

'Nothing in nature is so wonderful as the amount of injustice human beings will stand and still be contented unless it be the ease with which they swallow flattery and cheap glory, while their rights, comforts, necessities, are being stolen from them.'

MAY HUNTLEY

In this Issue:

'WE DON'T WANT TO DIE'
ANSWERS
VIEWPOINT ON CUBA
GENEVA AND DISARMAMENT
ISRAEL & THE EICHMANN TRIAL

MAY 6 1961 Vol 22 No 15

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

Success for all Concerned!

LAST Saturday's Sit-down demonstration in London, apart from a disappointing drop in the numbers who took part must surely be considered a success for all concerned. A success for the demonstrators who, faced with their first test of mass arrests, "stood" their ground, with very few exceptions to await the consequences whatever they might have been; a success for the police whose counter-demonstration was as impressive as the demonstration itself; a success for the State which through its Courts vindicated the LAW as well as frustrating the marchers' intentions to reach Parliament Square. But before examining these successes, let us first state the facts since some of the Press reports were more wide of the mark than usual. It is true that the Press was also harried by the police who were determined to seal off the demonstrators from the public. That the Press, which has access to the battlefields and the Royal Presence, should have been kept at a distance from a non-violent sit-down in the heart of London, must be taken as a compliment, as an indication that the forces of law and order were taking us seriously at last!

The *Observer* report noted that there were 1,200 demonstrators. Why their reporters should have thought this it is difficult to say. Police estimates were 2,500. Some observers put the number at 3,000 others at 2,000. The numbers arrested according to the *Sunday Telegraph* were "more than 1,000". The official figures were 826. According to the same paper the Metropolitan Police Commissioner had "at least 1,000 of the Force's total strength of 17,000 at his immediate disposal". But it was obvious even to the least expert observer that there were many more than that. (More than an hour before the Square meeting started hundreds of police had been disgorged by coaches and vans, and by three o'clock they were lining Whitehall, Parliament Square and still further, past the House of Lords. Indeed, the *Observer* which had only seen 1,200 sit-downers, saw "2,000 of them lining Whitehall, blocking its opening into Parliament Square and crowding in the courts and side streets off the route" and a further 1,000 were on call.

There were two halts along Whitehall, the first of short duration, and we have heard no explanation for it. The second, it was announced, would last 10 minutes. Senior police offi-

The People in the Street

cial, it appears approached the leaders of the march with the offer of a compromise. One newspaper reported that it consisted in allowing a symbolic sit-down on the pavement in Parliament Square of 50 marchers. The *Observer's* version was that "if the marchers promised not to sit in the road—to keep to the central garden of the square—to keep off the grass, they might proceed". According to Michael Randle, secretary of the Committee of 100, the police offer was to allow marchers to proceed in batches of 50 to occupy the pavements round the garden in Parliament Square.

The offer was refused, and the leaders were informed that they would be prevented from proceeding further. By then the ranks of the marchers had been closed and flanked on both sides by policemen standing shoulder to shoulder. We were trapped, encircled by a chain which could not be broken except by violence, and because the Committee of 100 is pledged to a campaign of non-violent protest the only answer was to sit down in the roadway. Within a few minutes everyone was uncomfortably seated (it was a mistake when the march was halted, for the demonstrators to bunch up together as closely as they did. For apart from the discomfort when sitting, the task of the police when they came to pick up the sitters was made easier since it was difficult to "go limp" in the uncomfortable sitting up position every-

body had to adopt because of the lack of leg room). A police car then moved along the line of sitters warning them that they were committing an offence, and shortly afterwards, since the only reaction to the warning was a wave of cheering, the vans and coaches moved in to load up their cargo of human protest. Starting at the extremities of the column, the police first removed the Committee leaders; they then took sample loads at various spots along the column. As our fellow-protesters were driven off they were given a loud cheer from the roadway as well as from spectators on the pavement on the other side of the road. This went on for nearly one and a half hours; then one saw two empty coaches arrive presumably to load up more law-breakers. But they didn't. What happened then, according to the *News of the World*, was that

Dozens of police moved among the remaining squatters taking names and addresses and warning them that if they stayed seated they would be arrested. Most of them moved on to the pavement to avoid detention.

