

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Laws . . . Good people don't need them, and bad people don't obey them, so what good are they?"

—AMMON HENNACY

Vol. 22, No. 6

February 11th, 1961

Threepence

Mr. Exchequer - Philanthropist

AT last the Government has given the Opposition something to get its dentures into. Announcing increased NHS contributions, the doubling of payments for prescriptions, increased charges for dentures and spectacles, the Government will thereby "save the Exchequer" £72 million in a full year. After all, Mr. Exchequer has been providing no less than £663 million out of the £867 million which was spent on the Health Service last year, and he would have had to find more this year since it appears that the Health bill will rise by a further 11 per cent.

Now who is this generous, philanthropic Mr. Exchequer who has been making it possible for us to get something for nothing, or almost? Where does he get his great wealth from? Last year just from those of us who smoke and drink he collected more than £700 million in Excise Duty, enough to pay for the whole Health Service. He is the super monopolist collecting from us in the course of the year more than £3,000 million one way or another, either by stealth or by the threat of force and then he alone decides how

he will spend our money, only informing us after he has spent it where it has gone. Mr. Exchequer considers for instance that £1,500 million spent on the Defence racket is money well spent. Why only the day after his spokesman the Minister of Health was telling us that we have got to buck up our ideas about "free" health services, his former boss, Mr. Peter Thornycroft (with whom he resigned from the government in 1958 in protest at the Cabinet's refusal to set a ceiling on social service estimates), was attending the 16-nation meeting at Strasbourg at which he declared that Britain was prepared "to increase her contribution to a European-British Commonwealth satellite launching project from £17 millions to £23 millions." A mere £6 millions which Mr. Exchequer feels is money well spent and which he can well afford by saving £1.6m. on spectacles, £1.5m. on welfare food charges, £1m. on dentures and the rest from the £12.5 million he is going to save on prescription

charges.

It's all a question of priorities, and the government knows best what is good for us. Did somebody say the trouble is that the wrong party is in power? Judging by the indignation of the Opposition when the announcement was made (we go to press before the debate in the Commons) it would seem that our heckler is right, except for one small detail which he has forgotten or was too young at the time to have noticed: that it was the *Labour government* which introduced the shilling charge on prescriptions, and over which the then Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan, resigned from the government!

There is no such thing as a free health service. We all pay for it one way and another. And the poor pay more than anybody else, indirectly if one has one's gaze fixed only on the balance sheet, but directly if one pauses to ask oneself why it is that in our society some are poor while others are wealthy!



OUR SUGGESTION FOR THE CREW FOR THE FIRST MANNED EUROPEAN ROCKET

1500 Volunteers for Sit-Down

BY February 1st the Committee of 100 had received 1,200 pledges to participate in the non-violent sit-down demonstration outside the Ministry of Defence on February 18th. The sit-down will be led by Bertrand Russell and Michael Scott in protest against the Polaris agreement and all policies that depend on weapons of mass destruction. In the light of this dramatic response to its appeal for volunteers the Committee has firmly decided to go ahead with the demonstration. Meanwhile recruiting for further volunteers continues. As we go to Press we understand that a further 300 pledges have been received.

The sit-down is to be preceded by a march from Marble Arch to Trafalgar Square starting at 1 p.m. and a rally in the Square starting at 2 p.m. Speakers will include Bertrand Russell, Herbert Read, Michael Scott, and Hugh MacDiarmid. After the rally demonstrators will march down Whitehall to the Ministry of Defence where the sit-down will commence. A declaration signed by all demonstrators and posted up on the main door of the Defence Ministry will serve notice on the Government that the demonstration is the first in a campaign of non-violent civil disobedience against weapons of mass destruction.

A supporting march of those not intending to take part in the sit-down will follow the demonstrators down Whitehall and continue past Parliament Square into Victoria Street and Tothill Street.

Local branches of a number of Trade Unions have sent donations and messages of support for the demonstration. The Seven Sisters Lodge of the National Union of Mineworkers representing 650 miners in South Wales is sending two delegates to take part in the demonstration. Donations and messages of support have come from seven A.E.U. branches. Last week-end delegates to a meeting of A.S.S.E.T. (Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives & Technicians) voted to support the demonstration; at least eight of those present at the meeting are expected to take part in the sit-down.

