

The Vatican
and Liberty - p. 2

On Being Against
the Atom Bomb - p. 3

Mao & Co-Existence - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"There is one thing in the world more wicked than the desire to command, and that is the will to obey."

—WILLIAM KINGDON CLIFFORD

"Good men must not obey the laws too well."

RALPH WALDO EMERSON

Making War Safe for Governments

CLEAN BOMBS BRING WAR NEARER

*Ashes to ashes
And dust to dust;
If the blast don't get you,
Radiation must.*

LIKE the super planes which were going to carry the super bombs, the little jingle above has become obsolete before it had got right round the world. For the gentlemen who work so assiduously for the human race, its survival and extinction, have now arrived at the position where they can produce what is laughingly described as 'a clean bomb'.

When Sir William Penney and his team of boffins put the Great back into Great Britain by successfully detonating a thermo-nuclear device over Christmas Island, the fears of the strontium-sensitive world were hushed and allayed by the gladsome news—Penney has perfected a 'clean' bomb. That is, a hydrogen bomb which carries the explosive punch expected of it without sending up into the stratosphere the deadly radio-active dust which can lead to the well-publicised results for succeeding generations.

We Are Not Told

Whether the gallant Knight has in fact achieved this noteworthy step forward, we have no means of knowing. Strangely enough, although anarchists are recognised as experts in the bomb business, the Government does not seek to take advantage of our long experience, neither has it ever awarded a knighthood to an anarchist for making bombs, nor

does it supply us with inside information on how it is progressing in a field where once we were virtually monopolists. We are not complaining; we are simply establishing the fact that those of us who cannot escape taxation are, like nearly the entire nation, kept in ignorance of what is being done with the money the Government takes from us until the Government sees fit to tell us as much as it thinks is good for us—or, more accurately, good for it.

We can therefore believe the story about the clean bomb, or not. When we are not in possession of the information, one guess is as good as another. There are plentiful reasons for suspecting it to be a propaganda story to whitewash the recent series of tests and to calm fears in preparation for a new series.

The Fall-out has them Worried

The agitation which swept Japan and Asia in general over the tests at Christmas Island was concerned mainly with the danger of radio-active dust eventually falling-out over those territories. There was little concern for the island itself being blown to smithereens. The blast from the H-bomb might be colossal, but at least it had a known, limited, range. The fall-out, on the other hand, was a great unknown, a great riddle, to which even the clever Sir William did not have the answer. If, then, it could be put out that the bombs were free from the deadly fall-out, much of the world's opposition would disappear.

After all, the world has shown itself quite happy to accept mere explosives, in war after war. We have always suspected the motives of those who have peddled the line of 'Ban the H-Bomb', for in nine cases out of ten they are people who supported the last war—complete with torpedoes, flame-throwers, petrol bombs and block-busters—but are now shocked by the possible long-term effects of atomic warfare. And in nine cases out of ten they will support the next war whether or not atomic weapons are used. They are not against war, they are against war going too far for their liking.

Governments Might Suffer

Similarly the arguments that the existence of the 'ultimate deterrents'

THE CHURCH AND H-BOMBS

The "Realistic" Approach

The Bishop of Norwich, Dr. P. M. Herbert, said that agitation to stop the testing of nuclear weapons was entirely misguided. If, and it was a big if, nuclear weapons must be made, then they must be tested. Testing was the only method of ensuring efficiency and of learning the capacity of the weapons. Dr. Herbert, who was speaking at his diocesan conference, continued:

"As I see it, the only moral question arising does not concern the testing. It concerns the manufacture of these weapons. No one can deny that they are a threat to world peace or that their use would mean world suicide and destruction.

"But also, as I see it, no one can deny that they are at present a political and military deterrent to world war. If this country continues to make them, every-one must deplore the necessity which prompts us to do so. We chose this evil as lesser than the ever-present risk of Russian aggression."

(Manchester Guardian).

made war impossible had, for us, one ounce of validity only. Up to the closing months of the last war, wars were fought by the suckers while the leaders led from the rear, and Britain was always very concerned that her wars were fought on other people's territory. The devastation which Europe, for example, suffered in war after war, was unknown in Britain.

One of the shattering experiences (in more ways than one!) of the last war was the sudden delivery of high explosive on our own door-steps by the Luftwaffe. When war came to London, where so many wars have been planned, it was thought to be not quite playing the game, and the caddishness of it provided a very good reason to hate the Germans. (And after all, when they were only liquidating Jews and Reds—that was no reason for hating them, was it?)

