of institutional racism, racist discourses and anti-racist politics in contemporary Britain. I began with a localisation of contemporary forms of British racism and anti-racism within the broader transformations marked by the decline of the British empire (2.1). Against this background, I moved on to examine which specific role the institutional framework of the state – particularly the police and the judiciary – plays not only for the reproduction of racist discrimination, exclusion and marginalisation, but also for the articulation and organisation of racialised political struggles (2.2).

2.1 Racism and Anti-Racism

In the following, I will try to shed light on the reproduction and transformation of British racism in the postcolonial and post-imperial period, and reflect upon its contested character by highlighting the important role of anti-racist struggles and the political self-organisation of racialised communities. For that purpose, I will mainly draw on historical

sociologies of racism which, in the words of Stuart Hall, 'begin from a rigorous application of […] the premise of historical specificity.' (1980: 336)

2.1.1 Racism, Nationalism and Postcolonialism

Many authors agree that racism is an explicitly modern phenomenon which historically emerged in the context of the bourgeois-capitalist transformations in the 18th and 19th century Europe, and became the main ideological foundation of colonial, imperial and totalitarian regimes in the 19th and 20th century (Mosse 1993: 28-42; Solomos/Back 1996: 36; Miles/Brown 2001: 9). In the British context, the historical emergence and popularisation of racism is especially connected to the legacy of colonialism and imperialism, with its most aggressive phase in the late 19th century (Virdee 2014: 56-66). In the modern imperial era, the political role of British racism can be described as twofold. On the one hand, it served as the ideological legitimation of the violent dispossesion, subjugation and exploitation of the indigenous populations in the British colonies; on the other hand, it organised the cohesion of a modern-capitalist social order which was struck by economic crises, class conflicts and other forms of socio-economic disintegration (Hall 1980: 34-36). It is also in this historical context that the fundamental role of nationalism for the rearticulation and popularisation of racism came to the fore (Goulbourne 1991: 214-233). In this regard, the main ideological stance of racist forces is to create images of a racially pure and/or ethnically homogeneous national order which needs to be separated from and defended against both "internal" and "external threats" (Balibar 1991a: 21). One of their dangerous effects is the reactionary fragmentation and restructuring of global class relations – 'not only in the sense of a transcending of class solidarities, but also of their active negation' (Balibar 1991b: 219).

In the aftermath of World War II, with the defeat of fascism and Nazism in Europe, and European colonialism in the Global South, the racist formation processes in the Western-European context have changed considerably. In the wake of the democratic restructuring of Europe, the creation of sovereign nation-states in the postcolonial world, and the founding of the United Nations, traditional forms of racism were progressively banned from the state, legal and public terrain in large parts of the world. However, this development was only one side of the coin. Apart from the long-standing persistence of officially racist regimes such as the Jim-Crow era in the United States or the apartheid system in South Africa, racism has also remained a pervasive driving force within those Western-European societies which have officially implemented the condemnation of racism in their legal and political framework.

In order to better understand these dynamics, we should keep in mind that the main problem of the official fight against racism is that it is largely limited to the public condemnation and legal prosecution of the most overt and extreme expressions of racism, such as white supremacist ideology. However, this limited strategy neglects not only the deep historical, social and political roots of racism, but also the ability of racist forces to adapt their ideological and rhetorical repertoires to the requirements of democratic discourse. Against this background, we can identify at least three forms in which racism is reproduced in contemporary Britain and other European democracies: First, neo-fascist and other openly racist forces, though pushed to the margins of the political discourse, remain a considerable political factor in the political life of contemporary Britain (Goodwin 2011). Second, we have been witnessing the increased attempt of both oppositional and hegemonic forces to detach racism on a rhetorical level from its biologistic legacy and rearticulate it in culturalist terms. As various authors have shown, this 'new racism' does not directly operate with racial classifications and hierarchisations, but instead attempts to racialise allegedly "neutral" symbolic fields such as "culture",

"ethnicity", "nationality" and "religion", and especially those which in public discourse have gained the status of "problem areas", such as "immigration", "crime" and "terrorism" (Barker 1981; Lawrence 1982; Balibar 1991a). In the British context, for instance, neo-racism is mainly based on imaginations of a "British way of life" which is believed to be threatened by "immigrants" and "foreign cultures" (Hall et al. 2013: 138-163), whereby the most violent hostility is directed against postcolonial immigrants and refugees who are demonised as social and political "threats", and attacked as 'unwanted reminders of an empire lost' (Virdee 2014: 107; see also ibid.: 113-119).[3] Third, we can observe forms of racist discrimination which are inscribed into the structural, institutional and organisational fabric of the British and other Western-European societies. What makes this 'institutional racism' (Miles/Brown 2000: 109-111) especially dangerous is that it operates "under the radar" of hegemonic discourses and anti-discriminatory policies, although it is quite visible and palpable for those who experience its violent effects in everyday life (Cashmore 1996: 172). With regard to the British context, there is some critical research on the complex structure of institutionalised racism in different state areas such as law enforcement and criminal justice (Bowling/Phillips 2002; Quinton 2015), or citizenship and migration (Piper 1998; Small/Solomos 2006).

2.1.3 Anti-Racism and Political Blackness

The history of racism is also a history of the struggles against racism and the political self-empowerment of those who are suffering from its violence. From the early slave uprisings in the Carribean and West-Africa in the 18th and 19th century to the anti-colonial liberation movements in the 19th and 20th century, as well as the different civil rights, anti-

[3] Sivanandan puts the rhetorics of anti-immigrant neo-racism into a nutshell: '[…] racism was respectable, sanctioned, but with reason, of course: it was not the colour, it was the numbers – and for the immigrants' sakes – for fewer blacks would make for better race relations – and that, surely, must improve the immigrants' lot.' (1982a: 12)

racist, and anti-fascist movements in the 20th and 21st century, there is a long tradition of anti-racist self-defense, mobilisation and solidarity worldwide. This also shows that the history of anti-racist mobilisation is as complex as that of racist domination. Hence, talking about anti-racism in the singular is problematic because it fails to take into account the heteregeneous character of anti-racist movements, including the long history of internal tensions and conflicts within anti-racist groups, organisations and movements (Bonnett 2000: 87-120; Lentin 2004: 9-23).

For the sake of this research project, I will reduce my discussion to the tension between what might be framed as the liberal and radical traditions of anti-racism in contemporary democratic societies. According to Lentin, one of the main controversies in contemporary anti-racist movements is the question of the relationship towards liberal-democratic principles and institutions. Summarising her extensive research on anti-racist organisations and movements in the European context, she argues that the field of anti-racism can basically be structured 'along a continuum of proximity-to-distance from the public political culture' (2004: 1). On the "proximity side" of that continuum, we find liberal traditions which pin all their hopes into – or at least try to mobilise – the self-reforming capacities of societies formally based on liberal-democratic and anti-discriminatory principles. Insofar as these principles are primarily institutionalised in the form of legal norms and procedures, liberal anti-racist struggles are essentially legislative and juridical struggles for 'democracy, solidarity, freedom, equality, tolerance, respect and dignity' (ibid.: 2). The historical experience of the US and other civil rights movements has shown that the legal and policy terrain can indeed be quite effective in order to fight against social and institutional racism, and to push the constitutional order itself beyond its exclusionary boundaries. However, another aspect of the civil rights experience has been the fragile character of its institutional achievements, as well as its limited emancipatory perspective. In the Western-European context, this frustration has

strengthened the formation of more radical versions of anti-racism. Located on the "distance side" of the continuum, radical anti-racisms maintain that racist exclusion and violence is so deeply entrenched in the social and political fabric of contemporary societies that any reform strategy is destined to fail. Instead, it would be necessary to fight against against the deep social roots of racism – which, in the last instance, is tantamount to the radical transformation of the society as a whole.

In the centre of many radical versions of anti-racism lies the conviction that the struggle against racism should be led by those who actually or potentially suffer from racist exclusion and violence. Hence, in contrast to the integrationist perspective of liberal anti-racisms, these radical movements are rather based on the claims for 'emancipation, empowerment, resistance, liberation and self-determination' (Lentin 2004: 2). An integral element of the anti-racist struggle by racialised minorities themselves has been the strategy of politically subverting the predominant racialised categorisations by reinterpreting them in an empowering way. One of the most iconic historical examples of this subversive strategy was the US Black Power movement which emerged from the radical segments of the civil rights movement. An essential aspect of the notion of Black Power is that the practical liberation from racism must begin with liberation from the racist stigmata of "submissiveness", "passivity", and "powerlessness". For instance, Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton assert in their programmatic work *Black Power*:

> 'Black people must redefine themselves, and only *they* can do that. […] Many blacks are now calling themselves African-Americans, Afro-Americans or black people because that is *our* image of ourselves. When we begin to define our own image, the stereotypes – that is, lies – that our oppressor has developed will begin in the white community and end there.' (1967: 37)

In this sense, they define Black Power as

> 'a call for black people to begin to define their own goals, to lead their own organizations and to support those organizations. It is a call to reject the racist institutions and values of this society.' (Carmichael/Hamilton 1967: 44)

It is important to keep in mind, however, that the historical Black Power movement was by no means a homogenous project, but rather an 'umbrella concept' (Shukra 1998: 28) consisting of a variety of different critiques of racism, notions of political blackness, and strategies of black liberation.[4] In her reconstruction of the US and UK Black Power movements, Wild (2015: 27) concludes that Black Power politics entailed a variety of different political traditions such as black communitarianism, geographical seperatism, anti-colonialism, Pan-Africanism and Marxism-Leninism. Similarly, Shukra (1998: 28-31) argues that the political spectrum of Black Power was extremely wide, ranging from conservative projects of 'black capitalism' to radical-militant currents with either a culturalist-nationalist and/or Marxist-Leninist orientation. This also led to fundamental political tensions and conflicts. Most notably, it raised difficult questions about the distinctiveness of blackness as a category of mobilisation, its relationship to other racialised and ethnicised minority identities, and about the perspective of black-and-white solidarity (Sivanandan 1982b). Another controversial issue was that of armed struggle as a means of anti-racist self-defence. However, as Wild outlines, this question only played a marginal role in the British context:

> 'Self-defense did not mean that the UK Black Power groups armed themselves or engaged in violence, although several provided martial arts training for members. […] A commitment to self-defense did not necessitate violent behaviour, but was rather a decision on principle not to passively endure individual racism and state repression.' (2015: 28)

[4] It is also important to keep in mind that „Black Power“ is not synonymous with „black radicalism“ or „black politics“ in general. Dealing with the British post-war history, Shukra (1998) shows for example that „Black Power“ was only a temporary phenomenon in a much wider history of both radical and moderate black politics. And also the 1960s and 1970s were characterised by complex field of radical black organisations not affiliated with the „Black Power“ label (Virdee 2014: 119-121).

As I will discuss further below, all these aspects and problems of anti-racist mobilisation were important for the political struggles over the Mangrove Restaurant in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The Mangrove Nine and their political supporters were not only confronted with the full force of police repression and the political contradictions of the judicial terrain, they also operated within an emerging field of Black Power groups and organisations which was struck by crucial personal conflicts and political tensions.

2.2 State Power and Political Struggles

It is a constitutive feature of critical state theory to locate the problem of nation-statehood in the historical context of capitalist modernity. This emphasis on the socio-historical embeddedness of state power is especially strong in the (neo-)Marxist tradition which is interested in the specific role of the state for the reproduction of the capitalist regime of accumulation and exploitation. In this sense, (neo-)Marxist approaches have made important contributions to what Hobsbawm (1977) has called a 'political theory of capitalism'.[5] However, the critical potential of neo-Marxist state analysis has long been obstructed by at least two orthodox traditions: On the one hand, the economic determinism and class reductionism of Marxism-Leninism and, on the other hand, the voluntaristic and technocratic doctrines of social democracy. As Jessop outlines, the common denominator of both traditions, despite their obvious political differences, is a schematic and mechanistic notion that fails to grasp the complex, dynamic and contradictory relationship between state power and social domination in contemporary capitalist societies (1990: 27-29). Against this background, a third current of neo-Marxist state theory has emerged which puts a much stronger emphasis on the role of

[5] For a detailed account of and critical intervention into the history of neo-Marxist state theory, see Jessop (1990).

institutionalised struggles for the reproduction and transformation of capitalist state power. It is such a relational approach, most famously connected to the writings of Antonio Gramsci and Nicos Poulantzas, which, I argue, is also most useful in order to critically theorise political struggles over racism within the state terrain.