Two playwrights who are members of the Committee have confirmed that they will be taking part in the demonstration. They are Arnold Wesker and Robert Bolt.

Who cares about the Pawns in

ALGERIA

SINCE the Arab Nationalists have now declared themselves ready for a new attempt at negotiating the organization of free elections in Algeria; since everyone, including General de Gaulle, seems to hold that such election are the only way of achieving "self-determination" for Algerians; since it should not be technically impossible to provide some form of neutral supervision of the ballot; since everyone seems to agree with everyone else on the main point at issue, why is it, one may wonder, that they are not falling into one another's arms and organizing these elections at once? Why don't they stop the war and consult the people?

The answer, or part of it, is that the people never do have a say in such things. Although everyone is officially clamouring for self-determination, it is obvious to anyone knowing the rules of the political game that the next Algerian ballot will have no more significance than any other ballot: the outcome will be independence, and so the real issue is the organization of power in the future independent state; but it stands to reason that, on such serious matters, the people cannot possibly be left to decide for themselves. Elections will be called simply to approve of what will have been agreed upon by the political leaders of both sides. Such an agreement is not yet in sight, although negotiations are notoriously going on "in secret" between the French government and the Algerian rebels. The reason for that secrecy is that both sides are afraid of losing their prestige should the negotiations fail, and of letting it be known to the world at large, and to the Algerian victims in particular, that there is in fact little or not question of peace in these talks: the stake being power, the politicians prefer playing their game patiently and quietly, far from the

madding crowd and its cries for peace.

★

IN order to safeguard as many of their economic and political interests as possible, the French will only negotiate peace from a "position of strength"—which means waving the threat of an alternative French solution should the rebels prove intractable. Hence the setting up of a semi-autonomous administration, the increase of military pressure on, and control of, the Muslim population; hence also de Gaulle's insistence on a "peaceful confrontation of all tendencies", the function of which would simply be to reduce the importance of the FLN to that of a tendency among others, of an ineffectual minority. But the FLN will not accept being placed in such a position, and so the game goes on.

One must bear in mind that the rebel leaders are seasoned politicians too, and that their aim is not simply independence for Algeria, but power for the FLN. Ever since the beginning of the armed rebellion, the FLN leaders have ruthlessly pursued the physical elimination of all rival anti-French organisations. Their attitude towards the more socially conscious MNA (the Algerian National Movement, led by the famous syndicalist Messali Hadj) is a case in point: members of the FLN have fought full-scale battles against MNA rebels in Algeria over the past few years, and have apparently succeeded in almost totally suppressing them; in France, members of the MNA have always been accused by agents of the FLN of being the stooges of the French police, and executed as traitors, in the purest Bolshevik tradition. Having appointed themselves the sole representatives of the Algerian

Continued on p. 2

An Ambitious Experiment Concerning FREEDOM'S FUTURE

FOR many months past FREEDOM'S columns have included a number of letters and articles on the subject of how anarchist ideas can best be communicated to the public by the written word. We have in the main published contributions from those readers who had suggestions to make for changing the format, the frequency as well as the editors of FREEDOM. Similarly so far as the editors were concerned the floor was taken by those who favoured change. But to restore the balance, we should point out that very many readers when ordering books, or renewing their subscriptions have, in passing, put in their plea that FREEDOM should continue as a weekly publication. The editors of FREEDOM are not unanimous on the subject. Most of us have worked together on the paper for the past fifteen years, each with his or her particular way of approaching the problems of propaganda, of organisation; each with his individual interpretation of anarchism. We hope we will not appear immodest when we suggest that to have "put to bed"—as the print-in fraternity so quaintly describe the process of getting a paper ready for print—something like 650 issues of FREEDOM, is no mean achievement in the circumstances! But neither is it unreasonable that some of us, after watching so many millions of words emerge from the presses over the years, should feel less enthusiastic as to their efficacy, or question the method of approach, or even just feel tired! After all, the results have hardly been brilliant, and the enthusiastic young people prepared to take over for the

next decade while we graze, in our old age, on the green pastures reserved for us (on paper!) by our good friend S.F. have not, so far, materialised. The point is of course that we do not spend our time (and for the sake of new readers we should point out that no-one connected with the many activities of the FREEDOM PRESS is holding down a paid job) publishing a paper, simply for the sake of entertaining our readers; the measure of the success of our efforts is the extent to which anarchist ideas are accepted and acted upon by a growing number of people. Some of us think that the results of 15 years of propaganda have been a dismal failure, and among them some think that it has been because we have not succeeded in "putting over the idea" while others maintain that if the public won't respond there is nothing much that you can do about it. In the third group are those who think that we should intensify our propaganda whether the public is apathetic or enthusiastic. None of us, however, doubts the "rightness", the validity, of anarchism.