Thus it is that the development of the particular hazards that come with fission and fusion, allied with radar-guidance and rocket propulsion of fantastic speed, have provided a deterrent for governments which they did not have before. Governments may not care about people, but they care about them-

elves, and in an all-out H-bomb war they cannot survive any more than anybody else. Assuming that they have shelters effective enough to withstand atomic blast, there would be no point in surfacing to a radio-active desert where the land, air and waters were polluted, perhaps for centuries. And surely even the Churchillian mind could find little consolation in the thought that the enemy leaders were similarly imprisoned in their own shelters.

It Might Blow Back

It was not as though they could launch their own weapons in a surprise attack without danger to themselves. The British Government's own White Paper spoke of the necessity of making sure that the wind was blowing in the right direction when atom bombs were despatched. Imagine the irony in the situation of British airmen dropping a hundred H-Bombs on Russia and then, while complimenting themselves on a job well done, discover that the wind had changed and was blowing their own radio-active fall-out back across the English Channel!

The ounce of validity in the 'deterrent' argument, therefore, lay precisely in this: that the statesman who signed the order for the first H-Bomb to be dropped in anger

was signing his own death-warrant at the same time.

But what is the situation now—now that the scientists are producing 'clean' bombs?

Serving Humanity—by Making War Possible Again

We printed the key to the situation in FREEDOM last week, when we referred to the arguments of the American scientists and top brass in favour of continuing H-Bomb tests. The scientists argued that it was more humanitarian to continue tests since they were on the point of developing a 'clean' bomb (why doesn't Sir William Penney pass on his know-how?), and the Service chiefs argued that they also were serving humanity by making it possible to wage atomic war without fear of dirty fall-out encircling the world!

People everywhere should study these arguments carefully and should see exactly what they mean. They are not only the ramblings of deranged minds; they are serving notice on humanity that war will soon be safe for governments again.

In developing the clean bomb the scientists have achieved the following:

1. They have destroyed many of the arguments of the H-Bomb's opponents. When the H-Bomb ceases to be a different kind of weapon and becomes only a more highly efficient explosive, the arguments of those who accept conventional weapons and old-fashioned wars fall to the ground. If you don't

Continued on p. 4

KOREA IN THE NEWS

THE world has already forgotten Korea, but last week from that devastated land came a piece of news to remind us of the carve-up which took place a few years ago between East and West and underlines the futility of hoping for lasting agreements between governments on the problem of armaments.

A clause of the Korean armistice prohibited the introduction of new weapons into Korea. Worn out weapons were to be replaced only on "the basis of piece for piece of the same effectiveness and type", to be brought in under the supervision of neutral inspection teams. Almost immediately, it is now reported, the Communists began running in train loads of new equipment and putting obstacles in the way of the "neutral" inspectors. By this spring North Korea had 500 jet fighters and 25 airfields.

The U.N. Command worried about the "balance of military power" no longer feels bound by the armistice agreement and in answer to Syngman Rhee's demand for atomic weapons, a force of F-100 jet fighters capable of delivering tactical atomic bombs will begin to move into Korea. Following this is expected a shipment of up-to-date infantry weapons.

The Communist disregard for agreements is well suited to the policy of the U.S., anxious to have a large number of tactical weapons in as many tactical areas as it can.

This is just another example of the immoral behaviour adopted by both sides in their dealings with each other, which as often as not helps the 'other side' by playing into their hands.

More Reflections on Wire-Tapping

'State Security' versus Human Dignity

THERE is surely a combination of the ironical and the comical in the fact that all the pother over telephone tapping, all the high-mindedness on both sides of the House over the ungallant behaviour of that officially "gallant" Member, the former Home Secretary (Major Lloyd George), has been set off by a Barrister who is appearing before the Bar Council on five "charges", two of which allege that he conducted himself "in a manner unbecoming a gentleman and a barrister". But for Mr. Marrinan's alleged lapses, the government would not at this moment be hot under the collar and the opposition (on both sides of the House) would not be burning with moral indignation... they would all be silently basking—within ear-shot of the Divisions Bell—in our present Indian summer. And telephones would go on being tapped, letters opened, and messengers trailed as in pre-Marrinan days, without so much as a whimper from Labour benches or down Fleet Street way.