This is a naked lie! The police may have taken names and given warnings, though this did not happen in the vicinity of the writer. What did happen instead, was that the police, starting from the Trafalgar Square end, began to pick up the sitters and carry or drag them to the pavement and dump them there. At one stage in the operation



a certain amount of rough handling took place, with the police actually throwing their limp human bundles onto people who had already been dumped on the pavement. One demonstrator, who turned out to be a Justice of the Peace, rose to ask an Inspector for his name (since the hierarchy of the Force do not wear their badge of slavery on their shoulders as does, for instance P.C. G.434 who many of us thought was throwing people about with a little too much gusto). The Inspector simply refused to give it and walked off. So far from being intimidated by the 800 arrests and by threats of further arrests, no one left the roadway on his feet. Everyone had to be removed by the police. Once on the pavement the police cordon sanitaire was reformed, shoulder to shoulder they were, and we were then informed that we were at liberty to stay until the end of the demonstration, that we were not under arrest, and that anyone who wished to could leave. So far as we could see no-one vacated his or her piece of pavement, apart from one

or two hopeless attempts to get through the police cordon to the roadway. At 5.45 p.m. the demonstrators made their way back to Trafalgar Square through a funnel of policemen, and there they dispersed. These are the facts of the demonstration last Saturday.

★

NOW, let us examine, what at the outset we called the "successes". First, the police "success". Undoubtedly the police high-ups and the Home Secretary, Mr. Butler, in the light of the magnitude and homogeneity of the February 18th sit-down viewed the second demonstration, with some apprehension. Obviously it was not a traffic problem that was worrying them. After all every time the Queen travels from the Palace to Euston Station the flow of London traffic is far more affected than it would have been had Parliament Square been "occupied" by the demonstrators on a Saturday afternoon. It is also clear that the Home Secretary did not fear that we were on the threshold of the social revolution. But Authority, whether it calls itself Tory or socialist, cannot allow its authority to be flouted and challenged by the people, for the very simple reason that to defend it, it relies on, say, one per cent. force and 99 per cent. acquiescence, apathy or bluff (which includes fear of the consequences arising from flouting the law). The strength of demonstrations, such as those organised by the Committee of 100, lies less in the mass support they receive than in the willingness and ability of those engaged in them, to pursue their objectives in spite of the sanctions of the law. That high police officials should have, last Saturday, shown willingness to reach

Continued on page 3

YANKEES, NO! CASTRO, NO! FREEDOM, YES!

The real revolution in Cuba is yet to come. It will be the social revolution against both Fidel Castro's totalitarianism and American imperialism. Both these pernicious forces must be overthrown. The Libertarian League calls upon all independent radicals to demand that the Cuban people be allowed to make their own revolution, free from outside interference from either side.

We honour all freedom fighters who stand for greater liberty and social justice and not for turning the hands of the clock back. They must be free from dependence on American imperialist interests.

The Cuban revolution has been betrayed by Castro. It will be doubly betrayed by U.S. interference. Cuba must not become a Korea or a Laos. Neither the American State Department nor the Soviet Union have any right to intervene in the Cuban revolution. Castro's mistake was that in reaction to American pressure he took Cuba into the soviet orbit and introduced Stalinist forms and methods detrimental to liberty. Castro's revolution moved in the reactionary direction of totalitarian nationalisation rather than forward to a truly revolutionary solution through workers' control.

Statement on CUBA by the Libertarian League of New York

Let the Cuban people understand Castro and deal with him. Let Cuba if necessary stand a while longer as an example to the rest of Latin America of what a totalitarian regime is like. In good time the Cubans themselves will see through it and will overthrow it themselves. This issue cannot be forced without opening the door either to a long and bloody civil war or to a revival of the North American imperialist exploitation which has already been repudiated.

To Latin Americans of all social classes, U.S. imperialism is the hereditary enemy. They have had very little experience with Stalinist imperialism and its methods. Castro's defiance of U.S. imperialism struck a responsive chord. Many non-Stalinists have been carried away by enthusiasm for a "social revolution" on their doorstep.

Some of the changes initiated after the fall of Batista have appeared to benefit the common man. The North American sugar interests were pushed aside and many long-overdue

social reforms were inaugurated. Most of those who are now fighting Castro were participants in these social changes.

But, as happened in Russia over 40 years ago, the genuine social revolution has been usurped by the statist counter-revolution of the totalitarian "communists". The revolution of the people, became a revolution of the State which replaced private capitalism by state capitalism.