★

FOR as many years as we have been connected with the FREEDOM PRESS we have been stressing the need for the newspaper which makes its anarchist propaganda by underlining and commenting on day to day news at home and abroad and the review which is the vehicle for unrestricted (in terms of space) thought and research on basic social, economic and organisational problems which will loom as large in the

Continued on p. 2

Freedom's Future

Continued from p. 1

free society as they do in the authoritarian society in which we live. For years we have attempted to combine both activities in one journal, and have done neither as effectively as we should have wished. And with the FREEDOM PRESS group as leaders will have gathered from the articles of one of our editors there are those who feel it is high time that some of us should have the time to pause and think, to write the kind of articles which the pressure of producing a weekly at present precludes. Others, the present writer included, agree (while hotly denying that no thought goes into the production of FREEDOM!) but we feel that it should not be at the expense of, but in addition to, the publication of FREEDOM "the anarchist weekly".

At our last group meeting we were not unanimous, but, of those who were prepared to accept the responsibility of ensuring continued publication, a compromise was reached which, so far as the present writer is concerned, is one which, even the collaboration of anarchist writers and journalists throughout the world, an intensification of effort on the distribution side; and the continued financial support of our comrades and sympathisers, represents a step forward in our propaganda. Unlike the capitalist press which aims at whittling down the printed word, we aim at increasing ours!

THIS is what we are about to do as an experiment for this year. Our readers' reactions to it will largely determine what we will do next year. For this reason we ask them to co-operate with us at least for this year, and to reserve their judgment until the end of the year. For most of our readers all it means is that the subscription to FREEDOM will cost them 30/- (\$5 for U.S. and Canadian readers) instead of 19/- as at present. Why?

Firstly because with the first issue of FREEDOM in March the price will be increased to 4d., not because that is what in capitalist terms is the "economic" price of FREEDOM but because with the few pounds extra that we will receive each week we are proposing to (a) improve the quality of the paper used (b) buy new display type for headings and (c) include illustrations, which means paying reproduction fees for photographs and the cost of half-tone blocks.

Secondly because on February 25, instead of receiving FREEDOM we shall be sending you the first number of the anarchist review AUTONOMY, a thirty-two page publication which you will go on receiving the last week of each month for the rest of the year instead of FREEDOM which will not be published for that week.

In other words in 1961 we shall be publishing 42 issues of FREEDOM and 10 issues of AUTONOMY. For the casual reader the former will cost 4d. the latter 1/6 a copy. For our subscribers the price is 30/- including postage, which alone accounts for 10/4.

We repeat, this is an experiment we are making not for the sake of dividends for the shareholders, but to further the ideas of anarchism and freedom. Next year, if the necessary support is forthcoming during the next ten months we will publish FREEDOM weekly, that is 52 issues, and the monthly AUTONOMY monthly, that is 12 issues. But it depends on you our comrades and

people, the rebel leaders want to make sure that they will also be the sole masters of the future independent state. If they succeed in securing that aim through negotiations with the French, there will be some hope of a cease-fire. If not, the game—that is: the war—will go on.

IT is interesting to note that one possible incentive behind the FLN's recent peace-offer may have been the fear that, with the prolongation of the war, the national consciousness of the Algerian masses is bound to give way to a more radical class-consciousness and bring about the emergence of new revolutionary leaders, whose authority will be a challenge to the bourgeois ministers of the provisional Algerian government. The Muslim demonstrations that were staged during de Gaulle's visit to Algeria had not been ordered by the FLN and are still lingering on in spite of the FLN's orders to the contrary: thus the initiative of the Algerian population has both reinforced the Nationalist Government's prestige abroad and foreshadowed a real danger for its power in the future state. Under the significant title "Algérie FLN ou Algérie anarchisante?" a journalist goes as far as hinting, in the usually reliable daily *Le Monde* (18.1.61), that "the soldiers of the National Liberation Army garrisoned in Tunisia or Morocco constitute a sort of 'reserve' which might well be of some use to the members of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic, should they encounter the resistance of the 'maquis'-fighters on their return to Algeria to take part in the referendum campaign. The 'external army' would thus be called in to support the authority of men who have long since ceased to take part in the actual fighting or had never done so in the first place." True enough, the seriousness of the FLN's misgivings should not be over-estimated. The rebel leaders are still considered as heroes by the

readers. Your task is clear.