The appointment, obviously by agreement among the political parties, of a select committee of three Privy Councillors to inquire into telephone tapping may temporarily put a brake on the trend revealed by the Marrinan disclosures (of information obtained by phone tapping or interference with the mails being passed on to interested parties both within and outside the administration, as well as being admitted as evidence in secret or public trials or witch-hunts—a situation already recognised and legalised in parts of the United States). But in view of the attitude of the "responsible" political parties and the general apathy of the public, the fundamental issues

remain untouched. The spectre of "1984" for from being exorcised, looms larger on the horizon the more so as the science of snooping tests the technological genius of man and plumbs the depths of his irresponsibility and inhuman materialism

★

COMMENTING editorially on a report from a Washington correspondent which carries the heading: "Tapping? We haven't started yet..." the *News Chronicle* last Saturday, with horror draws attention to the existing possibilities of listening-in to telephone conversations "without bothering to tap the wires. Even lovers' whispers in the open can be overheard at 300 yards with the new parabolic microphone and telescopic gun-sight". And it draws the public's attention to the fact that

"scientific invention has revolutionised the unsavoury art of Evesdropping. The telephone for a start, is no longer private. It is as open as an unsealed envelope. Science has got privacy on the run."

The voice of British liberalism asks "Where are the lines to be drawn?" And if we understand its answer correctly it does not really know where! For, on the one hand it tells us that

Security will use the latest devices whatever laws Parliament may pass. The police will say they are necessary for criminal investigation",

while on the other it suggests that

One possibility is to issue these inventions only under licence. That would be a start. But the most important thing at the moment is to grasp the full magnitude and implications of the problem, which Parliament has failed to do, and start devising freedom's safeguards

now—before we wake up to find the date in 1984.

The first two sentences of the above are pure double-think. Admittedly they might prevent ("mini-mise" or "reduce" would be more accurate terms) the kind of domestic snooping as described by the *News Chronicle's* correspondent (such as that of the millionaire Serge Rubinstein who had a secret microphone installed in the mattress springs of his girl-friend's bed). But since "Security" is a law unto itself and is the offender with which we are at present concerned, as well as the agency which would issue the licences (and not parliament, which in any case even the *News Chronicle* admits does not count: Parliament proposes, the police disposes!) it is

Continued on p. 3

*As a matter of fact FREEDOM was already drawing attention to these inventions and their implications more than two years ago. In an "American Letter" (FREEDOM, Mar 12, 1955, included in "Freedom Selections", Vol. 5, 1955, pp. 53-54), our correspondent wrote that "the accepted methods until now have involved the actual cutting in on the circuit of two people speaking on a telephone. It is now much less cumbersome although a technique still in the early stages of development, to listen in with the new ultra-sensitive microphones that can amplify with ease both sides of a conversation taking place inside a public phone box 20 or more feet away. If a couple of suspects are talking out of doors their sounds can be picked up by means of parabolic sound reflectors a hundred yards away in a restaurant or crowded street; and it is reported that underworld characters who until now have often conducted their deals in a hotel bathroom against a background of taps, showers, lavatories and air-conditioners can do so no more, since a pocket-size noise analyser in the suite next door can select only those frequencies of the human voice that the listener wishes to hear."

THE VATICAN & LIBERTY

THE following is an extract from a statement made recently by a high Vatican spokesman:

"Experience has taught that a system of freedom is in the end best for church interests. Any temporary privilege that may be gained through a dictatorship is soon lost, and more than offset by the hatred that arises against the church. Sooner or later, dictatorships end by turning against the church."

To those who do not understand the purpose of the Catholic Church, its past record and principal interests, this may sound very much like a declaration of its belief in freedom, and by implication its support of democracy. Nothing could, in fact, be further from the truth. The Catholic Church is interested in power and more power, and is not and never has been the least concerned by what method that power is achieved.

To avoid any confusion it is perhaps necessary to make a distinction between the Church Hierarchy—the rulers, and its millions of followers,

some devout and sincere, others unthinking, indifferent or merely paying lip-service—the ruled. Most of them have no stake in the Church as such, but because of their upbringing as Catholics or having embraced Catholicism for some other reason, believe in the ideas of the religion as a code of ethics for their own lives.

Mistaken as they are this does not necessarily indicate their whole-hearted support of all the individual actions of the Hierarchy, but since they are committed to Catholicism, with the Pope as its infallible leader, they are relieved of any necessity to object or criticise on grounds of conscience, for the Pope can do no wrong and that which he deems to be necessary is by definition correct for all Catholics. (This being one of the reasons for Catholicism's popular appeal, taking as it does all decisions and requiring no individual thought from its disciples, since all situations are covered by "the rules"—i.e. dogma).