2.2.1 The State, Hegemony and the Public Terrain

In order to better grasp the innovative contributions by Gramsci and Poulantzas, I want to elaborate on three aspects of their state-theoretical work which, as I think, mark the critical departure from orthodox-Marxist traditions without abandoning the materialist perspective of embedding state power within the social antagonisms and crisis tendencies of modern capitalist societies.[6]

First, both Gramsci and Poulantzas develop a critique of the determinist and reductionist positions of both the Marxist-Leninist and the social democratic tradition (Gramsci 1971: 158-168; Poulantzas 2000: 11-14). Whereas the role of the state vis-à-vis the capitalist system of domination and exploitation is framed in the first tradition as absolutely dependent, and in the second tradition as absolutely autonomous, Gramsci and Poulantzas make the case for the relative autonomy of the state (Gramsci 1971: 133-143; Poulantzas 2000: 127-132). According to this theoretical figure, it is a constitutive feature of modern state power that it is organised within a set of institutions which are relatively independent from the logics of capital accumulation and the dynamics of class struggle. Following Poulantzas, the modern state consists of an 'institutional materiality' (2000: 49) which allows for political, legal and bureacratic rationalities and contradictions to gain lives of their own:

---

[6] In the following, I will mainly focus on Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks (1929-1935)*, and Poulantzas' *State, Power and Socialism (1978).* Although Poulantzas is also critical of some aspects of Gramsci's – such as his discussion of the role of state repression (Poulantzas 2000: 76-86) –, I think it is nevertheless legitimate to make the case for the common theoretical ground of both approaches.

> 'It is […] a specialized and centralized apparatus of a peculiarly political nature, comprising an assemblage of impersonal, anonymous functions whose form is distinct from that of economic power; their ordering rests on the axiomatic force of law-rules distributing the spheres of activity or competence, and on a legitimacy derived from the people-nation.' (Poulantzas 2000: 54)

This autonomy, however, is only relative insofar as it remains connected to and pervaded by the social contradictions and antagonisms of the capitalist social formation. What is more, it is exactly this autonomous role which gives state institutions the power to actively manage, regulate and, by doing so, reproduce capitalist relations. As Poulantzas puts it, 'the capitalist separation of State and economy was never anything other than the specifically capitalist form of the State's presence in the relations of production' (ibid.: 167).

Second, both Gramsci and Poulantzas assert that this relative autonomy does not reproduce itself automatically but through a complex process of social and political conflicts within the state terrain. This means, on the one hand, that the state is crucially shaped by a whole variety of different social and political actors which fight over its sovereign power of decision-making and social intervention. On the other hand, these relations are conversely shaped and regulated by the institutional framework of the state. Poulantzas attempts to conceptualise this complex dynamic by characterising the state as 'the *specific material condensation* of a relationship of forces among classes and class fractions' (ibid.: 128-29). To put it in Gramsci's words,

> 'the life of the State is […] a continuous process of formation and superseding of unstable equlibria […] between the interests of the fundamental group and those of the subordinate groups.' (1971: 182)

One of the strengths of such a relational approach is that it takes into account the transformative nature of the state, thereby allowing for the analysis of different types of

state power in different socio-historical contexts. As we will see further below, the institutional framework of the British state in the post-war conjuncture is characterised by a complex tension between, on the one hand, liberal-democratic institutions and procedures and increasingly racialised forms of authoritarian statism on the other (Solomos et al. 1982; Hall et al. 2013: 206-214).

Third, Gramsci and Poulantzas emphasise the state's particular role for the creation of a public terrain on which the political, economic and cultural relations of forces by which a given social formation is characterised are fought out. It was especially Gramsci who has dealt with the significance of public struggles for the reproduction and transformation of social domination in Western-European democracies. According to him, the relations of forces which operate within the institutional framework of the state are also present within a wider set of social, political, cultural and religious institutions which form the sphere of the 'civil society' (Gramsci 1971: 245-246). Even though these institutions are strictly speaking not part of the state in modern democracies, they nevertheless play an important role for the dissemination of political ideologies, and the mobilisation of democratic majorities. In order to conceptualise the power dynamics in the civil society, Gramsci brings in the notion of hegemony. His most important observation is that bourgeois domination in Western-European societies is so powerful because it is organised not only by means of coercion and exclusion, but also draws on limited forms of consent and integration. Instead of exclusively drawing on state repression, Gramsci argues, bourgeois forces have managed to secure their dominant position by establishing a much more complex regime of domination which includes strategies of political integration, mechanisms of material concession, or the institutional canalisation of socio-economic conflicts. According to Gramsci, hegemony can be called the situation in which such a hierarchical equilibrium is successfully organised by the dominant forces. Although the moments of repression and exclusion continue to play an

important role, the moment of hegemony 'is characterised by the combination of force and consent, which balance each other reciprocally, without force predominating excessively over consent' (Gramsci 1971: 80). With this emphasis on the moment of consent, Gramsci sheds light on the significance of the symbolic and ideological aspects of social reproduction. Ideology in the Gramscian sense is nothing else than the symbolic aspect of the establishment and reproduction of a hegemonic order. Moreover, it is important to mention that Gramsci emphasises the predominant role of the media terrain in this regard: 'On the now classical terrain of the parliamentary régime', Gramsci argues, 'the attempt is always made to ensure that force will appear to be based on the consent of the majority, expressed by the so-called organs of public opinion, newspapers and associations which, therefore, in certain situations, are artificially multiplied' (ibid.; see also ibid.: 148-149, 195, 342).

2.2.2 State Racism

The most crucial limitation of both Gramsci's and Poulantzas' approach is their tendency to reduce their analysis of relations of forces to class relations and socio-economic conflicts. Such an isolated perspective entails the danger of neglecting the 'autonomous effectivity' (Solomos et al. 1982: 9) of nationalism and racism as modes of organising exploitation, subordination and violence. This raises the question whether Gramsci's and Poulantzas' approaches are applicable to the racialisation dimensions of state institutions and political struggles. There are two reasons why I think this is possible. First, Gramsci and Poulantzas were well aware of the limitations of an exclusive class-theoretical framework. Poulantzas, for instance, concedes that 'relations of power do not exhaust class relations and may go a certain way beyond them' (2000: 43). Second, and more importantly, their theoretical framework provides some important conditions which make it applicable to questions of racism and nationalism. As Stuart Hall argues, it is especially

the emphasis on the historical specificity and relational character of social domination, as well as the consideration of the relative autonomy of political, cultural and ideological processes that makes (neo-)Gramscian research useful for the critical analysis of racism (Hall 1986: 23-27).

Against this background, we can now conceptualise the above-outlined problem of institutionalised racism as the material condensation of a relationship of forces structured by a (neo-)racist hegemony. Such a definition is, of course, rather abstract, and raises further questions about the specific forms in which racist hegemonic relations are inscribed into the institutional and operational frameworks of different state authorities. At this point, I will reduce my discussion to those public institutions which are most relevant for my case study: the police and the judiciary.

A sophisticated application of Gramsci's and Poulantzas' perspectives to the problem of police and judicial racism can be found in the study *Policing the* Crisis, published in 1978 by Stuart Hall and several co-authors from the CCCS. Analysing the so-called 'mugging panic' in the early 1970s, Hall and his colleagues show that the British police and judicial institutions played an active part in the dissemination of racist narratives in the public discourse about crime (Hall et al. 2013: 7-31). Their underlying theoretical argument is that in 'formally democratic societies' (ibid.: xiii) such as Britain the relative autonomy of law enforcement and criminal justice manifests itself in the form of two contradictory processes: On the one hand, these institutions are bound to and constrained by a legal system which formally guarantees basic civil, political and social rights to its citizens, thereby banning any form of (racist) discrimination from private and public life. On the other hand, this liberal-democratic framework is itself embedded within and constrained by broader relations of domination, exploitation and exclusion. As empirical studies have shown (Bowling/Phillips 2002), this social embeddedness of the criminal justice system makes it highly incapable of effectively and sustainably

counteracting the powerful configuration of racist discrimination and violence. What is more, it should be expected that law enforcement and criminal justice institutions themselves tend to reproduce and intensify the very same relations of domination and exclusion which they are supposed to tackle. Following Hall et al. (2013: 50), police and judicial institutions tend to reproduce racist discrimination because they are integral parts of the social fabric from which racism emerges: 'If the individual policeman is constrained by his organisation, he is also constrained by the society of which he is a part.' (ibid.: 50) More precisely, they distinguish at least three ways in which racism can become the institutional and operational foundation of police and judicial institutions (ibid.: 32-55): On a structural level, many of the individual rights guaranteed by the constitution are basically limited to those who are already recognised as national citizens, which gives police and judicial institutions the opportunity to discriminate against migrants and non-citizens. On a practical level, police and judicial officials tend to operate in a highly selective way, based on highly arbitrary decisions about the priorities of crime control and prevention. Under the circumstances of racist discourses about crime, it must be expexted that racialised minorities are especially affected by these moments of selectivity and arbitrariness. On a symbolical level, police and judicial institutions are important producers, organisers and amplifiers of political images and explanations of "crime", "criminals", "criminal suspects". In this sense, they are not only influenced by, but also play an active part in the discursive racialisation of crime, as well as the criminalisation of racialised communities.

3. Research Design

Based on this extensive theoretical reflection on the social, political and historical context dimensions of the racialised conflicts around the Mangrove restaurant in the early 1970s, I will now move on to the methodological and methodical aspects of my research project. In the following, I will suggest a research design based on the methodological paradigms of critical discourse analysis and neo-Gramscian conjunctural analysis (3.1). On this basis, I will outline the concrete research process with which I have carried out my empirical anaysis (3.2). Finally, I will take into consideration the ethical potentials, challenges and limitations of my research design (3.3).

3.1 Methodological Framework

I consider the methodological paradigms of critical discourse and neo-Gramscian context analysis most suitable for my research project because they fit quite neatly to the theoretical perspectives with which I attempted to approach the broader social and political circumstances of the Mangrove case. As I will show in this chapter, both methodological paradigms not only allow for an in-depth analysis of both form and content of the political conflicts around the Mangrove Nine trial, they also provide a sophisticated framework for the periodisation and contextualisation of the political struggles over the Mangrove Restaurant in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

3.1.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

In the theoretical section about state power, hegemony and the public sphere, I outlined that political struggles are essentially symbolic struggles. For the construction of political ideologies and narratives is an integral aspect of how and where these struggles are carried out, and which political alliances and hegemonies are created, retained and transformed

in this process. In this sense, public discourses can be regarded as an interesting indicator of hegemonic power relations. To put it in the words of Norman Fairclough:

> 'The hegemony of a class or group over an order of discourse is constituted by a more or less unstable equilibrium between its constitutive discursive practices, which may become unbalanced and open to being restructured in the course of hegemonic struggle.' (1995: 95)

Hence, although it should be clear that every political conflict is mediated by extra-discursive factors such as material practices or sedimented structures, it nevertheless makes sense to use the symbolic and ideological expressions as an entry point. In the field of critical social research, the paradigm of critical discourse analysis provides the most sophisticated frameworks in this regard. In the following, I will mainly focus on the work of Norman Fairclough, Teun van Dijk and Ruth Wodak.

To begin with, I used the concept of 'discourse genres' (ibid.: 10-13; Wodak/Reisigl 2001: 36) in order to reflect on the broader embeddedness of discursive practices within the relational, institutional and structural framework of contemporary societies (Fairclough 1989: 28-31). Following Wodak, discourse genres may be characterised as the 'conventionalized, more or less schematically fixed use of language associated with a particular activity' (2001: 66). Furthermore, discursive texts are embedded in what Fairclough calls 'discourse orders' (1995: 10-13), that is, the more general symbolic expressions and sedimentations of the hegemonic power relations in the public sphere.

In order to analyse these institutional and political entanglements of discursive texts on a more concrete level, I further drew on van Dijk's distinction between the three analytical levels of schematic superstructures, semantic macrostructures and semantic microstructures: Schematic superstructures can be defined as those lingustic structures based on which a given text is integrated within a given discourse genre (van Dijk 1988:

52-56). Semantic macrostructures are those linguistic elements which embed the text within the political landscape of a given discourse order. The most important semantic macrostructures are ideologies which can be defined as linguistic 'means of legitimising existing social relations and differences of power' (Fairclough 1989: 2); and images which can be defined as imaginary representations which 'serve to condense and order the view of society in which the ideologies are active, […] and constitute both its unquestioned substratum of truth […] and the source of its collective emotional force and appeal.' (Hall et al. 2013: 139) Finally, semantic microstructures can be defined as those linguistic elements based on which the super- and macrostructural elements are realised on the more concrete level of argumentative and rhetorical schemata (van Dijk 1988: 59-70).