(1) In the course of this month we will be sending out renewal notices to all subscribers. If your subscription is due for renewal then please attend to this important matter without delay.

(2) If you value the work that a paper such as FREEDOM is doing and are aware of the fact that the subscription rate bears no relation to the cost of production (which does not include administration, nor payment to contributors and editors) then you will be among those of our comrades and friends who send contributions to the Deficit Fund, which this year will need your solidarity more than ever.

(3) If you value FREEDOM for yourself, then you will not think we are expecting too much of you when we ask you to do all you can to introduce the paper to friends, or even to sell it at meetings in your locality.

(4) In many respects, inducing those people who can write and who have something to say, to write for FREEDOM or AUTONOMY will be the biggest problem to overcome this year. There is no shortage of capable writers among the anarchists, but few of them seem to feel a sufficiently strong link with the paper to induce them to undertake a regular collaboration. We are hoping that the new developments in our publishing activities will reverse this trend and give an opportunity to anarchists of all tendencies to express themselves in print. Next week we will discuss in more detail what we think the new-look FREEDOM should be as well as outlining the programme for AUTONOMY.

Who cares for the Pawns in Algeria?

people and are in no immediate danger of losing their political hold on them. They can thus afford to pursue the war for quite a long time if it suits them. And the fact that Ferhat Abbas started on his Indonesian tour straight after his last peace-proposal shows that he did not expect an immediate positive answer from the French, but it also shows that he did not even hope for it. The point is precisely that, for the FLN, as for the French, the horrors of the war, the bloodshed, the tortures, the terror, the famine and the misery, do not really matter. The people don't matter, or only in so far as they are the pawns in the political chess-game which both governments are engaged in. The stake is power, and is therefore worth taking one's time before ending the game. Meanwhile, of course, the pawns are falling. But who cares about pawns anyway? De Gaulle has allowed the war to drag on, and the FLN leaders are prepared to sacrifice their own "brothers" in their pursuit of totalitarian power. But, from politicians, such attitudes are to be expected; that is not the sorest point.

THE sorest point about the Algerian war is surely that the French people don't care about it either. Sad to say: they don't really suffer from it enough, they can all too easily bear the burden of the war, both from the economic and the human points of view. The annual rate of casualties on the French side does not much exceed, as one cheerful minister once pointed out, "the number of deaths on the road", and the economic consequences are no doubt less to be felt in the field of consumer-goods than in those of long-term investments such as housing, health, education, electric power, etc. The bulk of the French, moreover, are much more chauvinistic at heart than is generally supposed, and are at present completely hypnotized by de Gaulle's nationalistic haughtiness. It is even possible to assume that, were de Gaulle to-morrow to decide that the interest and glory of France command her to launch upon a full-scale extermination war against the Algerian people, and were he then to consult the nation on this point, he would once more obtain a three-to-one majority in favour of his policy! So that the recent answer of the French to the referendum, though everyone agrees that it was a "yes to peace", means in fact that they hope for peace, not that they really want it: there are no tangible signs whatsoever that they do.

The present government is no doubt partly responsible for lulling the people into that blissful state of indifference, but the political parties of the left have dutifully helped in rocking the cot. Volumes of protests, petitions, manifestos have been issued by those parties in the course of the past six years—none of them insisted that something had to be done. "Sign this paper, and when the time comes, vote for us", was the slogan. At no time was any politician heard to say: "Don't bother to vote, but when the time comes, refuse to fight!" At no time were the people reminded that they had the power to stop the war at once, since they are relied upon to do the fighting and pay for it. Direct action is considered by our worthy political thinkers to be "limited in scope" and ineffective (the efficiency of political action for peace has been proved, of course, beyond all expectations!).