With an obedient and unthinking flock the Church is in a strong posi-

tion. It may rely on its instructions being carried out even under the most reprehensible conditions, and may therefore pursue its quest for power without too much regard for the feelings of the flock and with a complete disregard of the Christian ethics to which it is supposedly dedicated. The Catholic Church, like its bitter and total enemy Communism, is schizophrenic. On the one hand preaching goodness and love, and on the other giving support or making pacts, treaties and concordats with every totalitarian, dictatorial and Fascist State in the world.*

The Catholic Church in short believes in authoritarianism, totalitarianism, an élite, "just wars", capitalism and the State in conjunction with the Church. It hates all forms of liberty—liberty of conscience, of education, of propaganda, of meetings, of free speech, of the Press, and, most important of all—liberty itself. Any principle involving liberalism of any kind is, in effect, heresy, for so far as the Church is

concerned freedom means freedom from the power of God and from the power of the Church.

What then does the first sentence of the statement at the beginning of this article mean? "... a system of freedom is in the end best for church interests..." The key phrase is, "in the end". The Church has now made so many agreements with Fascist States, most of which have been eventually broken, that it finds it no longer possible to trust Fascists who promise the Church power and influence in exchange for support, but when they no longer need that support withdraw from the agreement. The most extraordinary feature of the whole process being that the Church should ever have supposed any other result.

Having been fooled in this way so often the Hierarchy has now decided to support democracy—the only alternative system excepting Communism, which amounts to the same thing as Fascism from most points of view but is identified with materialism and the devil in the eyes

of the Catholic Church.

The object therefore is a temporary concordat with "a system of freedom" until such time as the Church may become powerful enough to substitute its own system of authoritarianism. In its new rôle as supporter of freedom the Church will hope to become the guide and mentor to more and more millions of souls and thereby increase its power and influence to the point where freedom will gradually take second place to the Church and its laws and where the Pope will become the supreme dictator.

Throughout the centuries this has been the aim of the Catholic Church and will continue to be for so long as it exists. The methods by which this aim shall be sought are not important, the cost in human misery and degradation is of no-account. The Church is not concerned with human beings or their happiness, but only with its power over their souls. Any measure considered by the Vatican to be directed towards this end is for the greater glory of God and the Catholic Church.

UPSET SPANIARDS

The Spanish Ambassador, the Duke of Prima de Rivera, is not happy about Annigoni's "Spanish Sketchbook".

He is offended because it depicts mainly the poverty of Spain and little of the country's beauty and grandeur. The cover of the book shows a group of ragged children watching the artist at work.

There are revealing pictures by Annigoni's friend, photographer Alex Sterling. I understand the Spanish Embassy even went so far as trying to ban it.

And they said at one time they would not be attending the party to launch it.

On both points they have had second thoughts. The Ambassador himself will be the guest of honour at a luncheon party to-day.

I know he would like to express himself forcibly. But it's a tricky diplomatic position.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

New Books . . .

A Guide to Communist Jargon
R. N. Carew Hunt 15/-
The Insurgents
Vercors 15/-
Seeds of Life
John Langdon Davies 12/6
The Mendelmen Fire
Wolf Mankowitz 12/6
Road to Revolution: A Century
of Russian Radicalism
A. Yermolinsky 25/-

Penguins . . .

Atomic Radiation and Life
P. Alexander 3/6
Girl on the Via Flaminia
Alfred Hayes 2/6
Three Men in a Boat
Jerome K. Jerome 2/6
The Thirty Years' War
C. V. Wedgwood 3/-
Man and Automation
L. L. Goodman 3/6

Second-Hand . . .

Prater Violet
Christopher Isherwood 2/6
The Valediction
Jean Giono 3/-
On This Side Nothing
Alex Comfort 3/-
Comfort Me With Apples
Peter de Vries 3/-
Commonsense and the
Adolescent
Ethel Mannin 5/6
Ancient Society
Lewis H. Morgan 10/-
A Ghost at Noon
Alberto Moravia 3/6
My Country and My People
Lin Yutang 3/6
The General Strike
Sir John Simon 3/6
Bread and Roses
Ethel Mannin 3/-
Story of a Year, 1848
Raymond Postgate 6/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1

*For an impressively documented account of this branch of modern Church diplomacy see "The Catholic Church against the Twentieth Century" by Avro Manhattan. For example:

1. Having supported Franco throughout the Spanish civil war, when the Republic was finally crushed, Pope Pius XII broadcast to the victors: "With great joy we address you, dearest sons of Catholic Spain, to express our paternal congratulations for the gift of peace and victory, with which God has chosen to crown the Christian heroism of your faith and charity, proved in so much and so generous suffering . . . we give to you our dear sons of Catholic Spain, to the Head of the State and his illustrious Government . . . our apostolic benediction."