3.1.2 Neo-Gramscian Context Analysis

In order to conceptualise the societal embeddedness of language and discourse, I decided to combine the discourse-analytical with a neo-Gramscian methodology. Although many CDA approaches highlight the importance of the social context dimension of language and discourse, there is nevertheless the tendency to underemphasise it within the concrete research practice. Neo-Gramscian approaches, on the other hand, are especially powerful in this regard. In the following, I will try to reconstruct three aspects of a neo-Gramscian discourse, power and context analysis, focusing especially on the work of Norman Fairclough, as well as the early contributions by Stuart Hall and other CCCS scholars.

First, I needed a more concrete idea of how to identify and analyse asymmetrical relations of forces, and how this analysis feeds into the analysis of political discourses. For that purpose, I mainly drew on Faircloughs elaborations on discourse and power. Following him, the analysis of power and domination in the public sphere basically consists of two steps: First, the analysis of the social actors enmeshed in a given discourse,

which includes the identification and characterisation of their socio-economic positions, institutional affiliations, and politico-ideological orientations (Fairclough 1989: 37-40); second the analysis of the asymmetrical relationships between those social actors, which leads to the question to what extent and in which ways 'powerful participant [are] *controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants.*' (ibid.: 46) A useful starting point for this relational analysis is to examine which 'discursive strategies' (Fairclough 1995: 2002-205) certain political actors develop in order to defend, secure and/or strengthen their position within the discursive field (see also Wodak/Reisigl 2001: 31-84).

Second, this leads us to the question of the social context dimensions of discourse. Here, Fairclough (1989: 25-31, 162-168) proposes a three-level approach: The *situational level* refers to the immediate encounter and confrontation between different actors within limited institutional settings as parliamentary sessions, court hearings, talk shows, or public demonstrations. The *institutional level* refers to more complex discursive configurations which emerge within entire institutions such as parliaments, courts, media organisations, or public spaces. The *societal level* refers to the broader discourse orders which emerge as the combined result of all the discursive practices and hegemonic struggles on the situational and institutional level.

Third, I needed to further clarify how to take into account the moment of social change. For that purpose, I mainly drew on the neo-Gramscian periodisation developed by Stuart Hall and other CCCS scholars. Drawing on the Gramscian distinction between 'organic' transformations which refer to long-term changes in the political-economic structures of a social formation, and 'conjunctural' transformations which refer to the mid-term variations on the level of socio-political relations of forces (Gramsci 1971: 177-180), these scholars have mainly focused on the conjunctural aspects of social change:

> 'Conjunctural analysis deploys a type of periodisation based on a distinction between moments of relative stability and those of intensified struggles and unrest, which may result in a more general social crisis.' (Hall et al. 2013: xv)

In order to further conceptualise dynamic structure of conjunctures themselves, the CCCS scholars suggest the distinction between phases and episodes (Solomos et al. 1982: 19; Hall 1988: 123-127). A phase refers to political struggles which have considerable effects on the broader relations of force but do not change the political hegemonies which define the historical conjuncture. Furthermore, a phase can be characterised as the configuration and manifestation of a plethora of minor struggles which in themselves do not have major political impacts. In order to analyse this aspect of social change, it makes sense to use the category of episodes which refers to the most immediate forms of social struggle, consisting of only a limited sequence of social events. I hope that the analytical value of these admittedly abstract conceptual distinctions will become clearer in the next chapter.

3.2 Research Procedure

Based on this methodological framework, I developed an empirical research procedure based on the following three steps: First, I collected all the publicly accessible documents on the Mangrove case, focusing on official statements, internal reports and court transcripts by British state authorities (*Home Office, Metropolitain Police, Department of Public Prosecutions, Central Criminal Court*), as well as public interventions by anti-racist organisations (*Action Committee for Defence of the Mangrove, Black People's Information Centre, British Black Panther Movement* etc.). Moreover, I collected the relevant news coverage of the Mangrove case and the British Black Power movement in general. In order to keep the data amount manageable, I chose a selection of British

national newspapers (*The Guardian, The Times, The Daily Mirror*)[7]. In order to aquire these materials, I visited onsite archives based on London (*The National Archives, The George Padmore Institute Archives, The Black Cultural Archives*) and consulted online newspaper archives (*Gale News Vault, ProQuest Historical Newspapers; UKPressOnline*[8]). As already outlined, I am especially interested in locating the Mangrove Nine trial in the broader context of the transformation of British racism and the formation of British Black Power in the 1960s/70s. In order to bring in this context dimension, I decided to analyse the news discourse about both the Mangrove Nine trial in particular, and British Black Power in general. Having found that in the late 1960s and early 1970s there existed an extensive news discourse on "Black Power", I decided decided to reduce my broader news analysis the time period between August 1969 (one year before the Mangrove Rally) and December 1971 (the end of the Mangrove Nine trial).[9]

Second, I moved on to the empirical analysis of the selected corpus of documents. Here, I mainly drew on Wodak's distinction between an 'entry-level analysis' and an 'in-depth analysis' (2015: 50). The purpose of the entry-level analysis was to get an overview of the main actors, topics and conflict dynamics by which the discourse field around the Mangrove case was structured. For that purpose, I created short summary papers for each discourse text, making notes about the main topics of the text, as well as the institutional affiliations and political positions of the text author. Based on this entry-level analysis, I moved on to the in-depth analysis, that is, the more detailed analysis of 'the genre […],

[7] For pragmatic reasons, it was not possible to analyse the entire news discourse which would have involved the analysis of hundreds of news texts. I mainly focused on two national broadsheet newspapers which traditionally represent the centrist sections of the democratic discourse, that is, the left-liberal *The Guardian* and the liberal-conservative *The Times*, as well as the *The Daily Mirror* which can be characterised as a tabloid newspaper with a right-wing social democratic orientation (van Dijk 1991: 9; KhosraviNik et al. (2012: 283). Due to limited access to the online platforms GaleNewsVault and UKPressOnline through the University of Glasgow, it was not possible to get access to the weekly issues of the Daily Mirror (Sunday Mirror) and the Times (Sunday Times).
[8] I respected the copyright terms of these platforms.
[9] For an overview of the applied search terms, see Appendix 1.

the macrostructure of the respective text, discursive strategies and of argumentation schemes, as well as of other means of linguistic realisation.' (Wodak 2015: 51) I mainly focused on identifying the discursive strategies and political-ideological images developed by British state authorities in order to delegitimise and criminalise anti-racist mobilisation, and those developed by anti-racist activists in order to defend themselves and delegitimise the racist status quo. Most notably, I used Wodak's and Reisigl's (2001: 44-85) distinction between five types of discursive strategies: referential strategies by which social actors and events are made present within a text; predicational strategies by which these actors/events are portrayed and characterised based on certain political/normative positions; argumentative strategies by which these political/normative positions are legitimised; strategies of perspectivation by which self-other dichotomies are constructed throughout the text; and strategies of mitigation/intensivation by which the significance of certain events/actors/positions is either exaggerated or underrated.[10]

Finally, I moved on to a 'context analysis' (ibid.: 40-41) of the Mangrove Nine trial. In this last step, I attempted to draw the lines between the immediate conflicts around the Mangrove Nine trial, the broader conflicts around the emergence of the Black Power activism in the British context, as well as the overall transformation of British racism in the beginning of the 1970s. The main goal was to review and reinterpret the entry-level and in-depth analysis in terms of the asymmetrical power relations between the main actors involved in the Mangrove Nine trial, as well as the public representation of the Black Power and anti-racist mobilisation in London and Britain. In order to bring in this broader context dimension, I tried to connect my own research results with existing studies on the relationship between racism and anti-racism in 1970s Britain.

[10] For an example of how I carried out the entry-level and in-depth analysis, see Appendix 2.

3.3 Ethical Discussion

Since my research project is solely based on archival documents which are publicly accessible and reproducible for research purposes, that is, does not involve human participants, it was not necessary to formally acquire ethical approval. This does not mean, however, that the specific way I have developed and approached my research questions and objectives is ethically and politically unproblematic. As various CDA scholars convincingly argue, it is the responsibility of the researcher to critically reflect not only on his/her relationship towards the object of research, but also on the positioning of his/her research projects within the overall field of academic research, as well as within the broader political discussions around the issue in question (Fairclough 1989: 166-168; Jäger 2012: 142-62). For my research project, it was especially important to critically reflect on the historical entanglements of academic institutions with racist structures of domination and exclusion. This also brings in the question of personal positionality: As a white academic student with a middle-class background who does not suffer from racist discrimination, it was important to continuously ask myself whether this racialised background influences my research project in a problematic manner. In this context, it became especially important for me to critically deal with the long tradition of what Lentin calls the 'paternalist solidarity of so-called "white left" anti-racism' (2004: 11), that is, a political practice which, intentionally or inadvertently, reproduces racist hierarchies and exclusions even within anti-racist organisations and projects (see also Bonnett 2000: 143-143). In academic research, this tradition entails at least two problematic tendencies: On the one hand, the tendency to neglect the political significance of anti-racist mobilisation at all; one the other hand, in case this fallacy is avoided, the tendency to neglect the political significance of the anti-racist self-organisation and self-empowerment of those who are sufferung from racism. I hope that with the selection of my research topic, as well as with the design of my research questions, frameworks and

perspectives, I could sufficiently counter these tendencies. However, such a research focus also brings in new problems and challenges. For instance, I was confronted with the problem that as an academic researcher who carries out critical research on a political conflict, one always politically intervenes into that conflict as well, thereby exerting a certain authority over it. Most notably, this raises the question whether my research project puts enough empasis on the subjective perspective of the Mangrove Nine and their anti-racist supporters. In this regard, my methodological approach might be considered ethically problematic because it does not include interviews. This is in indeed a weakness – and I mainly decided against interviews for the pragmatic reason that would have been very difficult to find interview partners, and to conduct sufficient interviews, on a case that occurred more than four decades ago. On the other hand, I think that my research project also entails a major strength that outweighs this weakness: Instead of reproducing the political marginalisation of the Mangrove Nine and their supporters, my research focus takes into consideration that they were indeed highly capable of expressing their subjective experiences in the public terrain, and of politically intervening into the hegemonic discourse.

4. Research Results

For the presentation of my empirical research, I will reverse the direction of my research process, that is, I will use my reflections on the socio-historical context of the Mangrove case as the main entry point for structuring the research findings, and from here on move to the more concrete questions of the power relations and public discourses around the Mangrove Nine trial. Beginning with an an analysis of the conjunctural (4.1) and periodical (4.2) background, I will move on to critically analyse the Mangrove rally (4.3) and Mangrove Nine trial (4.4) as two confrontational episodes which were resulting from increasing state repression against Black Power groups in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Finally, I will make some remarks on the periodical aftermath of the Mangrove Nine trial (4.5).

4.1 Background: The Emerging Crisis of Post-Imperial Britain

A sophisticated periodisation of the British post-imperial conjuncture in terms of the relationship between racism and anti-racism can be found in the collaborative work of the *Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies*, most notably in the studies *Policing the Crisis* (Hall et al. 2013) and *The Empire Strikes Back* (Solomos et al. 1982). Based on a neo-Gramscian theoretical approach, both studies attempt to show how the changed patterns of „race relations", multiculturalism, immigration, and law-and-order were embedded within broader transformations which had led to an 'organic crisis' of the British social fabric, that is, a crisis which is the 'the result of the combined effect of economic, political, ideological and cultural processes.' (Solomos et al. 1982: 9; see also Hall et al. 2013: 206-214).

According to Solomos et al., this process contained at least two aspects: On the one hand, they argue, the British society – after it had lost its geo-political and world-economic power as a colonial empire – experienced a deep 'crisis of accumulation'

(Solomos et al. 1982: 14) which constituted the structural conditions for the decline of the Fordist production regime and welfare system.[11] On the other hand, this economic crisis was accompanied and deepened by a 'crisis of hegemony' (Solomos et al. 1982: 16), that is, the increasing break-up of a traditionalist consensus which found its most striking expression in the subcultural movements and counter-hegemonic revolts associated with the year 1968 (Hall et al. 2013: 215-267).