Batista was overthrown by a combination of forces and circumstances. It was not the work of Fidel Castro personally. Students, workers and intellectuals had died by the thousands in the struggle. Batista had been weakened and his army was practically useless. Even so it is doubtful if victory could have been assured without the material aid of the Betancourt Government of Venezuela, and the last minute withdrawal of the U.S. props under the tyranny.

In the 28 months since the overthrow of the tyrant Batista the Cuban state has developed along definite totalitarian lines. Most industries and the major sectors of Cuban agriculture have been nationalised under rigid state control. The unions have been converted into a servile "labour front" of the State. The autonomy of the University has

Continued on page 3

ANARCHY 3

includes
Moving with the times . . . but not in step
Maurice Goldman's South African notebook
Jeremy Westall on Africa & the future
Nicolas Walter on "The Long Revolution"
Anthony Weaver on Exceptional Children
ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.

Meeting for May Day

SUNDAY MAY 7 at 7.30 pm
Sponsored jointly by The London Anarchist Group and 'The Agitator' at the WORKING MEN'S CLUB AND INSTITUTE, Clerkenwell Road EC1 (Next to the Holborn Hall)

Speakers:
Bob Pennington ('Agitator')
Philip Sansom (LAG)
Admission Free

'We don't want to die' - 2

(Continued from previous issue)

AND let's face another unpleasant fact. World War III, if there is a World War III, will be a nuclear war, whatever is arranged in advance.

Even if the statesmen of the World did decide to agree on some control system, and even if it was foolproof, and even if all the existing stock piles of nuclear weapons and factories for making nuclear weapons were destroyed, the knowledge of how to make bombs would still be there. Once a war started, the redevelopment of atomic bombs would start. Within a year, both sides would have a small supply at least, of nuclear weapons ready for use.

Whether the emerging supply of weapons would include hydrogen bombs is, of course, a different question. Side by side with the development of bigger and better bombs, there has been the development of controlled atomic explosions, and tactical nuclear weapons, capable of laying flat a mere nine or ten square miles. Some military expert has said that these comparatively small bits of nastiness will be the weapons of the next war. Hydrogen bombs are all right for destroying a country, but they are too devastating, too generous in their destruction, to be of much use in conquering a country.

All right. But what about the country

that knows it is defeated, that it is only a matter of time before the members of its government are convicted for war crimes and hanged? May not such a government decide to use the hydrogen bomb, as the Germans used the buzz-bombs and V-2 rockets at the end of World War II, as a last act of vengeance?

So if a hydrogen bomb is dropped on us, we'll know we've as good as won.

We may ask ourselves what the scientists, who originally developed the cyclotron and "split the atom", thought they were doing. What did they think would come of it? Probably not much; Dr. Millikan, one of the scientists who worked on the original research project, said in 1935 that while atomic energy was theoretically feasible, it could not possibly be developed for a least two hundred and fifty years. But if any of them did have a vision of a future world, equipped with atomic power, can we suppose that he thought in terms of bombs?

Wilbur and Orville Wright, when they developed the aeroplane, described how it could be used eventually for carrying mail, and for rushing doctors to the bedsides of patients. The thought of dropping bombs on civilians never occurred to them.

Now there are starry-eyed scientists busy getting to the moon. Some of them want to get to it just because it's there. Some of them see in it the first stage of a visionary adventure, settling the surplus population of earth on other planets. But the statesmen of the world, and the military experts of the world, who are actually paying for space research out of the taxes they take from

ordinary people, have a more practical object in mind.

They say: "The government that controls the moon controls the earth."

Project Mohole, the experiment to dig through the earth's crust to find out what is underneath, seems a particularly innocuous bit of research. But when the statesmen get hold of it, they'll probably turn it into a method of blowing the planet itself to smithereens.

* * *

What hope is there?

Mr. Thomson, in his *Sunday Telegraph* letter, thinks the hope lies in the new American President. He says:

All the energies of those who desire peace should be devoted to educating public opinion in favour of the surrender of sovereignty to a World Authority implicit in controlled disarmament.

But the people who have to surrender their sovereignty are the governments, the statesmen, the power-maniacs. Public opinion, the vast majority of ordinary people, have already surrendered their sovereignty by acknowledging themselves to be citizens, by accepting the constitution, by agreeing that they have certain duties towards the state.