The implication, in any case, is that direct action is individual action and requires individual thinking; it is therefore highly unpolitical and ultimately dangerous for all political parties. The Communists and the

other left-wing groups may well be right in claiming that "the masses" would not at present follow a policy of active resistance to war, but the point is that the principles of such an action have not even been put forward. Here, as always, the parties are concerned with keeping their political "clientèle", not with upholding moral principles. Since the parties are both unable and unwilling to take a firm moral stand with regard to the Algerian war and to war in general, the people themselves have come to feel that the issue is but a political one, which in no way concerns them morally. Nobody, then, seems to care; nobody feels strongly enough about the war to take the personal risk of fighting it personally. That is why all political actions against the war have hitherto been doomed to failure: they had not seriously been meant to succeed in the first place.

IT is not quite true, however, that nobody cares. The encouraging sign is that the young, especially, are beginning to realize that the present inertia of public opinion is due precisely to the organic impotence of the political parties, and that they will have to rely upon themselves if they wish to obtain tangible results. It is thus the Students' Union which took the initiative of staging the mass protest meeting last October and then asked the left-wing parties to join them. (The Communists boycotted the meeting, according to their usual tactic of sabotaging such movements as they cannot control). It is, moreover, interesting to note that the chairman of the Students' Union gave as one of the reasons for staging the demonstration the fact that the pressure in favour of military disobedience was steadily increasing among the rank-and-file, and that some outlet had to be found for the young people's indignation before things got out of hand! That is already typical of a politician's attitude, but at least it reveals the existence of healthy reactions among the young.

It seems that, in spite of the heavy prison sentences, the number of conscientious objectors is still on the increase—though well-nigh all the

left-wing papers conspire in hushing it up. Non-violent action groups are still courageously trying to arouse public opinion, but they, too, have receded into the background: they have ceased to be "news", what with the UNO debate, the referendum, the peace-proposals—and the continuation of the war. There are some others who do care: the intellectuals who signed the Manifesto of the 121. Their case must not be confused (and Hem Day is guilty of such a confusion in his own counter-manifesto recently published in FREEDOM) with that of the Jeanson organization supporting the FLN. It is true that the text of the Manifesto is not a pacifist or an anarchist text. It is true that it does not condemn all wars. It is also true, by the way, that some 120 out of the 121 people who signed it (many of whom are known to hold libertarian ideas) have declared themselves to be not quite in accordance with the exact wording of the text. But it is not true that the Manifesto calls the young to enrol in the Algerian liberation army: the main tenet of the Manifesto, that on which the stress was brought to bear in the public's mind, is the sentence in which the 121 declare that they "respect the refusal to take arms against the Algerian people and consider such a refusal to be justified". The signatories were not irresponsible enough openly to recommend desertion while being themselves too old to bear the consequences of desertion; but to proclaim that desertion or conscientious objection are respectable and justified is, in this country and at this time, a gesture which entails a definite personal risk. That so many thinking and influential people (the total number of signatures exceed 200) should have cared enough about the moral issue of the war to run that risk is in itself encouraging. It is also significant that, with one or two exceptions, none of the signatories belonged to any of the big political parties... Their gesture may well have been "inefficient" from a political point of view: they have, like the conscientious objectors and the nonviolent groups, planted seeds of responsible thinking and courageous action that cannot all be lost.

C.D.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

- Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
- Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
- Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
- Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
- Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
- Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*
- Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*
- Vol. 8, 1958, *Socialism in a Wheelchair*
- Vol. 9, 1959, *Print, Press & Public*

each volume paper 7s. 6d. cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- a copy

- CHARLES MARTIN : *Towards a Free Society* 2s. 6d.
- VOLINE : *Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d. *The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)* cloth 12s. 6d.
- PAUL ELTZBACHER : *Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy)* cloth 21s.
- V. RICHARDS : *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.
- JOHN HEWETSON : *Ill-Health, Poverty and the State* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

- RUDOLF ROCKER : *Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA : *Anarchy* 9d.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI : *Neither East nor West* paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.
- PETER KROPOTKIN : *The State: Its Historic Role* 1s. *The Wage System* 3d. *Revolutionary Government* 3d. *Organised Vengeance* *Called Justice* 2d.
- HERBERT READ : *Poetry and Anarchism* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d. *The Philosophy of Anarchism* boards 2s. 6d. *The Education of Free Men* 1s.
- E. A. GUTKIND : *The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON : *Youth for Freedom* paper 2s. *Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK : *New Life to the Land* 6d. *Homes orhovels?* 6d. *Railways and Society* 3d.