The official, hegemonic and institutional responses to these crisis dynamics had severe impacts not only on the reshaping of the British political landscape in general, but also on the rearticulation of racism as an 'articulator of the crisis' (ibid.: 2). What the CCCS scholars observe was a complex process of authoritarian transformation which was closely connected to the renewal and reinforcement of British nationalism and racism: '[…] race has increasingly become one of the means through which hegemonic relations are secured in a period of structural crisis management.' (Solomos et al. 1982: 9). Most notably, they identify at least three forms of racialised authoritarianism: First, the development of a selective and repressive regime of migration control and citizenship which is especially directed against post-colonial labour migrants and their families (ibid.: 10-13); second, the intensified use of disciplinary and repressive state measures against racialised minorities in general and anti-racist organisations in particular (ibid.: 13-24; Gilroy 1982); third, and closely connected to the first two points, the resurgence of traditionalist ideologies of British-/Englishness based on (neo-)racist phantasies of imperial power, cultural homogeneity and racial purity (Hall et al. 2013: 138-163; Lawrence 1982).

[11] For a detailed analysis of the transformations of the British state institutions in light of the politico-economic crisis processes in the post-war conjuncture, see Gallas (2015).

In order to better understand how these historical processes were articulated on the level of hegemonic conflicts, Solomos et al. suggest a periodisation of 'the post-1948 experience of Black workers in Britain' based on 'three phases' (1982: 13)[12]:

> '(a) the period of immediate response by the state to the wave of black settlement, leading up to the control of immigration strategy promulgated by the 1962 Act; (b) the articulation of various policy package to deal with the 'problems' which were seen as associated with a black presence, e.g. in education, the social services, employment, which dominated official thinking up till the early seventies; (c) a period of 'crisis management' which has operated since the early seventies and which prioritizes the option of control and containment of forms of black resistance against racial domination.' (ibid.)

This periodisation povides a useful starting point for moving from the conjunctural to the periodical and episodical level. It not only draws a comprehensive picture of the variety of racialised conflicts in the post-war conjuncture, but also allows for a more concrete localisation of the conflicts around the Mangrove restaurant within it. As a sequence of events which represents one of the first major confrontations between anti-racist groups and state authorities, the Mangrove Nine trial can be situated within the beginning of the third phase. However, the Mangrove case also gives cause for slightly antedating the beginning of this phase. For, as I will show in the following, the Mangrove case must be located within a pre-history of increased police harassment against racialised communities in marginalised urban areas, and of increasing anti-racist self-organisation within these communities, which at least goes back to the mid-1960s. It is to this pre-history that I will now turn.

[12] A similar periodisation is suggested by Hansen (2000: 3-34).

4.2 Prelude: Black Power Politics, State Repression, and the Rearticulation of British Racism in the late 1960s

The periodical prelude to the Mangrove Nine trial was characterized by the intensification of state repression against racialised minority communities, which led to the increasing politicisation of these communities and the radicalisation of some parts of the anti-racist movement. The resulting confrontational dynamic between state authorities and anti-racist groups can be regarded as the combined effect of at least three processes: First, the 1950s bore witness to the intensification of anti-immigrant racism in the British society and culminated in the 1958 racist riots in Notting Hill and Nottingham, and the racist murder of Kelso Cochrane in 1959. Furthermore, the 1962 and 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Acts, implemented by both conservative and social democratic governments, marked a new phase of restrictive immigration policies and repressive state measures against black communities (Sivanandan 1982a: 9-13; Virdee 2014: 107-112). The violent repercussions of these developments are well documented: There are detailed studies which show that the problem of racist police harrassment significantly exacerbated in the late 1960s (Humphrey 1972), and reached a new authoritarian quality in the 1970s (IRR 1979). Second, the racialised minority communities developed new projects of anti-racist self-organisation. This was indeed not a new phenomenon: In the immediate after-war period, immigrant communities created a variety of self-defence and pressure groups in different social fields such as work, housing, education or subculture (Sivanandan 1982a: 4-8). However, as Shukra argues, many of these organizations were based on 'ethnic lines stressing differences in religion, culture and language' (ibid.: 9). In the wake of the racist violence of the late 1950s and early 1960s, this approach was increasingly regarded as counterproductive, and gave rise to the formation of various new organisations which attempted to create higher degrees of political unity within and between the different ethnicised minority groups, such as the *Coloured Peoples' Progressive Organisation*

(1958), the *West Indian Standing Conference (1959/1962),* or the *Campaign against Racial Discrimination (1964)* (Sivanandan 1982a: 9-15; Shukra 1998: 10-19; Wild 2015: 34-35). Third, this development was accompanied by three major political events which had a lasting influence on black political organisation in the 1960s and 1970s: the visits of Martin Luther King, Malcom X and Stokely Carmichael to London in 1964, 1965 and 1967 (Wild 2015: 38-42).

As a result of these processes, the British field of anti-racism underwent substantial transformations. On the one hand, there have been attempts to form more comprehensive pressure and lobby organisations on the "proximity side" of the anti-racist continuum. Most notably, these organisations attempted to exert influence on the emerging British immigration and race relations legislation. The most important umbrella organisation was the *Campaign against Racial Discrimination (CARD)* which was created in the aftermath of Martin Luther King's visit to Lonon and became 'the first substantial postwar attempt of black and white activists to intervene in national British politics on the "race" question.' (Shukra 1998: 19) According to a leaflet from 1965 or later, its main and objectives were to fight against the racist discrimination of 'coloured people', 'minority people' and 'Commonwealth citizens', focusing especially on the implementation of 'effective laws requiring equal opportunities', '[f]air immigration laws' and '[e]qual education for children of immigrants' (GPIA GB 2904 JLR/3/1/10). However, after heated debates over CARD's cooperation with the Labour government, several organisations with a more radical orientation left CARD in protest, thereby triggering a process of disintegration which eventually led to its break-up in 1967 (Shukra 1995: 21-25). In the late 1960s, the organisational vacuum and political frustration that CARD's reformist approach left behind was increasingly filled with groups and organisations on the "distance side" of the anti-racist continuum.

An important development in this regard was the growing influence of the US Black Power movement in Britain, with London as its political centre. In the wake of Malcom X's and Stokely Carmichael's visits to London, many organisations with a Black Power orientation were formed, such as the *Racial Adjustment Action Society (RAAS, 1965)*, the *United Coloured People's Association (UCPA, 1967),* the *Black Panther Movement (BPM, 1968)*, the *Black Unity and Freedom Party (BUFP, 1970)*, the *Black Liberation Front (BLF, 1971)*, or the *Black Eagles (1968)* (Sivanandan 1981a: 16-37; Shukra 1998: 31-43; Bunce/Field 2015: 27-42; Wild 2015: 29-31).

According to Wild, the most important achievements of British Black Power organisations were their attempts to develop a notion of blackness that politically unites the different racialised and ethnicised minorities:

> '[…] in the United Kingdom unlike in the United States, Black Power had to bridge the racial divide between Asian, African-Carribean, and African immigrants and their differing experiences of colonialism and white racism. […] The irrevocable establishment of blackness as a unifying political identity was one of the most important achievements of the UK Black Power.' (2015: 29)

However, that is not to say that British Black Power was a homogeneous political movement. As Humphrey puts it, 'there is no organisation called The Black Power Movement as is widely believed but there is a political philosophy called Black Power' (1972: 103). But even this characterisation is insufficient because its neglects the ongoing political conflicts over the very idea of Black Power which led to various rearrangements, split-ups and break-ups. According to Bunce and Field, the very first Black Power organsations were mainly created and shaped by three activists – Michael X, Obi Egbuna and Roy Sawh – who attempted to put forward a notion of Black Power based on essentialist ideologies of black nationalism and seperatism, combined with a militant rhetoric and revolutionary gesture (2010b: 394-398; 2015: 29-30, 36-40). In the late

1960s, however, they increasingly encountered opposition by other fractions. The best example is the *BPM* which was formed by Egbuna in 1968 but after his imprisonment in the same year developed a different political stance. Under the leadership of Althea Jones-Lecointe, and intellectually influenced by C.L.R. James, the *BPM* moved away from essentialist notions of blackness and whiteness, and developed a critique of white racism which brings in the broader context of (post-) imperial capitalist societies (2010b: 407-413). Most notably, it focused on the class-specific implications of racism, arguing that one of the primary forms of racist domination in Britain and elswhere in the Global North is the proletarianisation and deprivation of large parts of the black and immigrant population. This also introduced the question of black-and-white solidarity: Although the necessity of black autonomy and leadership was emphasised, the BPM nonetheless advocated the perspective of anti-racist and anti-capitalist solidarity movements across racialised boundaries (ibid.: 408). In the *BPM's* political programme, this is expressed in the following way:

> 'We must unite and get organised in order to defend outselves in a racist and hostile society; and we must join with all other oppressed and revolutionary forces in Britain to fight for the complete overthrow of the oppressive capitalist system and for our liberation and that of all oppressed people.' (Black People's News Service 1970 [BCA WONG/7/74])

The overall political influence of British Black Power remained limited. According to Wild, 'the official membership of even the largest London Black Power groups never reached more than a few hundred, although greater numbers could be mobilized for demonstrations.' (2015: 30) It is also important to highlight that Black Power represented only one part of radical black politics at that time. For instance most of the Black Power organisations were part of the umbrella organisation *Black People's Alliances (1968)* which consisted of many more black political organisations operating on the "distance

side" of the anti-racist continuum, and organised demonstrations with several thousand participants (Sivanandan 1982a: 25).

In addition to the internal fragmentations, it was especially the external pressure of state repression which contributed to such a marginalised position of Black Power politics. From its very beginning, British state authorities made all efforts to attack, weaken and destroy Black Power activism throughout Britain. Between August 1969 and December 1971 alone, I found news reports on 13 trials against 89 activists associated with the Black Power movement, mostly resulting from altercations with police officers.[13] Furthermore, as Humphrey (1971: 94-104) describes, this repressive offensive was grounded in a comprehensive practice of observing and surveilling Black Power organisations (see also IRR 1979: 8-9).

Compared to this fragmented, conflictual and marginalized reality of Black Power politics in London and other British urban centres, considerable parts of the hegemonic media discourse in the late 1960s and early 1970s have developed a rather different political-ideological image. Although my discourse analysis only focused on a segment of the British media discourse on Black Power, it nevertheless shows very well how the Black Power phenomenon has become the subject of a highly sensationalist discourse.[14] Between August 1969 and December 1971, I found 65 Guardian, 98 Times, and 24 Daily Mirror articles in which "Black Power in Britain" is either the main or a secondary topic.[15] Focusing on this text corpus, I developed an entry-level and in-depth analysis in which I tried to identify the main discursive strategies and ideological images with which the

[13] See Guardian 18/04/70, 27/04/70, 23/06/70, 13/10/70, 29/07/70, 08/12/71, 18/12/71; Times 03/12/69, 03/03/70, 09/09/70, 06/05/71, 14/07/71; Daily Mirror 28/04/70, 29/06/71.

[14] It can be expected that these sensationalist images and narratives were even stronger in both the broadsheet and tabloid segments with a stronger right-wing orientation, such as the *Daily Telegraph, Sun, Daily Mail* or *Daily Sketch*. For pragmatic reasons, however, I was unable to carry out this extended discourse analysis. What is more, it was impossible to draw on secondary literature because, unfortunately, such a discourse analysis has not yet been carried out in the field of critical racism studies.

[15] It is important to mention that the news discourse on „Black Power" was in all three newspapers much broader, also entailing other contexts such as the US or the Carribean.