There is hope in multilateralism. The governments may decide, one way or another, to surrender part of their power. They've had 274 meetings already at Geneva, and decided absolutely nothing. But there is still hope.

There is hope too, in unilateralism. Some very able politicians are convinced unilateralists, and they may take over the state, and still remain convinced unilateralists. The Britain-Must-Give-A-Lead crowd, of course, think this would

shame the American and Russian statesmen into giving up their nuclear arms—an even less likely proposition. But there is hope, of a kind.

And there is hope, of course, in the deterrent effect of the bomb itself. We know that no statesman, and no militarist, has ever worried about killing millions of people in an enemy country, or surrendering the lives of as many of his own subjects as necessary for winning a war. We know that the humanitarian American government was unmoved by this bezeesus about "your children and your children's children" when it came to dropping atom bombs on Japan. But now there is a new factor. The statesman who starts the next great war annihilates himself. If only statesmen were sane people this would be the greatest hope of the lot.

Unfortunately, it looks as if idealism, and national prestige, and moral what's-name, are more important to statesmen than life itself. But while we're grasping at straws like multilateralism and unilateralism, we might as well mention the hope of deterrence too.

Lastly, there is the hope implicit in the spirit of the march itself, a piece of mass emotion crying out: "We don't want to die."

Here are a crowd of people, responsible citizens for the most part, or kids on the way to becoming responsible citizens, who yet have enough sense to see that citizenship is not enough. A crowd of ordinary people who refuse to be content with a society which cannot gratify even the simple, sane emotional feelings of ordinary people such as: "We don't want to die."

Perhaps most of the marchers don't realize it, but opposition to the hydrogen bomb involves opposition to the state as well; not merely opposition to a particular government which insists on having hydrogen bombs, but opposition to the state itself as an institution. It is inevitable in the nature of statesmen, that they will go to extreme lengths to defend the power they have worked so

hard to win. And as long as there are statesmen, there remains the danger that they will use the hydrogen bomb to defend their power. Even the existence of a World State would not preclude a World Civil War.

There is one faint bright spot. In the long run no government rules without consent. No government can collect taxes, or expect good conscientious work on things like bombs, or make war effectively, unless its subjects, including most of its thoughtful and vocal subjects, are willing to let it stay where it is.

Members of the anti-bomb movement must recognize that their marching, and sitting down, and going limp, and paddling canoes to oppose the wishes of the duly elected democratic government of the country, is a flagrant defiance of the constitution. And they must extend that defiance far enough to weaken the constitution.

It is all very well to say anarchism is all right in theory, but will it work in practice? Government is all right in theory, but in practice it produces the hydrogen bomb. We cannot, of course, have anarchy overnight, but what we might have within a year, if the campaigners for nuclear disarmament take the courage to go the whole hog, is an effective vocal minority which is at war with the state, and defies the state, and avoids co-operating with the state on every possible occasion. We can make a weak government in this country, and that means a peaceful government.

Mr. Thomson says the marchers should devote their energies to educating public opinion in favour of the surrender of sovereignty implicit in controlled disarmament. We say surrender of sovereignty—individual sovereignty—has gone too far already. Our best hope now is to educate public opinion against the surrender of sovereignty implicit in the state itself.

DONALD ROOM.

BOOKS?

We can supply

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

NEW BOOKS

Darwinism and the Study of Society: a Centenary Symposium M. Banton 21/-
The Tiger and the Horse Robert Bolt 8/6
Jealousy Alain R. Grillet 10/6
Karl Marx: Short Biography E. Stepanova 3/6
Ned Kelly G. Bond 10/6
The Spring Ilya Ehrenberg 18/-
Next Stop Paradise M. Hsrlasko 18/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Mackerel Plaza Peter de Vries 5/-
Main Street Sinclair Lewis 5/-
Justine Lawrence Durrell 5/-
Education through Art Herbert Read 12/6
The Sexual Revolution Wilhelm Reich 25/-
The Complete Ronald Firbank 42/-
Introduction to Politics Harold Laski 4/6
The Conquest of Happiness Bertrand Russell 6/-
History of Western Philosophy Bertrand Russell 30/-
Marriage and Morals Bertrand Russell 6/-
Chinese Poems Arthur Waley 6/-
Borstal Boy Brendan Behan 5/-

SECOND-HAND

The Varieties of Religious Experience William James 6/6
Reflections on Hanging Arthur Koestler 6/-
Quaker Relief Roger C. Wilson 4/6
God is my Adventure Rom Landau 6/6
The Epic of the Alcazar Geoffrey McNeill-Moss 7/6
The Torment of Secrecy Edward Shils 3/6
Bertha von Suttner and the World War Caroline Playne 4/-
Russia and Britain Edward Crankshaw 3/-
The English Middle Classes Roy Lewis and Angus Maude 3/-
Lenin (Official Biography) 3/-

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily; 10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays; 10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

Viewpoint on

CUBA

ed during their two years of freedom from tyranny, and that if Krushchev or Kennedy gained control of a government in Cuba, there would be no political means of repelling them.