2. The infamous concordat with the Italian Fascist State. The Pope's admiration of Mussolini: "... that man whom Divine Providence" had allowed him to meet. An Order of the Day, approved by all archbishops, bishops and priests (January 10, 1938), to Mussolini: "May the blessing of heaven come upon you. The clergy of Italy are invoking on your person, on your

work as a creator of the Empire, and of the Fascist régime, the blessing of the Lord. Duce, the priests of Christ give honour to you and swear their allegiance to you."

3. The equally infamous Concordat with Hitler's German Reich. Mgr. Kaas, leader of the Catholic Party is instructed by the Pope to make a declaration: "Hitler knows well how to guide the ship . . . It matters little who rules so long as order is maintained. The history of the last few years has well proven in Germany that the democratic parliamentary system was incapable."

4. The Vatican's support of Marshal Petain—friendship with Japan improving with each new Japanese victory during the war—Catholic support of Fascists throughout all Europe.

Wherever there has been Fascism and Totalitarianism in the world, wherever dictators and strong men have desired to crush Liberalism, Socialism, Secularism, Communism or Democracy, the Catholic Church has always been ready, willing and anxious to assist and co-operate—under any and all circumstances—for the good of the Catholic Church . . .

ANARCHISM AND RELIGION

LET it be clear from the start that this article is neither for religion nor against it. My purpose in writing it is simply to show that there is no one anarchist attitude to religion, and that the most diverse and conflicting beliefs can be equally anarchistic.

I shall mention some dozen such beliefs before the end; but my purpose will best be served if I devote most of my space to four of them, and describe at fair length the opinions of three Russian noblemen and a German schoolmaster: Tolstoy, Kropotkin, Bakunin and Stirner. Each

I. Tolstoy's Anarchist Christianity

There are those who call themselves Christian anarchists, Catholic anarchists, and what have you, who mean by this that they are anarchists except for accepting the authority of some church or other. By "Christian anarchist" or "Catholic anarchist" they mean they would be anarchists if they were not Christians and Catholics.

Tolstoy was not among these. His anarchism was complete in that the acknowledged nobody's right to command anybody, by any means, in any particular. And he did not call it anarchism; he called it Christianity.

It is said often enough that government would be unnecessary in a Christian society. Tolstoy said it would be not only unnecessary but impossible, because no Christian could possibly take part in the business of government! He had what appears to me as a layman to be a perfectly

of these writers expressed himself emphatically on the subject of one particular religion, Christianity, their views ranging from the unconditional acceptance of Christianity to the total rejection of every Christian precept. Each of them had emphatic opinions about human society, which arose from, or were closely connected with, his attitude to Christianity. Yet in spite of the diversity of their religious teachings, their social teachings were, as I shall show, broadly similar, and in full accord with the body of opinion we call anarchism.* (I will simplify their teachings somewhat for the sake of clarity).

There are those who call themselves Christian anarchists, Catholic anarchists, and what have you, who mean by this that they are anarchists except for accepting the authority of some church or other. By "Christian anarchist" or "Catholic anarchist" they mean they would be anarchists if they were not Christians and Catholics.

Tolstoy was not among these. His anarchism was complete in that the acknowledged nobody's right to command anybody, by any means, in any particular. And he did not call it anarchism; he called it Christianity.

It is said often enough that government would be unnecessary in a Christian society. Tolstoy said it would be not only unnecessary but impossible, because no Christian could possibly take part in the business of government! He had what appears to me as a layman to be a perfectly

of these writers expressed himself emphatically on the subject of one particular religion, Christianity, their views ranging from the unconditional acceptance of Christianity to the total rejection of every Christian precept. Each of them had emphatic opinions about human society, which arose from, or were closely connected with, his attitude to Christianity. Yet in spite of the diversity of their religious teachings, their social teachings were, as I shall show, broadly similar, and in full accord with the body of opinion we call anarchism.* (I will simplify their teachings somewhat for the sake of clarity).