British Black Power phenomenon. The main result of my analysis was that all newspapers, despite their different political orientations, developed a relatively coherent discursive construction and imagination of "Black Power" as a political threat to the British society. In order to create such an image, these newspapers mainly drew on three major discursive strategies: First, the strategy of homogenizing British Black Power as a uniform movement by neglecting the complex internal differences, fragmentations and conflicts. For instance, this is expressed in the tendency to simplify the complex field of Black Power organisations by reducing it to the activities of a handful of individuals. In the majority of the analysed articles, the story is basically told as that of Michael X, Obi Egbuna and Roy Sawh, thereby neglecting the political infuence of other activists and intellectuals such as C.L.R. James, Selma James, Farrukh Dhondy and Olive Morris, who are not mentioned at all, or Darcus Howe or Althea Jones-Lecointe, who are not mentioned until the beginning of the Mangrove Nine trial. Second, I found the strategy of delegitimizing Black Power politics by framing it as a form of "extremism" (Guardian 19/06/70; Times 20/04/70) or "fanaticism" (Times 15/03/71, 03/11/71) that should be excluded from the legitimate horizon of democratic politics. In many articles, Black Power was not presented as a political reaction to the reality of British racism, but instead as one – if not the major – contributing factor to 'race clash[es]' (Guardian 29/04/70), 'the problems of race relations' (Times 30/04/70), the 'increasing bitterness between coloured and white' (Times 23/05/70), the 'growing immigrant problem' (Times 20/10/69) or 'the seeds of race hate' (Daily Mirror 26/09/69). In some cases, this neo-racist narrative was expressed in the form of blatant victim blaming: 'The danger is that the Black Power attack will strengthen white racim." (Times 26/05/69). This image of Black Power as an extremist threat which is 'unnessecary and unwanted here' (Guardian 14/01/71) was further consolidated in the context of various articles in which the aspect of 'Black Power violence' (Guardian 27/04/70) was emphasized, whereas the political

context of anti-racist self-defence is basically ignored.[16] Against this background, it is no surprise that large parts of the Guardian, Times and Daily Mirror coverage were dominated by reports on violent clashes during Black Power demonstrations as well as criminal proceedings against Black Power activists, whereas the problem of racist police harrassment, was mostly absent in those articles. Third, I found the strategy of exaggerating the political influence of Black Power organizations. Many articles created the image of Black Power as a conspirational force which intentionally escalates political conflicts, takes over public events, and infiltrates other organisations. This can be exemplified by looking at what kind of Black Power stories were regarded as newsworthy: In a report on an anti-war demonstration in London, the Guardian decided to focus on 'an attempted Black Power takeover' (Guardian 27/04/70). In another article dealing with a meeting of West Indian organisations on the question of anti-racist self-defence, it was highlighted that it 'seemed to fall […] under the influence of black power groups' (Guardian 20/04/70). In a Times article, the opening of an all-black supermarket in London was framed with the following ominous remark: 'Behind it all is the ubiquituous Michael X' (Times 22/12/69). In another article, Black Power was imagined as a military offensive: 'After its recent victories against the professors Black Power has now laid its gunsight on the pastors and priests.' (Times 26/05/69) In a Daily Mirror article, we find the story of an alleged 'Black Power poll plot' in the Manchester City Council (Daily Mirror 09/09/70).

4.3 Confrontational Episode I: The Mangrove Rally, August 1970

The Mangrove Restaurant was in the centre of the confrontations between black anti-racist groups and state authorities in late 1960s London. Since its opening in March 1968,

[16] There were only some exceptions to this depoliticisation and criminalisation of Black Power activism (Guardian 01/10/70, 22/07/71; Times 31/03/69, 05/06/70; 29/07/70).

the Mangrove has become not only an important community centre in Notting Hill, but also a meeting place and organisational base for black and white radicals such as such as C.L.R. James, Lionel Morrison, Colin MacInnes or Richard Neville, as well as for Darcus Howe, Althea Jones-Lecointe and other Mangrove Nine defendants (Bunce/Field 2015: 97-98).[17] It is against the background of these political activities that the state repression against the Mangrove should be understood.[18] According to Bunce and Field (2010a), the Metropolitan Police raided the Mangrove Restaurant twelve times between January 1969 and July 1970, mostly based on charges of drug abuse and licence violation, which in most cases turned out to be unfounded. In a leaflet from August 1970, published by the *Black Panther Movment*, it was further asserted that the frequency of those raids had increased to 'at least twice a week in the past two months', and that in many cases a search warrant was not presented (GPIA GB 2904 JLR/3/1/5).[19] After some unsuccessful attempts to make complaints to the local council and the Home Office[20], Critchlow and several political associates came to the conclusion that a more comprehensive and organised approach was necessary. What followed was the creation of the *Action Committee for Defence of the Mangrove* which, together with *British Black Panther*

[17] One of the outcomes of these activities was the small Black Power magazine *The Hustler* which was published on the premises the Mangrove Restaurant (Bunce/Field 2015: 98).
[18] The Metropolitan Police's increased repressive stance towards the Mangrove Restaurant is expressed in an internal police report from August 1970 where the Mangrove Restaurant is described as 'without doubt a meeting place of the more militant sections of the Black Power Movement and present up-to-date criminal intelligence informs that CRITCHLOW is forming a breakaway movement in direct opposition to Michael de FREITAS […] (known as Michael X or Malik). Briefly it may be stated that whereas Michael de FREITAS is anti-white, Frank CRITCHLOW is purely anti-police.' (NA MEPO 31/20) During the Mangrove Nine trial, Frank Pulley, one of the operating police officers during the Mangrove demonstration, further discredited and criminalised the Mangrove as a 'den of iniquity' which 'is a haunt for criminals, prostitutes, ponces and the like. Anyone going there is likely to be corrupted if not corrupted already.' (Times 19/10/71)
[19] For the owner of the Mangrove, Frank Critchlow, these police raids which were practically disrupting and financially burdening his business activity must have been disastrous. During a later court hearing, Critchlow stated that because of the raids the number of customers decreased from 1,000 to 300 persons a week (Times 18/11/71).
[20] These attempts are documented in a leaflet by the *Black People's News Service*, published by the *Black Panther Movement* (WONG/6/73).

Movment, organised a demonstration in Notting Hill under the slogan 'HANDS OFF BLACK PEOPLE' (GPIA GB 2904 JLR/3/1/5).

On 9 August 1970, approximately 150 demonstrators took the streets in solidarity with the Mangrove Restaurant (Humphrey 1972: 127). Equipped with numerous banners and signs, they called for an end of police repression against the Mangrove Restaurant ("LEAVE MANGROVE ALONE"; "HANDS OFF GROVE NOW") and black people in general ("PIGS, HANDS OFF BLACK PEOPLE"), made allusions to the continuation of colonialism and slavery in Britain ("SLAVERY IS STILL ALIVE"), and raised the issue of black self-organisation and unification ("BLACK UNITY NOW"; "UNITE AND FIGHT"). Whereas some slogans expressed a militant attitude ("WE HAVE TO GET RID OF THE PIGS"), others were formulated in a moderate tone ("EQUAL RECOGNITION OF ALL BLACK PEOPLES"). The main banner highlighted the Black Power orientation of the demonstration ("BLACK PANTHER MOVEMENT – BLACK OPPRESSED PEOPLE ALL OVER THE WORLD ARE ONE").[21]

Compared to other anti-racist demonstrations in London at that time, the Mangrove rally was rather small.[22] It is therefore striking that the Metropolitan Police mobilised a large amount of operational resources in order to police that demonstration. According to Metropolitan Police files held at the *National Archives*, the demonstration was flanked by more than 700 police officers, and surveilled by a Special Branch team (NA MEPO 31/20). After the wave of police raids against the Mangrove, this repressive approach was undoubtedly a political provocation. The demonstration eventually erupted in violent altercations between protesters and police officers, whereby both sides made strong allegations of violent escalations.

[21] I gathered this information from photographs of the Mangrove rally stored at the Black Cultural Archives (BCA PHOTOS/102).

[22] On 21 March 1971, for instance, a demonstration against the 1971 Immigration Act took place which was mainly organized by Indian and Pakistani Workers' Associations and mobilised between 4,500 (Times 22/03/71) and 10,000 participants (Black People's News Service May/June 1971 [WONG/7/74]).

A closer look at the news coverage of the Mangrove demonstration illustrates very well who had won this public conflict over what had happened during the demonstration. Both the Guardian, Times and Daily Mirror reproduced the official police story of an allegedly passive, neutral and peaceful police force which was violently attacked by a mob of black demonstrators. In all of the analysed news articles, the reader is informed about the number of injured police officers and arrested demonstrators, but not about injured demonstrators and allegations of violent police escalation.[23] Moreover, the demonstration was primarily described on the ground of the previously developed Black Power narratives. By framing the incidents in a sensationalist way as a 'battle' (Guardian 10/08/70; Daily Mirror 11/08/70) that was stirred up by 'inflammatory speeches' (Times 09/10/71), the identification of "Black Power" and "violence" was reproduced. Additionally, some articles drew on the strategy of constructing "Black Power" as a dubious political threat to British "race relations". A Guardian author, for example, emphasised that '[t]he recent marches on police stations in North and West London by groups of black militants are part of the "tensions" about which the commission [Community Relations Commission, H.P.] is concerned.' (Guardian 14/08/70) Other authors forwarded the Metropolitan Police's speculation that 'external outsiders' were responsible for the eruption of violence during the demonstration (Times 14/08/70; Observer 16/08/70). This narrative was especially strong in a Times article dedicated to the new-right politician Enoch Powell who imagined Black Power as an 'enemy within', and the Mangrove demonstration as a 'small but classic specimen of an operation against the police' (Times 23/11/70; see also Daily Mirror 05/11/71). In some articles, this strategy was accompanied by the symbolic construction of a dichotomy between Black

[23] The first headlines covering the incidents were '17 police hurt in race fight' (Guardian 10/08/70) , '19 held in clash with police' (Times 10/08/70) and 'Black Power .. after the violence flared: hustle on "demo" report' (Daily Mirror 11/08/70).

Power militants and ordinary black residents who were said to be 'unnerved' (Guardian 15/08/70) by the demonstration (see also Daily Mirror 11/08/70). Although some articles – especially in the Guardian – made references to the protesters' perspective, they were nevertheless based on an explanatory framework which relativizes the problem of racist police harrassment and reduces it to a matter of lacking trust among those affected by racist police violence:

> ‚In reality, the degree of harrassment, if it takes place, matters very little. What counts is the total distrust of the police shown by some immigrants in this and other London districts, and their readiness to fight back.' (Guardian 11/08/70; see also Guardian 15/08/70; Times 11/08/70; 17/12/71)

4.4 Confrontational Episode II: The Mangrove Nine Trial, October – December 1971

In the aftermath of the Mangrove rally, the police arrested 19 people and carried out another raid in the Mangrove Restaurant (Times 10/08/70). After the subsequent criminal trial at the Marylebone Magistrates' Court, nine defendants were committed to the Central Criminal Court on charges of affray and possession of offensive weapons. At first, the defendants regarded this result as a limited success because Judge David Watcher rejected the incitement to riot charges (Humphrey 1972: 127). However, the official indictment to the trial at the Central Criminal Court revealed how seriously the state authorities took that case: After an intervention by the Director of Public Prosecutions Norman Skelkhorn, the serious charge of incitement to riot was reinstated (NA HO 325/143).

Despite these adverse legal circumstances, Mangrove Nine nevertheless decided to adopt a confrontational strategy. Especially Darcus Howe and Althea Jones-Lecointe who as experienced Black Power activists were well aware of the failures of previous Black Power trials – for example the trial against Obi Egbuna in 1968 – came to the conclusion

that in such a precarious situation the only effective defence strategy is to go on to the offensive, that is, to use the available legal resources and public attention in order to politicise the case.[24] This approach which Bunce and Field call a 'radical legal strategy' (2015: 121) basically contained two elements: First, the Mangrove Nine sought for new ways of disturbing the existing judicial routines and of politicising the case. In contrast to previous Black Power trials in which Black Power activists were defended by (mostly white) defence lawyers, three of the Mangrove Nine – Darcus Howe, Althea Jones-Lecointe and Rhodan Gordon – sought a different approach: They defended themselves in the courtroom. From a legal perspective, this strategy entailed enormous risks. From a political perspective, however, it was quite advantageous: Instead of being pushed by the judicial procedure into a position of passivity, Howe, Jones-Lecointe and Gordon actively spoke out for themselves and their fellow defendants, called their own witnesses, cross-examined police officers, and used the publicity in order to raise attention to what in their view was at the heart of that trial: the ongoing repression of black radicalism, and the racist discrimination of marginalised black communities. An especially powerful rhetorical strategy which Darcus Howe applied in order to politically contextualise the trial during one of the hearings is documented by the Guardian: 'The judge says he has 35 years of legal experience. Well, I have had 400 years of colonial experience.' (quoted in Guardian 17/12/71b).

Second, the Mangrove Nine not only developed innovative strategies within the institutional and procedural framework of the trial, but also attempted to change that framework itself. One of their most important interventions was the demand of an all-black jury. Here again, it was especially their political experience of the omnipresence of

[24] As Bunce and Field show with regard to Darcus Howe, this approach was a reflection of his personal and political experiences with Black Power radicalism in the United States, Canada and Trinidad (2015: 32-40, 59-69, 71-91).