The only way in which the Cubans will be able to defend and extend their revolution will be if they can keep power in their own hands, on the collectives, in the militias and in the streets. They will have to be sufficiently clear-sighted to defend the revolution and not the government of Castro, and to fight for individual freedom against the encroachments of authoritarian methods without throwing in their lot with sympathisers of capitalism.

IT was a closed shop for most of the Bond Street boys at the beginning of the week, for gallery after gallery was locked and shuttered for re-hanging and the art lover flatfooting along the Golden Mile found that if he wished to view the products he had to breathe on the window like a Bisto kid in an attempt to sniff the rarified odours of sanctity that came drifting through an occasional open door.

I stood outside the Molton Gallery at 44 South Molton Street, W.1., and watched William Turnbull sweating it out in the window with a massive length of polished tree trunks and when Turnbull had finally placed it in position we both stood back to admire it. I on the stones and Turnbull inside the gallery.

When I returned some hours later I found that we had both been admiring the base for another of Turnbull's latest adventures into art. One can become a little breathless in attempting to keep up with Turnbull's exploration into the past and this current exhibition must be fathered onto the late Constantin Brancusi, for the 80-year-old Rumanian who died in '57 not only gave the world some memorable minor works of art but by the very simplicity of his style spawned a myriad imitators. Turnbull has taken simple standing phallic shapes and has given them a tension by balancing a large oval egg on the tip. One is reminded of a recurring theme of Dalí's when in life and in painting he would balance a long French loaf on the head of his model. Turnbull is at liberty to work as he pleases but while the name

It is unfortunately understandable that under the threat of outside intervention, the people are usually more ready to surrender their freedom to a dictator, and it is depressing to see for instance in the response to Thomas's newly-published history of the Spanish War, that the policy of liquidating a revolution in the interests of anti-fascist unity is still the accepted line from one end of the socialist spectrum to the other. Politicians need to stand together, but in Cuba, just as in Spain, the people can only gain in strength and unity by rejecting political leaders both in their own land and from the power blocs.

All we can do in England is to reject support for any of the groups which are seeking to achieve a monopoly of power in Cuba, but at the same time to avoid a pessimistic fence-sitting attitude, and to remember that the creative forces loosed by the anti-Batista movement in Cuba have the strength within themselves to preserve their revolution if they only keep their independence. P.H.

Round the Galleries

of most practising artists immediately conjures up a vision of their known and personally created style Turnbull is known only for his essays into other men's creations. Turnbull surely owes it to himself to work out a personal interpretation of his inner eye for in the end we must always prefer the master to the pupil.

The Marshall Gallery was closed and deserted and without the cheerful off-beat characters who gave it life. It has relapsed into a grimy little shop in a slummy back street. Gallery One was bolted and barred, for the sweated and soft-spoken Victor Musgrave who runs it has decided to move to richer pastures complete with cash register, sucker list and a fine little stable of creative artists.

The Beaux Arts in their turn were closed and as I peeped around the edge of the door I found myself gazing into what appeared to be a pair of headless eyes. The whole business was unpleasantly reminiscent of Dotheboys Hall. The window of the closed Portal Gallery was graced by one of the two dealers who run this small and exciting gallery but the star-dust has finally faded from their eyes for he scowled into my inno-

cent face and turned to arrange the solitary oil that formed his background. This is still the best of the small galleries and it is right that critic, dealer and artist should hate the sight of each other, for in spite of all the cant that is written and spoken they can only debase each other in association. When the three are working in harmony then you will have a spiv dealer and a sycophantic critic living on a third-rate artist.