There are those who call themselves Christian anarchists, Catholic anarchists, and what have you, who mean by this that they are anarchists except for accepting the authority of some church or other. By "Christian anarchist" or "Catholic anarchist" they mean they would be anarchists if they were not Christians and Catholics.

very right, and very Christian, to offer a lift to someone walking in the street and very tired. But if the circumstances are changed a little bit (if, for instance, the walking man is training for a race, or out with his girl and not wanting to be disturbed, or if you are driving a lorry full of dynamite instead of a car), then it may be pointless, or even very wrong, to offer a lift. There is nothing we want men to do to us in all circumstances, and therefore no single act which is right in all circumstances.

However, there are a number of things we do not want men to do to us in any circumstances, and these things are definitely and unchangeably wrong, in any circumstances. We do not want men to shoot us, for example, or drop bombs on us, or force us by the threat of shooting or bombs to do anything we do not want to do. We do not want men to beat us, or imprison us, or sentence us to be beaten or imprisoned, or make us behave as they wish by the threat of being beaten or imprisoned. We do not want men to come into control of the means of livelihood, and force us to work on their terms by the threat of taking our livelihood (or part of it) away from us. We do not want men to convince us that they know the secrets of heaven and hell, and force us by the threat of hell to follow their moral teaching. In short, we do not want to be coerced in any way, nor do we want anybody to have the means of coercing us, in any circumstances.

And therefore, by the simple negative application of the Christian Golden Rule, it is wrong in any circumstances to coerce anyone or have the means of coercing him. It is wrong to be a king, a boss, a landlord, a politician, a manager, a magistrate, a soldier, a policeman, a gaoler, a tax-collector, a bishop, or anything involving power over other people; and no Christian could possibly accept such a job. So in a society of Christians, or one based on Christian principles, there could be no government of any kind.

(To be continued)

*By anarchism I mean the doctrine that relationships involving command or coercion are opposed to the true purpose of society, that a society where all relationships (or at least all institutionalised relationships) are voluntary and co-operative is both desirable and possible, and that coercive institutions cannot be used in establishing such a society. This is a general definition, not just a convenient one for the purpose of this article.

More Reflections on Wire-Tapping

Continued from p. 1

clear that legislation can be best only prevent information so obtained being used as evidence in the event of criminal proceedings. But, what the *News Chronicle* rightly calls, the "full magnitude and implications of the problem", go much deeper, and as to how we can "start devising freedom's safeguards now" is something the Liberal organ conveniently avoids discussing! And understandably so. For you cannot both wear political blinkers, champion the division of Man by competition, differentials and frontiers, and at the same time range your hopes and expectations over broad horizons where men behave decently towards each other or of governments being both moral and considerate!

★

IN the United States which leads the world in most things material, we can see to what uses wire-tapping can be put, quite apart from those connected with the "security of the State". According to the *News Chronicle's* Washington correspondent private detectives—armed with the latest inconspicuous or innocuous-looking devices, such as hearing aids "which will be recording all that you and the other party are saying"—are "swarming everywhere". They are used

by businesses to spy on industrial rivals and to listen in to customers' conversations, so as to spot the easiest sell. They are used by trade union leaders to check upon the loyalty of their subordinates.

Other regular customers include the cuckolded husband and the editors of "scandal magazines".

To restrict the use of such inventions will surely do little to modify the frame of mind of those who are now having recourse to these methods of snooping. Private detectives existed before the tape-recorded or the "parabolic sound reflector". So long as "cuckold" remains in our current vocabulary so long will there be a job for the private detective with or without electronic gadgets. So long as production is based on profit there will be "spies" in industry; so long as workers' organisations are controlled and dominated by power maniacs or Executive cliques there will be "loyalty checks". And so long as such a mentality exists at the so-called "domestic" level of society, is it surprising that at the political level every abuse is connived at?

★

WE live in a world in which every man is his worst enemy. Government spying—via the telephone, the mails and the chance conversation—is only an extension of the petty snooping and reporting that goes on every day in every street and suburb, in every office and factory. (Keeping up with the Jones' however praiseworthy an occupation even such Labour supporters as Lady Packenham may think it, also implies that one spends not a little of one's time snooping on the Jones'!†). Hence the vocal indignation against government snooping is not in fact against snooping but against unauthorized, illegal, snooping. However much the Labour

†To avoid being misunderstood we should add that we distinguish between the interest in our fellow beings that is summed-up in "keeping up with the Jones'" and that which is evinced by one's desire to get closer to them. The latter, surely reaches its peak, when one gets to love, or "falls in love" with one (or more) of the Jones'!