17a, Maxwell Road, Fulham London, S.W.6

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

MENTAL ILLNESS

GLYN HARRY HUGHES writes an interesting and provocative letter in the issue of 28th January, but it is difficult to suppose he is entirely serious.

Undoubtedly, there are people to whom delusions are necessary. We must accept Comrade Hughes's examples of the poor soul lifted from the slough of despond by believing: "I can do all things through Christ", and the wretch saved from suicide by repeating: "Jesus loves me."

We must also agree that all of us have props and crutches in the form of beliefs. Whenever we eat, for instance, we are sustained by the belief that what looks and smells like food is edible, and held in check by the belief that plates are not edible; beliefs which we share with such humble beings as rats, and for which we have a certain amount of a priori evidence, but beliefs which are incapable of logical proof and may on occasion be false.

HAVE YOU ORDERED TOWARDS A FREE SOCIETY by Charles Martin 64 pp. 2s. 6d. post free

there is no actual evidence either way. So delusion and rational belief are alike, in that neither can be proved by logic. Similarly, an elephant is like a biscuit tin, in that neither can ride a bicycle; but it does not follow that there are no important differences.

And we need not be afraid that reasoned argument against faith will persuade those who really need it to give up. No-one gives up a belief unless he is quite capable of managing without it and finds it something of a burden.

"The Army of Today's Alright"

DEAR FRIENDS, "The Army Council and the Air Council had been studying the question of punishments carefully. There appeared to be a gap . . . between detention and the restriction of privileges. . . . In each case the higher punishment was often too severe—particularly for officers.

These extracts from the report on the second reading of the Army & Air Force Bill (Guardian 3/2/61) coming on top of the announcement of increased Health Service charges confirm my prediction forecast of 1955 that the Tories will leave no stone unturned to run the country on the cheap—or to run it in such a manner that their precious tax-concessions shall be fully covered.

Yours fraternally, Southampton, Feb. 3. B. C. BEVIS.

PROMISCUITY

The Editor, FREEDOM. DEAR SIR, In his article on promiscuity, N.W. paints a doleful picture of unenlightened youth. Sex lives are to be lived for their own sakes and not used as instruments of rebellion.

Down with the Deficit!

Table with columns: Deficit on Freedom £100, Contributions received £84, DEFICIT £16

January 30 to February 4

Table with columns: Warrington: J.H.* 7/6; Caterham: F.B. (2 weeks) 10/-; Coventry: R.W. 1/-; London, S.W.A: P.W.C. 2/6; California, San Francisco and Morongo Valley: A.R. and J.S. £3/14/-; London, N.W.6: S.B. 1/-

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: H.M. *Indicates regular contributor.

own sakes and not used as instruments of rebellion. The people who live for kicks and intense pleasures on the sexual level will probably be sadder and wiser when they find they have survived to 30. Has no-one ever told them that we live in a permissive society?

Yours faithfully, W. G. QUADRY (MR.) London, Jan. 29.

DEBATE

Saturday, February 11th—City Literary Institute, Stukeley Street, W.C.2, 7 p.m. Debate: "That the Classless Society is an impossibility".

AN ANARCHIST'S NOTEBOOK

Portugal: The Curtain of Silence is Raised

A WELCOME VOL. 1, NO. 1, WAS AMONG the papers, magazines, bulletins and leaflets we received at FREEDOM office this week. It is the Portuguese and Colonial Bulletin which is to be published monthly in London.

It would seem that the publishers of the Bulletin were not in the secret of the seizure of the Santa Maria as their first issue had already gone to Press when Captain Galvao's daring action captured the news headlines of the world.

In Portugal the people have rights, but only on paper. It is a commentary on the regime that after 33 years of Dr. Salazar there were, in 1959, according to the Anuario Estatístico, 3,811 trials in Portugal leading to convictions for "crimes" against religion, the security of the State and other political offences.

"LIBERATION" THE MONTHLY PUBLISHED IN New York features in its December and January issues an article on Cuba "America's Lost Plantation" by one of its

editors, Dave Dellinger who spent three weeks there last November seeing things for himself. One would like to believe that what he saw was a complete picture of the Castro regime at work, for much of what he saw is encouraging.