British racism which made them reluctant to the prospect of being tried by a predominantly white jury. In a public statement from October 1971, the Mangrove Nine asserted that 'we defendants […] believe that in this "Law and Order" climate – deliberately created by the government we stand no chance of getting justice from an all white jury.' (BCA WONG/6/73) Although this claim was rejected and dismissed by Judge Edward Clarke as 'ridiculous nonsense' (Guardian 06/10/71), its broader political significance should not be underestimated. The Mangrove Nine trial took place only two years after the 1968 Race Relations Act, that is, at a time when the political struggles for anti-discriminatory institutional reforms were still in a very early phase. Furthermore, it should be added that such a demand is still not implemented in the British criminal justice system (Bowling/Phillips 2002: 187-188).

Over the course of the trial, various protests events were organised in solidarity with the Mangrove Nine.[25] At the beginning of the Mangrove Nine trial in October 1971, the *Black People's Information Centre* issued a leaflet titled "JUSTICE FOR THE MANGROVE 9" (BCA WONG/6/73) which can be used as an example of the discursive strategies developed by the support groups. In addition to the documentation the most recent police raids in the Mangrove, the arrests of the Mangrove Nine, the hearings at the Marylebone Magistrates' Court, as well as similar Black Power trials in 1971, the authors directly intervened into the public debates about the Mangrove Nine trial. For instance, they challenged Home Secretary Maudling's assertion that he had not been aware of the police raids in the Mangrove by highlighting that the *Action Committee in Support of the Mangrove* had made complaints to the Home Office long before the Mangrove demonstration (ibid.). In order to raise the broader issue of institutionalised racism within

[25] In a police report from 30 March 1972, it is stated that 'during their trial at the Central Criminal Court there were regular demonstrations by coloured outside the court. The demonstrators purporting to represent the Black Power or Black Panther Movements.' (NA DPP 2/5059)

the British law enforcement and criminal justice system, the authors developed a twofold approach: On the one hand, they politically scandalised the case by framing British state racism as a colonialist and fascist tendency:

> 'In the continuous court battles that black people are forced to fight daily, we are constantly confronted with a racist and fascist court system which legally upholds slavery and legally upholds the brutality and exploitation we experience in society.' (ibid.)

On the other hand, they attempted to strengthen their position by referring to the critique of moderate political forces who had demanded an independent inquiry into police racism for years, such as *CARD*, the *West Indian Standing Conference*, or the Labour MP for Kensington North, Bruce Douglas-Mann (ibid.). Hence, despite their critique of liberal-moderate versions of anti-racism, they nonetheless agree that what is at stake are the basic rights of black people to get organised, defend themselves and raise their voice in public. Hence, from their point of view, the main reason for the Mangrove Nine trial is quite obvious: 'Because we dared to demonstrate" (ibid.).

Another issue which was discussed in the context of the Mangrove Nine trial was the importance of black-and-white solidarity. For instance, this point was raised by Althea Jones-Lecointe as part of a critical summary of the Mangrove case in the Black Power magazine *Liberation*:

> 'This case was an open attempt to tell all Black people that they are not allowed to use the only legitimate means available to them to make their grievance known. Ordinary rights are denied to them. White people should realise that if these rights are withdrawn from black people, in the end they will be withdrawn from them too.' (1972: 14 [BCA WONG/7/7])

There was indeed one attempt to bring such a form of solidarity to the streets. On 31 October 1970, the *Black Defence Committee*, founded by the Trotskyist *International Marxist Group*, organised a solidarity demonstration under the slogan "HANDS OFF BLACK PEOPLE – WHITE PEOPLE MARCH IN SOLIDARITY WITH BLACK

VICTIMS OF REPRESSION" (NA HO 325/143). According to an internal Special Branch report, various left-wing organisations supported the demonstration such as the *Goldsmith's Socialist Society,* the *British Vietnam Solidarity Front*, or the *Notting Hill Peoples' Association* (ibid.). However, despite the support of various organisations from different parts of Britain, the demonstration was rather small: estimations range from 260 (Bunce/Field 2015: 120) to 360 participants (Observer 01/11/71). This can be regarded as an indication that in the early 1970s the project of anti-racist cooperation across racialised boundaries was embryonic at best. But this lack of broader political support was a general problem of the Mangrove Nine campaign. Apart from smaller pickets outside the Central Criminal Court, there was only one second demonstration on 5 October 1971, organised by the *Black People's Information Centre*, which mobilised approximately 400 people (Bunce/Field 2015: 121). Against this background, Bunce's and Field's conclusion that in the wake of the Mangrove Nine trial 'a movement is born' (ibid.: 120) seems to be an optimistic exaggeration. Although they indicate that various anti-racist groups throughout Britain were involved in the organisation of the Mangrove Nine protest campaign, they only mention, as the major public protest events, the two demonstrations in London which can hardly figure as indicators of what they call 'mass protest' (ibid.: 7) or 'mass rally' (ibid.: 121). Apart from that, they do not provide further evidence which could support the thesis of a mass movement throughout Britain in solidarity with the Mangrove Nine.

4.5 Aftermath: The Mangrove Nine's Success, the Decline of Black Power, and the Consolidation of Racialised State Repression in the early 1970s

After three months of jury hearings, the Mangrove Nine were partially successful. On 16 December 1971, five defendants were acquitted, four received suspended sentences, and

– most importantly – the incitement to riot charges were dropped in all cases. Moreover, during his final statement, Judge Clarke made a remarkable comment:

> ‘We have now reached the end of a very long trial which I think it must be agreed has been a very unpleasant experience for everybody concerned. What this trial has shown is that there is clear evidence of racial hatred on both sides.’ (NA MEPO 31/20)

This statement was obviously formulated in terms of the race relations paradigm according to which both sides of the conflict, Black Power groups and Metropolitan police officers, are to be blamed for “racial hatred”. It is also important to keep in mind that Clarke had contended one day earlier that in his view the main problem is Black Power activism rather than police harrassment (Guardian 15/12/71). Nevertheless, it was the first time in British history that a high state representative acknowledged the problem of police racism (Bunce/Field 2015: 134).

The Mangrove Nine’s success in challenging central elements of the official police story was also partially reflected in the news coverage of the trial. From all the 23 Guardian articles covering the Mangrove Nine trial, eight focused on the concerns and demands of the Mangrove Nine, whereas three focused on the police story. The Times coverage was rather reserved in this regard: Twelve articles focused on the defendant’s and twelve on the prosecution’s perspective. However, these slight changes in the public discourse should not be overestimated. The Daily Mirror, for instance, simply ignored the Mangrove Nine trial. And apart from some articles in which demands for police reforms were discussed (Guardian 15/08/70; 28/01/72; Observer 09/01/72; Times 28/01/72), the Guardian and the Times quickly lost their interest in the Mangrove case, and directed their attention back to sensationalist Black Power stories, such as the criminal proceedings against Michael X (even though he had resigned from Black Power activism already in 1970 (Guardian 01/12/70)).

In the wake of these public discussions, the Mangrove Nine trial triggered some reform discussions and political tensions within the British state institutions. The Metropolitan Police immediately recognised the political significance of Judge Clarke's remarks which in internal correspondences were characterised as 'disappointing', 'quite uncalled', 'most unfortunate' and 'completely unjustified' (NA MEPO 31/20). Internal documents reveal that the Metropolitan Police Commissioner contacted the Director of Public Prosecutions in order to put pressure on Clarke, and to exert political influence on future criminal proceedings (ibid.). On the other hand, there is some evidence that various civil society representatives and state officials attempted to push forward institutional reforms, such as the recruitment of black police officers or the implementation of a police complaints authority, and demanded an official inquiry into police-community relations in Notting Hill. According to internal files and press reports, the Home Office held meetings with David Pitt, the former head of *CARD*, and with representatives from the *Catholic Institute of International Relations* and the *National Council of Civil Liberties* (NA HO 325/143; Guardian 17/12/71). Moreover, Home Secretary Maudling was called for a parliamentary hearing on 21 January 1972 during which he was confronted by Labour MP Douglas-Mann who asserted that

> 'there is a danger of racial violence in the area which has not existed for many years; that the acquittals in the Mangrave [sic!] case raise a strong interference that a number of police officers were lying in concert and that, with the connivance of senior officers, they have been responsible for persecution of particularly articulate black people in the area.' (NA MEPO 31/20)

In the long run, however, these initiatives did not trigger any reform process. The Home Office which in the immediate aftermath of the Mangrove Nine trial was not confronted with considerable public pressure simply neglected the necessity of official inquiries and institutional reforms.

Against this background, the Metropolitan Police simply continued its repressive approach against black political activism in particular, and black community life in general: The Mangrove case was followed by numerous incidents of police harrassment against black community centres and events, as well as political trials against black activism in the 1970s. According to the *Institute of Race Relations*, there were numerous police raids against black community centres throughout Britain between 1971 and 1979 (1979: 5-18). Furthermore, the 1970s witnessed a variety of other criminal proceedings against black activists in the 1970s, such as the Metro Four, Oval Four, Oval House Four, Old Bailey Three, Brockwell Park Three, Clapton Park Four, Swan Disco Seven, Cricklewood Twelve, Stockwell Ten, Dallow Road Seven, Lewisham 21, Islington 18 (Shurka 1998: 41; Procter 2002; Bunce/Field 2015: 171-175). In contrast to the Mangrove Nine, however, the vast majority of these cases was much less prominent and successful, even though some of the support campaigns were definitely inspired by the Mangrove Nine. Under these circumstances of continuously high state repression, but also of internal political conflicts, the field of black radicalism changed considerably. During the first half of the 1970s, the majority of British Black Power organisations either broke up or changed their political orientation (Wild 2015: 29). In 1973, for instance, the *Black Panther Movement* broke up and was reconstitued for some time as the *Black Workers Movement* (Bunce/Field 2010b: 412-413).

It is against this background that the broader political significance of the Mangrove Nine case should be evaluated. In the existing anti-racist literature, the Mangrove Nine trial is commonly interpreted as the peak of Black Power strength in Britain. For Sivanandan, the Mangrove Nine trial 'marked the high water-mark of Black Power' (1982a: 33). Goulbourne describes it as 'the single most dramatic event of these years' (1998: 65). Bunce and Field regard the struggles over the Mangrove as proof that 'Black Power […] was finally stretching its muscles in Britain.' (2015: 105). During my analysis,

however, I came to a less optimistic conclusion. From an activist perspective, the Mangrove Nine trial can indeed be regarded as a moment of political strength, insofar as the Mangrove Nine successfully defended themselves against the state's repressive offensive and effectively resisted the temptation of reformist strategies. However, the Mangrove Nine campaign largely remained a defence campaign which was confronted with the full force of state repression and neo-racist criminalisation. Moreover, this confrontational episode occurred against the background of the increasing decline and defeat of Black Power activism in the early 1970s. In this sense, the Mangrove Nine case is also a story about increasing state repression and authoritarian exclusion: Despite some throwbacks on the episodical level, the British state's repressive approach, backed up by a hostile public discourse on Black Power, turned out to be an effective way of weakening and defeating Black Power politics in the long run. This was, of course, not the end of radical anti-racism and black resistance in general. For instance, the Lewisham 21 defence campaign was the starting point for the formation of the *Anti-Nazi League* in 1977 which became one of the major anti-racist forces in recent British history (Virdee 2014: 135-144). But the 1970s were nevertheless a period in which the existing black anti-racist organisations, confronted with the growing authoritarian tendencies in the British society, were forced to significantly reconsider their political strategies. And it was a period in which the British state's repressive approach had some devastating effects on black community life at large. In his introduction to the IRR report on police repression against black people in the 1970s and 1980s, Sivanandan concludes that the British law enforcement and criminal justice system has increasingly created a 'distinction […] between its publics, as to whom it shall serve by consent and whom control by force' (1987: vii), which marks the first step towards authoritarian politics. The most striking example of such a tendency is the Mangrove Restaurant itself: Due to continued incidents

of police, judicial and administrative harrassment, Frank Critchlow was eventually forced to close it down in 1992.[26]

[26] In a Carribean Times article from 1990, it was reported that Frank Crichlow was arrested and charged around 50 times, but has never once been convicted (Carribean Times 14/08/1990 [GPIA GB 2904 LRA/01/0500]).