Opposition attacks the government for its actions, let us be quite clear in our minds that what it attacks is the government's abuse of its powers, not its powers in themselves.

Mr. Butler whilst referring to his power to intercept communications as "distasteful" nevertheless, declared that since 1735 the House has always resolved that the Secretary of State of the day "has special powers by warrant" and he was not prepared "to go back on the tradition". Similarly, if we accept the word of the *Manchester Guardian's* Political Correspondent (28/6/57), then in spite of his moral indignation, Mr. Gaitskell, leader of the Labour Opposition is

believed to be unwilling to deny to the Government of the day appropriate powers, including telephone tapping for the protection of the State, provided that the limits within which the more extreme powers may be used are defined and understood.

★

LET us, equally, not be misled by the appointment of a select committee

To consider and report upon the exercise by the Secretary of State of the executive power to intercept communications, and in particular under what authority, to what extent and for what purposes this power has been exercised, and to what use information so obtained has been put; and

To recommend whether, how and subject to what safeguards this power should be exercised, and in what circumstances the information obtained by such means should properly be used or disclosed.

Admittedly within this jungle of words one notes that the Committee can even explore "whether" as well as "how and subject to, etc." this power should be exercised (that is the prerogative power of the Home Secretary to snoop). We confess that a committee composed of two ex-Ministers (one relegated to the Lords, the other a Labour Party "shadow-minister") and a judge (albeit liberal), only recently retired, who knows full well that the forces of law and order obtain more of their information illegally than through scientific detection, does not inspire us with confidence. What special qualities do these three men possess to represent the dignity of Man, and to advise for the future of Civil Liberties? They are Privy Counsellors, that is, in theory, advisers appointed by the monarch. In fact they are Ministers (in or out of office) and judges, and according to one authority, in spite of the pompous rigmarole about advising the king "according to the best of their cunning and discretion", etc., their chief remaining duty is to "proclaim to the world the will of the executive"‡. Since Mr. Butler has already made quite clear what is the will of the Executive, one can only assume that the Big Three's report will do no more than seek to sugar the pill. It can afford to deprecate the Marrinan incident but to our minds cannot condemn, on principle, wire-tapping, and all the other snooping powers vested in the Government, through the person of the Home Secretary. It may criticise the fallibility of Home Secretaries but not of Governments. It may proclaim the freedom of the individual, but we have no doubt that it will be made conditional to the over-riding demands of the "security" of the State and the rule of Law and Order. It may deprecate the tapping of M.P.'s telephones as being

§Sir Norman Birkett, the third member of the Committee, was the judge in the trial of the four members of Freedom Press in 1945. No anarchist could hope for a more friendly judge... but when he sentenced three of them to 9 months, invoking the sanctity of the Law, did he close his eyes to the fact, or did he recognise as legal, and part of the game, that our telephones were being tapped, our correspondence opened, our readers in the forces subjected to searches, and some subscribers intimidated by the Special Branch? The files of *War Commentary* (FREEDOM's predecessor) make interesting reading in retrospect!

†Everyman's Encyclopaedia.

On Being Against the Atom-Bomb—3

IN two previous articles the thesis was stated that the prevention of atomic explosions depends on the presence of the following factors. A general public informed by an accurate objective evaluation of the real and of the bogus dangers of testing atom bombs. A propaganda campaign based on this objective appraisal directed at scientists working on the atom bomb, encouraging them to stop their work. A feeling by the scientists of support from the general public and an agreement over the real and not the moral reasons making their action necessary.

The most important of these is that public opinion which should be such that the scientist does not find himself compelled to disagree with it on matters of fact.

Since there is now an atom-bomb dichotomy of opinion where those against exaggerate the dangers of fall-out and other matters and confuse their argument with sentimental or emotional flurries, and where those in favour easily pick holes in the statements of their opponents and point to the risks you take anyway when you drive a car or lie on the beach, what is needed is a manual of information on the atom-bomb that can be consulted without fear of one's being handed weighted information and facts coloured up to suit some emotional or political group. It would be a non-political collection of facts with Don't Knows honestly recorded.

The remainder of this article will attempt to answer the question, "What are the dangers to life and health of testing atomic and hydrogen bombs?" It should be understood that this is an entirely different question from, "What are the dangers inherent in the existence of atomic and hydrogen bombs?"—a guide to which will be attempted in a further article.