The people may be getting what they want, but politically Cuba is under the control of a small group of idealists who formulate the laws and broad policy (after unusually imaginative and conscientious consultation with the people involved).

He also points to a unique feature of the present regime in Cuba. In all previous revolutions the first act of the new governments has been to force the people to surrender their arms.

If the people of Cuba were as regimented, deprived of civil liberties and ready to revolt as the United States claims, Castro would not answer the threat of invasion by widely distributing machine guns.

The writer however tempers his enthusiasm for the armed defence of the revolution with the reflection that

Cuba will have more chance of preserving her present idealism and avoiding the corruptions attendant upon her enforced involvement in the international power struggle if she takes one more giant step forward and begins to study and develop methods of non-violent resistance.

We would disagree with D.D.'s "one aspect" of non-violent resistance, in that we believe that in a revolution whilst it may be essential for the people in arms to remain armed for a considerable

time it is a fundamental mistake to execute the enemies of the revolution who fall into one's hands. One may have to kill in order not to be killed, but when one's would-be killer is disarmed and without power there is no valid argument to deprive him of his life.

RUMOUR HAS BEEN RIFE IN ANARCHIST circles in London that Castro has closed down the anarcho-syndicalist Press in Cuba.

On our desk this week is a copy of Solidaridad Gastronomica, organ of the catering workers of Cuba. It is dated November 15, 1960, and on the front page is an article with the title "The Policy of One Class dominating another can lead to Dictatorship" in which the writer in forcible language puts forward the orthodox anarchist arguments about "dictatorship of the proletariat".

However, reading on another page "A Review of the Foreign Press" it is clear to us that though the Castro government may still allow the anarchist press to appear it is conditional on their making no comments on Cuban affairs.

It is possible that the comrades of Uruguay should not understand why Solidaridad Gastronomica does not deal with problems of major importance and topicality with reference to our country, and they may well be right in thinking thus.

monthly published in Uruguay) in regard to Cuba, at least as expressed in the issues 195—198 which we have just received.

We can only assume, as we haven't the copies of Lucha Libertaria at hand, that that paper extolled the Castro regime and that the Cuban anarchist paper had not the freedom to openly say why it does not.

WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING IN CUBA, IN the Congo and a dozen other countries which are in the "News" and where events might well be leading in more positive, libertarian directions? Is it possible to get at the truth without actually going oneself and staying there to see and hear and read enough to build up an objective picture of the situation?

He tells of how after a meeting at which Castro was the principal speaker he had a talk with a North American newspaperman who had told him earlier that he got the material for his articles "from the people whose business it is to know what is going on—the diplomats."

"But Joe," I said to him, "he promised some of the things for next week and others for a month or six weeks from now. He would be a fool to make such short-range assurances if he weren't able to carry through."

How many problems, apart from financial ones, will have to be solved before we shall be entitled to claim that we have a truly Free Press!

The Congo Tragedy

Caution from p. 2 In ending this review I would like to leave this issue of the Congo with the words of Jayaprakash Narayan which lead in a direction that could be a thing of a solution to the agonising

"We have at present no workable solution of non-violence. There is no doubt such bodies as the War Resisters International; but none of these bodies is comprehensive enough to cover and represent all the diverse voluntary forces for a non-violent social order.

"The UN is no doubt there, but it is a body made up of the armed states of the world and itself relies for its enforcement of authority on arms.

"There seems to be no possibility of the near future, however, of the UN disarming itself. The necessity, therefore, is further emphasised for an international body that might bring together the voluntary forces and efforts being made in the world on behalf of peace."

This seems to me to be constructive and practical and it can possibly amplify the qualified goodwill of both the War Resisters and the editors of FREEDOM.

Meetings and Announcements

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP IMPORTANT

On and after February 12th—Meetings at "The Swan", Cosmo Place, Southampton Row, W.C.1. (Holborn Station). Feb. 12.—Martin Grainger on LESSONS OF THE BELGIAN STRIKE. All Welcome. Refreshments available after meeting.

London Anarchist Group AN EXPERIMENT IN OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. At Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx. Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. At Dorothy Baran's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.

JAZZ GROUP

Friday, 10th February Ian Celnik on COLEMAN HAWKINS at 37, Old Compton Street, W.1.

FREEDOM The Anarchist Weekly Postal Subscription Rates: 12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00) 6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)