The Grosvenor Gallery at 15 Davies Street, W.1., is showing the collages of Miss Whiting who exhibits under her Christian name of Lorri. She has arranged grey oblongs of paper into loose spiral forms and one can read into them a whirlpool of mysterious envelopes swirling into an unknown destination. For those interested in the Kandinsky exhibition at the Marlborough at 39 Old Bond Street, W.1., I would suggest that they find it worth their while to stroll across to the Lefevre at 30 Bruton Street, W.1., where they will find, No. 12, a small oil of Kandinsky's painted in 1905.

Kandinsky painted his first true abstraction in 1910, yet here in this coastal scene painted near Rugen is the hint of all that was to follow. The cold, raw colours even to Joyce's "snot green sea", the lack of depth and the sense of doom that even the bright colour could not alleviate and the dehumanized figure of Gabrielle Munter merging into a mosaic of colours that spelt Kandinsky's and his disciples rejection of the singing, bleeding world around them.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

THE PEOPLE IN THE STREET

Continued from page 1
a compromise arrangement with the Committee is both an acknowledgment of their respect for the demonstrators' determination and integrity, as well as an admission of the impotence of the Executive when challenged. Not by a pin-striped, House-trained opposition "on the benches opposite", playing the game according to the rules (mutually agreed, for their own protection, as politicians) but by the people ... in the streets.*

We try, to the best of our ability, to base our opinions on evidence not wishful thinking. The facts so far as last Saturday's sit-down is concerned are that (a) there were probably 2,000 fewer demonstrators than at the previous sit-down, that is about half; (b) the authorities, sharing the Committee's optimism, reckoned on there being 3,000 more demonstrators than in fact there were and laid their plans accordingly; (c) in spite of the fact that the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police based his personnel requirements on the assumption that there would be 5,000 and not 2,500 demonstrators, yet in the middle of Whitehall he is prepared to negotiate a face-saving alternative; (d) this being refused by the Committee of 100 the police had to start arresting people on a mass scale or lose

face; (e) but the moment they do so, other machinery is set in motion; the people arrested must be taken into custody, charged searched and appear before a magistrate within 24 hours. It may involve having to spend the night in custody, which adds to the problems.

It was quite clear last Saturday that in carrying out what the *News of the World* headlined "The Greatest Mass Arrest of the Century" they had bitten off more than the courts could chew. It would only have needed a plan of non-co-operation—such as refusing to give one's name, pleading not guilty, insisting that the actual policeman who carried out the arrest should give evidence—to have given the machinery of law and order chronic indigestion. As it was certain legal formalities were bypassed at the police stations and by the Courts in order to deal with what were, after all, good-humoured prisoners!

It would seem, from the evidence last Saturday, that had there been 5,000 sit-downers, even with the large police force on duty, they would not have been able to clear the roadway within the time-limit of the demonstration. But of course we do not doubt that the police have many more tricks up their sleeves to deal with future demonstrations.



SO far as the State's "success" is concerned, it is clear to us that the government was anxious to vindicate its authority without having to resort to methods which would spotlight the demonstration, and in this sense its success—in having the roads cleared—was at the same time a failure in that it was done by means which resulted in the biggest publicity the unilateralists have so far received.

So far as the success of the demonstration is concerned, there can be no doubt that in spite of smaller numbers, and in spite of the fact that Parliament Square was not reached the demonstrators were tested and came out of the test stronger and more determined. But it seems to us that a number of lessons have to be learned from the demonstration so far as tactics are concerned for future actions. But because we believe that one lesson is that one cannot co-operate with the police, we do not propose to discuss in public what, in our opinion, future tactics should be. But it is obvious that a movement of civil disobedience and protest cannot achieve its objectives if it gives advance information to the "enemy" as to its programme thus handing the initiative to the authori-

ties every time.

Nevertheless with all its defects last Saturday's demonstration was an advance so far as the mood of the demonstrators was concerned. Of the 18th February demonstration we wrote in *FREEDOM* "Sit-down—without illusions". Of the 29th April one is tempted to substitute "with hope", for perhaps for the first time many people became aware of the strength that lies in each of us when we start thinking and acting as individuals in a "community" of individuals. And let us not forget one important asset of these sit-downs; the comradeship that is forged by the people "in the streets".