5. Conclusion

With this dissertation, I provided a systematic analysis of the political struggles over the Mangrove Restaurant in late 1960s and early 1970s London. Using the Mangrove Nine case as a concrete example, I attempted to explore which role criminal trials against Black Power activism played for the rearticulation and reinforcement of public racism and state authoritarianism in 1970s Britain, but also for the changing patterns of anti-racist mobilisation in that period. In sum, the Mangrove Nine trial can be regarded as a good example of how everyday conflicts over state racism gained entrance into – and were fought out within – the institutional terrain of the British state. Furthermore, it shows how the Mangrove Nine and their support groups strategically used the institutional terrain into which this political confrontation was pushed in order to resist and subvert the state's repressive offensive.

However, in contrast to the existing anti-racist literature which tends to draw an all too optimistic picture of the Mangrove Nine story, my conclusion is rather ambivalent. On the one hand, the Mangrove Nine case can indeed be regarded as a political success, insofar the Mangrove Nine were able to politically assert their radical legal strategy. What is more, they also triggered some institutional reform discussions without falling back to a reformist position: The claims for black self-defence, an all-black jury, and an official inquiry into police racism were the most important results in this regard. On the other hand, it must be emphasised that the Mangrove Nine and their support groups were confronted not only with the full force of state repression, but also with a hostile political discourse, which made it highly difficult for them to manouevre in the public terrain and gain political strength – a problem which was further exacerbated by ongoing conflicts and tensions within the field of Black Power politics. As a result, the mobilisational dynamics around and in the aftermath of the Mangrove case remained rather limited.

As an individual case study, this dissertation could only provide a limited account of the hegemonic discourses and repressive state actions against black radicalism in the 1960s and 1970s. A comparative analysis of all the major political trials against black activists would be useful in order to gain more comprehensive insights into the specific role the criminal justice system played for the rearticulation and reinforcement of neo-racist hegemonies and authoritarian state transformations in 1970s Britain. Additionally, such a study could make an important contribution to the politics of remembering anti-racist resistance in contemporary British history. For, besides some recent attempts to bring the Mangrove Nine story back into public consciousness (Bunce/Field 2010a; 2010c; Brown 2013, 2017), the vast majority of similar solidarity campaigns in the 1960s and 1970s remains to be in danger of fading into oblivion.

6. Bibliography

Back, L. and Solomos, J. (2001): Doing Research, Writing Politics: The Dilemmas of Political Intervention in Research on Racism. In: Goulbourne, H. (ed.): *Race and Ethnicity.* London and New York: Routledge.

Balibar, E. (1991a): Is there a 'Neo-Racism'? In: Balibar, E./Wallerstein, I.: *Race, Nation, Class. Ambiguous Identities.* London/New York: Verso, pp. 17-28.

Balibar, E. (1991b): Racism and Crisis. In: Balibar, E./Wallerstein, I.: *Race, Nation, Class. Ambiguous Identities.* London/New York: Verso, pp. 217-227.

Barker, M. (1981): *The New Racism. Conservatives and the Ideology of the Tribe*. London, Junction Books.

Bonnett, A. (2000): *Anti-Racism.* London/New York: Routledge.

Bowling, B./Phillips, C. (2001): *Racism, Crime and Justice.* Harlow: Pearson Longman.

Bunce, R./Field, P. (2010a): Frank Critchlow: Community leader who made the Mangrove Restaurant the beating heart of Notting Hill. In: *The Independent 22/09/2010.* Online: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/frank-critchlow-community-leader-who-made-the-mangrove-restaurant-the-beating-heart-of-notting-hill-2086839.html [last access: 29/08/2017].

Bunce, R./Field, P. (2010b): Obi B. Egbuna, C.L.R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain: Black Radicalism in Britain 1968-1972. In: *Twentieth Century British History 22 (3)*, pp. 391-414.

Bunce, R./Field, P. (2010c): Mangrove Nine: the court challenge against police racism in Notting Hill. In: *The Guardian 29/11/*2010. Online: https://www.theguardian.com/law/2010/nov/29/mangrove-nine-40th-anniversary [last access: 29/08/2017].

Bunce, R./Field, P. (2015): *Darcus Howe. A Political Biography.* London/New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Brown, M. (2013): Britain's black power movement is at risk of being forgotten, say historians. In: *The Guardian 27/12/2013*. Online: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/dec/27/britain-black-power-movement-risk-forgotten-historians [last access: 29/08/2017].

Brown, M. (2017): British black power: from shrug to school syllabus in six short years. In: *The Guardian 06/01/2017.* Online: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jan/06/british-black-power-from-shrug-to-school-syllabus-in-six-short-years [last access: 29/08/2017].

Carmichael, S./Hamilton, C. V. (1967): *Black Power. The Politics of Liberation in America.* New York: Vintage Books.

Cashmore, E. (1996): Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations. 4. Auflage, London [u.a.]: Routledge.

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) (1982): *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 1970s Britain.* London: Hutchinson.

Cohen, A. (1982): A Polyethnic London Carnival as a Contested Cultural Performance. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies 5 (1)*, pp. 23-41.

Delsol, R./Shiner, M. (2015): *Stop and Search. The Anatomy of a Police Power.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fairclough, N. (1989): *Discourse and Power.* Essex/Edinburgh: Longman Group.

Fairclough, N. (1995): *Critical Discourse Analysis.* Essex: Longman Group.

Fryer, P. (1984): *Staying Power. The History of Black People in Britain.* London: Pluto Press.

Gallas, A. (2005): *The Thatcherite Offensive: A Neo-Poulantzasian Analysis.* Leiden: Brill.

Gilroy, P. (1982): Police and Thieves. In: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) (1982): *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 1970s Britain.* London: Hutchinson, pp. 141-180.

Gilroy, P. (1987): *There ain't no Black in the Union Jack. The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation.* London: Routledge.

Goodwin, M.: *New British Fascism.* London: Routledge, 2011.

Goulbourne, H. (1998) : *Race Relations in Britain since 1945.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.

Goulbourne, H. (1991): *Ethnicity and Nationalism in Post-Imperial Britain.* Cambridge: University Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* New York: International Publishers.

Hall, S. (1980): Race, articulation and societies structured in dominance, in UNESCO (ed.): *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism*. UNESCO: Paris, pp. 305-345.

Hall, S. (1986): *The Hard Road to Renewal. Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left.* London/New York: Verso.

Hall, S./Critcher, C./Jefferson, T./Clarke, J. (2013): *Policing the Crisis. Mugging, the State and Law and Order.* 2nd ed., Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmilan [1978].

Hansen, R. (2000): *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-War Britain*. Oxford: University Press.

Hobsbawm, E. (1977): Gramsci and Political Theory. In: *Marxism Today July 1977*, pp. 205-213.

Humphry, D. (1972): *Police Power and Black People*. London: Granada Publishing.

Institute of Race Relations (IRR) (1979): *Police against Black People*. London: Institute of Race Relations.

Institute of Race Relations (IRR) (1987): *Policing against Black People*. London: Institute of Race Relations.

Jäger, S. (2001): Discourse and Knowledge. Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of a Critical Discourse and Dispositive Analysis. In: Wodak, R./Meyer, M. (ed.): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 32-62.

Jäger, S. (2012): *Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung*. Münster: Unrast Verlag.

Jessop, B. (1990): State Theory. Putting the Capitalist State in its Place. Cambridge [u.a.]: Polity Press.

Keith, M. (1993): *Race, Riots and Policing: Lore and Disorder in a Multi-Racist Society.* London: UCL Press.

KhosraviNik, M./Krzyzanowski, M./Wodak, R. (2012): Dynamics of Representation in Discourse: Immigrants in the British Press. In: Messer, M./Schroeder, R./Wodak, R. (eds.): Migrations: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Berlin: Springer, pp. 283-297.

Lawrence, E. (1982): Just Plain Common Sense: The 'Roots' of Racism. In: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) (1982): *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 1970s Britain.* London: Hutchinson.

Lentin, A. (2004): *Racism and Anti-Racism in Europe.* London: Pluto Press.

Miles, R./Brown, M.: *Racism.* 2nd ed., London/New York: Routledge, 2003.

Mosse, G. L. (1993): *Die Geschichte des Rassismus in Europa.* Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

Olusoga, D. (2016): *Black and British. A Forgotten History.* London: Macmillan.

Piper, N. (1998): *Racism, Nationalism and Citizenship. Ethhnic Minorities in Germany and Britain.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Poulantzas, N. (2000): *State, Power, Socialism.* London/New York: Verso Books.

Procter, J. (2002): Mangrove Trials. In: Donnell, A. (ed.): *Companion to Contemporary Black British Culture*. New York: Routledge, p. 191.

Quiton, P. (2015): Race Disproportionality and Officer Decision-Making. In: Delsol, R./Shiner, M. (eds.): *Stop and Search: The Anatomy of Police Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 57-78.

Sivanandan, A. (1982a): From Resistance to Rebellion: Asian and Afro-Carribean Struggles in Britain. In: Ibid.: *A Different Hunger. Writings on Black Resistance,* pp. 3-54

Sivanandan, A. (1982b): Black Power: The Politics of Existence. In: Ibid.: *A Different Hunger. Writings on Black Resistance,* pp. 3-54.

Sivanandan, A. (1982c): From Immigration Control to 'Induced Repatriation'. In: Ibid.: *A Different Hunger. Writings on Black Resistance,* pp. 131-140.

Shukra, K. (1998): *The Changing Pattern of Black Politics in Britain.* London [etc.]: Pluto Press.

Small, S./Solomos, J.: Race, Immigration and Politics in Britain. In: *International Journal of Comparative Sociology 47 (3-4),* 2006, pp. 235-257.

Solomos, J. (2003): *Race and Racism in Britain,* 3rd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Solomos, J./Findlay, B./Jones, S./Gilroy, P. (1982): The Organic Crisis of British Capitalism and Race: The Experience of the Seventies. In: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) (1982): *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 1970s Britain.* London: Hutchinson, pp. 7-44.

Solomos, J./Back, L. (1996): *Racism and Society.* Basingstoke [u.a.]: Macmillan.

Trew, W. N. (2012): *Black For A Cause ... Not Just Because ...: The Case of the 'Oval 4' and the Story It Tells of Black Power in 1970s Britain.* TaoFish Books.

van Dijk, T. (1988): *News Discourse.* London: Routledge.

van Dijk, T. (1991): *Racism and the Press.* London: Routledge.

Virdee, S. (2014): *Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wild, R. (2015): 'Black was the Colour of our Fight': The Transnational Roots of British Black Power. In: Kelley, R. B. D./Tuck, S. (eds.): *The Other Special Relationship. Race, Rights, and Riots in Britain and the United States.* Luxembourg: Springer Link, pp. 25-46.

Wodak, R. (2001): The Discourse-Historical Approach. In: Ruth Wodak /Michael Meyer (ed.): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 63-95.

Wodak, R. (2015): *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean.* London [etc.]: SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R./Reisigl, M. (2001): *Discourse and Discrimination. Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. London: Routledge.

Archive Material Cited

National Archives (NA)

- (MEPO 31/20): '"Black Power" demonstration on 9 August 1970: France, L and 18 others arrested for assault on police and other offences in Portnall Road and Shirland Road, W9. Critchlow, F acquitted of charges of riot and affray.Reports, statements and correspondence'
- (MEPO 31/21): '"Black Power" demonstration: original statements and newspaper cuttings. With photographs'
- (HO 325/143): 'Relationship between police and immigrants: Black Power movement; demonstration and march in Notting Hill, London, August 1970 in support of restaurant, Notting Hill; allegations of police discrimination; police sustained injuries; arrests'
- (DPP 2/5059): 'BLACK PANTHER MOVEMENT "Battle for Freedom at the Old Bailey": possible offences for contempt of court during the course of the trial of the 'Mangrove Nine'. No action case.'