*We have in mind that passage from Kropotkin's *Great French Revolution* in which he wrote: "One can guess the revolutionary results which were to be expected from these representatives who always kept their eyes fixed on the law—the royal and feudal law; fortunately the 'anarchists' had something to say in the matter. But these 'anarchists' knew that their place was not in the Convention, among the representatives—their place was in the streets; they understood that if they ever set foot inside the Convention, it must not be to debate with the 'members of the Right', or the 'frogs of the March'; it must be to exact something, either from the top of the galleries where the public sat, or through an invasion of the Convention, with the people at their back."

Beside Eichmann

IT seems to me that R.M. is getting on very slippery ground when she writes, "... since he [Eichmann] was directly responsible for the inhuman treatment of millions of people he relinquished his claim to be regarded as human himself."

The Eichmann trial is a rather depressing example of revenge. Nothing that can be done to Eichmann could equal the suffering he caused, so that even as revenge it is futile. His death will not bring back to life the millions he killed. His release, to go free wherever he wishes, would be a magnanimous gesture which would do Israel immense credit, and would be the truest victory over everything for which Eichmann stands.

If however we are to start putting people in the dock, a dubiously anarchist proceeding, for crimes against humanity, there will be no end to it.

Eichmann may have been responsible, directly responsible, for more deaths than is common among members of ruling classes. But he had exceptional opportunities. Yet one must ask, "Is it more atrocious to kill six million than six hundred, or even six? We can't base morality on numbers surely?"

If mass-murder is to become a penal offence then what of the military commanders of the last two world wars (and the other minor ones), who threw whole divisions into battles, fully realising that they would be decimated, but considering the sacrifice necessary to victory? Is not this genocide?

Besides Eichmann the following should stand in the dock:

Sir Winston Churchill and his advisers, for genocide of the German people by the "obliteration bombing" of their cities.

The following should stand in the Dock..

The American statesmen responsible for the atom-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Mrs. Bandaranaike for the campaign against the Tamils.

Mr. Nehru for the war against the Nagas.

Dr. Verwoerd for "apartheid".

The Australian statesmen responsible for the "white Australia" policy, which has no doubt been indirectly responsible for many Asians starving to death who might have lived had they been able to settle in Australia.

Batista for shooting his political opponents.

Castro for doing the same, if on a smaller scale.

The dock is now beginning to fill up with people who have, whether they know it or not, relinquished their claim to be members of the human race. But we cannot stop here. The victims of the peoples' justice could turn round and say:

"We merely carried out the policies that you, the public, demanded. If you wished us to stop, why did you not stop us? A police chief or politician cannot murder six million (thousand, hundred) Jews (Negroes, Gypsies, Nagas) single-handed. None of this could have been done without public acquiescence at least."

Freedom for Cuba

Continued from page 1
been wiped out. Freedom of the press and communication in general, freedom of association and assembly have all virtually ceased to exist. The tentacles of the totalitarian State have penetrated into every aspect of Cuban life.

The only legal political party in Cuba today is the Popular Socialist Party (Stalinist). Anti-communism is equated by Castro with counter-revolution. The 26th of July movement has in essence dissolved, leaving Fidel Castro and a few of his intimates as collaborators of the Stalinist organisation. The latter has a stranglehold on the national and provincial committees of all the labour unions, all of which it controls. But this is a simple formality anyway since the Minister of Labour can remove union committees and functionaries at will. The Minister of Labour, Augusto Martinez Sanchez is an old Stalinist militant according to our Cuban comrades.

Stalinism succeeded in imposing a much more repressive and tighter dictatorship than Batista's ever was. The masses are controlled by a combination of demagoguery and terror. They have thus had less opportunity to develop their struggle. The present fight against Castro called for political and social actions leading up to a general strike, which could then perhaps be clinched by an armed struggle. But the political coalition of the opposition chose a military solution instead. "This has been unfortunate but it follows in the Latin-American tradition. It follows the same general pattern as in the case of the anti-Batista revolt.

The "invaders" of Cuba were sincere, dedicated Cubans ready to die to save their country from an odious dictatorship. They are the same kind of people that fought with Castro three years ago. Many if not most of them are the very same people. This was not an invasion in the commonly accepted sense. As previously in the case of Castro's 26th of July Movement, the Cuban Revolutionary Council reflects the internal struggle within Cuba itself. The assaults on Cuba's beaches from

abroad were designed to support the anti-dictatorship forces in the island, of which they are but a reflection.

Lovers of freedom throughout the world cannot but support the efforts to oust Castro, however long it may take. In the last analysis, only the Cuban people themselves can solve the political and social problems of their country. This they must do against both North American and Russian imperialist interests. To the extent that the U.S. is known to aid the opposition forces, the Cuban masses will hesitate to support them. We know, and the Cuban workers know that the U.S. State Department is incapable of opposing Stalinist tyranny on the only basis on which it can be effectively fought.

In Hungary in 1956 it was the anti-Stalinist radicals who led the Struggle. For reasons of their own, reactionary and even totalitarian elements participated in the revolution. In Cuba the non-radical play a bigger part. These consist of two main categories: the American imperialists and their Cuban lackeys who want to restore a Batista type dictatorship and the anti-totalitarian coalition represented in the Cuban Revolutionary Council. We are 100% against the former and will fight them with every means that we can.

On the other hand, our sympathies are wholeheartedly with every real opponent of totalitarianism. Libertarians, socialists, anti-stalinist radicals of all kinds, "democratic conservatives" and liberals of every shade are currently making common cause against the Stalino-Castrist dictatorship in Cuba. Insofar as they fight for political freedom we support them. To the extent that some of them want to re-establish private or "welfare" capitalism we oppose them. The victory of the anti-totalitarians could create a fluid situation and open the way for the extension and libertarian development of the revolution aborted and usurped by Castro.

The struggle against both Castro and American economic interests trying to re-establish themselves in

The objection is just. The present writer himself supported the Second World War, in childhood and early adolescence. He was old enough to have known better. Multiply him by about forty to fifty million other nearly-grown children, adolescents and adults in the British Isles who believed that it was justifiable to conduct a policy of genocide against the German and Japanese peoples, and you can understand where the responsibility lay. Forty million Eichmanns can't be wrong. Or can they?

If people are to be put on trial for crimes against humanity, or punished for supporting inhuman policies, or simply put out of the way as people no longer belonging to the human race, then the present writer, along with not a few other persons, should also stand beside Eichmann.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

*Obviously this list is not exhaustive. I have included Germans and Japanese in it, since everyone is agreed as to their guilt. They committed the crime of being defeated.

STATEMENT BY THE 'THIRD FORCE'

In connection with the opening of the Eichmann Trial, "The Third Force" movement in Israel (5, Yavneh Street, Tel Aviv. Tel. 63768) issued the following statement:

"We are deeply satisfied with the fact that the abominable mass-murderer who caused terrible suffering, humiliation and death to millions of Jews, has been caught and held by Jews. This is an act of supreme and most encouraging justice.

But with deep sorrow and shame we ask:

Israel that for 13 years has been enforcing exile, misery and decay on hundreds of thousands of men, women and children whose only guilt is that they are Arabs.

Israel that has deprived her Arab inhabitants of elementary human rights, robbed most of their lands, turned their villages into ghettos and forces them to beg for a permit for every move in the country the soil of which is soaked with their and their fathers' sweat and blood.

Israel of Kibya, Gaza, Kafr Kassem and of the wanton murderous attack on Egypt—has this Israel the moral right to judge a Nazi?

Israel that has deprived her Arab inhabitants of the right to live in peace and to denounce the Germans who were silent during the beastly Nazi reign. 'Even the "good Germans" drew profits from the plunder of Jews. Even German liberals and leftists became Nazis.' There is truth in these accusations.

But how do behave the Jews in Israel? Do they not approve—and not tacitly, but quite loudly—the inhuman actions of their government? Are there many Jewish houses in Israel that do not harbour some stolen Arab property? Do not the Kibbutzim—all Kibbutzim—build 'socialism' on robbed Arab land? Do not Israeli 'socialists' and 'progressives' stand at the head of a government whose hands are covered with innocent Arab blood?

What a spectacle! In the City of the Prophets and under the eyes of Humanity they are sitting in judgment.

Upon whom? Upon a man whom they follow in thought and deed.

(Sgd.) M. STEIN, Chairman.
A. ZICHRONY, Secretary."

Cuba will go on. People raised in the tradition of Simon Bolivar and Jose Marti will never supinely submit to the slavery of statism. Nor will they allow foreign capitalists to again exploit the Cuban people.

Those American radicals who shut their eyes to the monstrous growth of state power under Castro, betray the cause of human liberty. Power and the fruits of their labour must belong to the whole people. No one should tell them what to do. They should themselves make all the decisions.

This goal is no longer utopian; it is the only goal to which true revolutionists can wholeheartedly subscribe.