George Padmore Institute Archives (GPIA)

- (GB 2904 JLR/3/1/5): 'Black Panther Movement'
- (GB 2904 JLR/3/1/10): 'Campaign against Racial Discrimination (CARD)'
- (GB 2904 LRA/01/0500): 'Mangrove Restaurant and Mangrove Nine Trial'
-

Black Cultural Archives (BCA)

- (PHOTOS/102): 'Photographs of the Black Panther Movement'
- (WONG/6/73): 'Justice for the Mangrove 9'
- (WONG/7/7): 'Liberation, number 1, volume XVI'
- (WONG/7/74): 'Black People's News Service'

Newspaper Articles Cited

The Guardian [access via ProQuest Historical Newspapers]

- (18/04/70): *Michael X accused of blackmail*, p. 1.
- (20/04/70): *Pakistanis heed call for 'self-defence'*, p. 1.
- (27/04/70): *Police hold 20 after Black Power violence*, p. 1.
- (29/04/70): *Six accused remanded after clashes*, p. 6.
- (23/06/70): *Eight on charge of robbery*, p. 7.
- (29/07/70): *Bail for 11 accused*, p. 4.
- (10/08/70): *17 police hurt in race fight*, p. 1.
- (11/08/70): *Suspicion a la Mangrove*, p. 11.
- (14/08/70): *Race tensions spurs Cousins to action*, p. 18.
- (15/08/70): *Call for more coloured police,* p. 1.
- (01/10/70): *'Repressive terms' of planned legislation*, p. 18.
- (13/10/70): *'Black Power' man for trial*, p. 6.
- (01/12/70): *Michael X resigns*, p. 1.
- (14/01/71): *The attack on Mr Carr*, p. 12.
- (22/07/71): *Black & white*, p. 13.
- (06/10/71): *Defence demands all-black jury*, p. 16.
- (08/12/71): *Picket at court arrested*, p. 6.
- (15/12/71): *Jury told to forget racialism*, p. 5.
- (17/12/71): *Mangrove four sentenced,* p. 4.
- (17/12/71b): *Short order for the law: John Cunningham on the Mangrove Nine trial,* p. 13.

The Observer [access via ProQuest Historical Newspapers]

- (16/08/70): *Police seek black recruits*, p. 2.
- (09/01/72): *The time bomb in Notting Hill,* p. 8.

The Times [access via Gales News Vault]

- (31/03/69): *Pulpit call for sympathy to Black Power*, p. 3.
- (26/05/69): *From campus to church,* p.7.
- (20/10/69): *Growing immigrant problem in Brent*, p. 3.
- (03/12/69): *'Courts are colour blind'*, p. 3.
- (22/12/69): *London supermarket will be all-black*, p. 3.

- (03/03/70): *16 arrested in Panther protests*, p. 8.
- (20/04/70): *The London Interview: Protesting priest in search of racial harmony*, p. 4.
- (30/04/70): *Need for more urgency in race reforms*, p. 2.
- (23/05/70): *Kirk rejects 'ban immigrants' call*, p. 3
- (10/08/70): *19 held in clash with police,* p. 1.
- (11/08/70): *Tougher attitude among coloured*, p. 2.
- (14/08/70): *Outsiders blamed for weekend race clash*, p. 3.
- (09/09/70): *Reports 'prejudiced Michael X case'*, p. 3.
- (23/11/70): *Public more aware of enemy within, Mr Powell says*, p. 4.
- (02/01/71): *Missiles thrown at police, constable tells court*, p. 2.
- (15/03/71): *Poetry and extremism from a jail cell*, p. 2.
- (22/03/71): *Immigrants protest*, p. 2.
- (06/05/71): *Police attacked at Black Panther dance, jury told*, p. 5.
- (14/07/71): *Two found guilty in Black Power case*, p. 3.
- (09/10/71): *Police 'did not provoke violence' at march*, p. 3.
- (19/10/71): *PC says restaurant is 'a den of iniquity'*, p. 2.
- (03/11/71): *Different worlds of black Americans and Africans*, p. 8.
- (18/11/71): *'Aim of Black Power march was to enlist sympathy',* p. 24.
- (17/12/71): *Notting Hill Gate: a suitable case for treatment*, p. 14.
- (18/01/72): *Race relations committee to visit Notting Hill*, p. 6.

Daily Mirror (access via UKPressOnline)

- (26/09/69): *How the seeds of race hate may be sown in Britain*, p. 19.
- (28/04/70): *Pc knocked out in Black Power battle,* p. 2.
- (11/08/70): *Hustle on 'demo report',* p. 24.
- (09/09/70): *Ban on a Black Power poll plot*, p. 7.
- (29/06/71): *Three arrested after a battle at Old Bailey,* p. 2.
- (05/11/71): *Enoch raps teachers over migrants*, p. 16.

Carribean Times [access via George Padmore Institute Archives]

- (14/08/1990): *The trials of Frank Crichlow*, p. 4-5.

7. Appendices

Appendix 1: Search Terms, Online Newspaper Archives

Black Power; Black Panther; Mangrove; Mangrove 9*Nine; Darcus*Radcliffe How, Frank Critchlow*Crichlow; Althea Lecointe-Jones*Jones-Lecointe; Barbara Reese; Ruddy*Rothwell Kentish; Rupert Boyce; Rhoden Gordon; Anthony Innis; Godfrey Millett; Ian Macdonald; Tony Mohipp; David*Judge Watcher; Edward*Judge Clarke; British Black Panther Movement; British Black Panthers; Black People's Information Center; Action Committee in Defence of the Mangrove; ; Black Defence Committee; Universal Coloured People's Association*UCPA; Universal Black Improvement Organisation*UBIO; Racial Adjustment Action Society*RAAS; Black Unity and Freedom Party*BUFP; Black Power Party; Freedom News; Tricontinental Outpost; Black Eagle; Race Today; Hustler; Black Dimension; Black Liberator; The Voice; Campaign against Racial Discrimination*CARD

Appendix 2: Examples of Entry-Level and In-Depth Analyses of Newspaper Articles

Harvey, P. (1970): Police hold 20 after Black Power violence. In: *The Guardian 27/04/70*, p. 1.

Headline: ‚Police hold 20 after Black Power violence'

Topics: The author covers the arrest of 20 demonstrators after violent altercations between Metropolitan police forces and groups of demonstrators in the context of a demonstration against the Vietnam war and in solidarity with the Black Power struggles in Trinidad. The article's main emphasis is the alleged violence of Black Power demonstrators against the police.

Referential Strategies: As the main actors involved the author mentions approximately 400 police officers on the one hand and approximately 200 to 500 demonstrators on the other. The author makes a distinction between ‚Black Power demonstrators' or ‚Black Power groups' and the other ‚groups of demonstrators protesting against American involvement in Vietnam'. The main political events mentioned (but not further outlined) are the Vietnam war and the 1970 events in Trinidad. The demonstration is connected with other protest events in the London West End.

Predicational Strategies: The demonstrators are vaguely characterised as ‚various anti-American and pro-Black Power groups', we do not learn anything about concrete political groups or organisations involved. It remains unclear who had organised the demonstration. Apart from short references to Black Power, Trinidad and the Viernam war, the political demands of the demonstrators are not dealt with. The main emphasis of the article is to frame the entire demonstration as a violent escalation (‚abuse heaped on

individual policemen‘; ‚Suddenly , sticks and bottles began flying and chants of „pigs, pigs“ and „Black Power“ filled the air.‘). While descriptions of injured police officers prevail, the question of injured demonstrators is not even brought up. What is most remarkable about the article is that the ‚Black Power groups‘ are symbolically singled out and seperated from other demonstrators. By doing so, these ‚Black Power groups‘ are characterised as especially violent, and constructed as the main actor responsible for the alleged outburst of violence. The Black Power demonstrators are racialised as ‚coloured men and women‘. The police officers, on the other hand, are characterised as a passive and peaceful escort, which only begins to actively intervene after the alleged outburst of violence. The police is the actor which is directly quoted by the author.

Argumentative Strategies: The author’s main narrative is that the violent altercations are the sole result of escalating behaviour on the side of the demonstrators, especially those affiliated with Black Power. This narrative is supported by creating the image of the demonstrators as a violent and irrational group of people (‚swearing, screaming crowd‘; ‚this mob just won’t talk to us – or listen‘ (quote police officer)). Another assumption is that the Black Power segments of the demonstrations have increasingly taken control of the demonstration, thereby creating the image of Black Power as a powerful infiltrating force (‚the Black Power groups had taken complete vocal charge‘). The police forces are mainly described as either passive or reactive.

Strategies of Perspectivation: The main dichotomy put forward in this article is between demonstrators and police in general, and Black Power demonstrators and police in particular. By framing the demonstrators in a negative way, and the police in a neutral/positive way, the author politically positions himself on the side of the police.

Strategies of Intensification/Mitigation: The author uses a strong strategy of intensifying the demonstrators‘ violence and ignoring police violence.

Evans, P. (1971): Poetry and Extremism from a Jail Cell. In: *The Times 15/03/71.*

Headline: „Poetry and Extremism from a Jail Cell“

Sub-Headline: „‘The first move towards black consciousness is to kill that part of yourself that is white‘“

Topics: The article deals with and review Obi Egbuna’s book *Destroy This Temple* which he had written during his imprisonment in 1968. It mainly deals with Egbuna’s imprisonment and the Black Power underpinnings of his book, whereby the author’s negative characterisations overweigh.

Referential Strategies: The main emphasis is on Obi Egbuna, considerable parts of the article are direct quotations from Egbuna’s book. The main topics the author is interested in are the imprisonment of Egbuna, the notion of Black Power and the question of violence. Other references figures are Frantz Fanon with whom Egbuna is compared, and the group of ‚young West Indians‘. Furthermore, Enoch Powell is mentioned whose racism is regarded by Samuel Bonhomme, another author who is mentioned in the article, as an inadvertent support of the Black Power case. During his description of the trial

against Egbuna, the author mentions that Egbuna was tried by an ‚all-white jury‘. The author further writes from a first-person perspective.

Predicational Strategies: The author’s review of Egbuna’s book is twofold: On the other hand, the poetic aspects of the book are valued (‚genuine literary merit‘); on the other hand, the political views are discredited as ‚extremism‘ and ‚fanaticism‘; and he is further made responsible for the growth of extremist views among black youth. The author xxx. He further identifies himself as part of the British society which is imagined in opposition to the racialised minority population (‚Many young West Indians are losing faith in our institutions […]‘).

Argumentative Strategies: In order to support his negative characterisation of Egbuna’s views on Black Power, the author avoids a political critique and rather attempts to critique Eguna in a depoliticised way, by characterising him as a ‚difficult person‘ which the author ‚did not fully understand‘. He further uses the first-person perspective in order to give these claims authenticity (‚I first met Egbuna in 1967.‘) In this article, the author also touches upon the question of racist discrimination of black communities and especially black youth. In his view, however, the main reason is not racism but a lack of ‚faith‘ among the youth themselves.

Strategies of Perspectivation: The author personally distances himself from Egbuna and at the same time identifies himself with the British society (‚our institutions‘)

Strategies of Intensification/Mitigation: Some aspects of the hegemonic Black Power discourse are rather mitigated, especially the question of violence, while others are intensified, especially the characterisation as ‚extremism‘ which in this article is further exagerrated as ‚fanaticism‘.

Tullett, T./Todd, R. (1970): Hustle on ‚demo‘ report. In: *Daily Mirror 11/08/70*, p. 24.

Headline: „Hustle on ‚demo‘ report“

Sub-Headline: „Black Power .. after the violence flared“

Topics: The authors cover the events around the Mangrove demonstration on 10 August 1970, focusing especially on the alleged violence by the demonstrators, and on the official government reactions to the demonstration. Most notably, it covers Home Secretary Maudling’s demand for an official report on the Black Power phenomenon.

Referential Strategies: As the main actors involved the author mentions an indefinite number police officers on the one hand and approximately 200 demonstrators on the other. The events are contextualised with another event in front of another London police station.

Predicational Strategies: The authors emphasise and exaggerate the violent aspects of the demonstration by framing it as ‚the Battle of Marban-road‘ during which ‚violence flared‘. Black Power groups (‚Black Panthers‘) are identified as the main actors

responsible for the violence (‚deliberate action by the Black Power organisation'). „Black Power" is imagined as a homogenous political organisation (‚the Black Power organisation'). The demonstration is characterised as an „'anti-police protest march'". The police officers are mainly described as victims of anti-police violence.

Argumentative Strategies: The authors' main narrative is that the violent altercations are the result of escalating behaviour on the side of the demonstrators. In support of this narrative, the authors give a detailed description of the alleged violent activities (‚Demonstrators hurled bricks, broken milk bottles and beer cans […]'), as well as of the injured police officers. Furthermore, the authors created a dichotomy between the demonstrators and ‚the local black population' some of whom were alleged to have ‚invited policemen […] into their houses for cups of tea' and ‚apologised for the behaviour of their black brethren.'The Home Office's reaction to the events is described as a great shock (‚Mr. Maudling is said to be deeply disturbed about the incidents. He is anxiously awaiting the report'), although it has been informed about the case months before the demonstration.

Strategies of Perspectivation: The main dichotomies which are created within the article are the dichotomies between Black Power demonstrators and the police, and between Black Power demonstrators and allegedly unpolitical black residents.

Strategies of Intensification/Mitigation: The author uses a strong strategy of intensifying the demonstrators' violence and ignoring police violence.