★

The most recent hazard to be discussed is that of radio-active strontium—induced cancer of bone. The journal *Science*, organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, published on February 8th, 1957, an extensive review of strontium-90 contamination which is already out of date in certain matters but serves as a useful guide to the subject. Anyone wishing to can look up the article, the gist of which is as follows. Strontium-90 is an early product of the fission bomb and decays very slowly with a half life of 28 years. The "kiloton" explosions of the atom bomb spray this element over the surrounding earth in distinction to

the "megaton" explosions which send practically all of the vapourized element into the upper atmosphere from where there is a steady drip over about 10 years back to the earth's surface. Once in the earth's soil strontium-90 is exchangeable with calcium and so finds its way into vegetables and the dairy and meat products of herbivorous animals. Columbia University has been testing autopsy samples of human bones during the past two years and has found that probably no living animal is now uncontaminated by radio-active strontium. At the end of 1955 the average concentration, higher when the skeleton is actively growing and lower when it is not, amounts to 1/10,000 of what is called the maximum permissible concentration (a figure which was established by guess by members of the National Academy of Sciences).

So far as strontium-90 goes there is no such thing as a "clean bomb". It all comes back to earth in time. With radiation-emitting metal in our bones then, what are the after-effects? There is only one after-effect and that is a hypothetical one: cancer of the surrounding bone after an unknown number of years. Now there is nothing unique about the ionizing radiations emitted by strontium-90. The source of the radiation makes no difference to the quality of radiation. And as has been stated many times by the orthodox atomic apologists of the United States Atomic Energy Commission the dose we receive from cosmic rays and medical X-rays is enormously higher than that we are receiving from fission-formed radio-active products, or are ever likely to receive from "fall-out". Whether or not it has been caused by irradiation bone cancer has always occurred, and there is no reason to suppose that atom-bomb tests at the present rate and degree of control will alter the incidence of bone cancer.

Strontium is not the grave threat that wild opinion has supposed. Bone cancer and other types of cancer will occur with an increased incidence above normal in anyone exposed to radiation, but precautions in 1957 against populations receiving any but very low exposures are considerable.

At the risk of labouring the point I will repeat the contention over again. No one can deny that exposure to radiation is dangerous, but release of radiation is not the chief nor only threat posed against the Earth and its life by the men who test atom bombs. Some danger, there certainly is because no threshold serves to warn that up to this dose you are in no danger, and beyond you are in danger.

This article is intended as an examination of the facts upon which is supposed to be based the popular case against the atom-bomb tests, a case which is as much emotionally overblown as any well conducted legal case whose inconsistency is thus being carefully concealed. *People don't mind the government having the bombs, they just don't want them displayed too openly.* Let each British protestant search his heart for that guilty inconsistency, a pride and joy in the British H-Bomb; and each American that the marvellous technological achievements of science and industry in the United States made it after all the first to join two subcritical masses of Uranium 235 together; and each Russian—well I don't know what the Russians think about their bomb but I doubt if any protest against the Soviet Union Bomb.

Hysteria is supposed to conceal guilt and there is enough hysteria surrounding the atomic tests to suggest the same diagnosis. To return to Strontium 90, this has caught the public's attention because, of all the 200 odd radio-active elements formed by fission of Uranium 235, it uniquely has a long half-life in combination with a metabolic route that causes it to be taken up by bone. But this does not justify statements like that of Linus Pauling that such and such a test will cause so many cases of bone cancer or leukaemia. Consider the facts of leukaemia. It has been shown beyond doubt that radiation to certain areas of the body increases the incidence of leukaemia especially in childhood. But a long-term study of the victims in Hiroshima more than 10 years after the bomb was exploded shows that of those exposed to radiation who were between 1.3 and 2 miles from the epicentre (the distance at which swift death from acute radiation poisoning is very unlikely) one person out of fifty has since died of leukaemia. To kill a man with leukaemia is no less shameful than to kill him with liquid fire; but it does not seem likely from the experience of Hiroshima that radio-active fall-out from a bomb exploded in an area from which

all humans have been deported should be any great cause for concern as a leukaemic agent.

Radiation poisoning is caused by larger doses of radiation than can be expected from a well-conducted test. The same can be said for cataract formation in the eye.

No, bomb-owners who base their objections to bomb-testing upon the dangers of Strontium 90 uptake, leukaemia, cataracts and other non-genetic effects, if honest would be saying, "Daddy please test our wonderful bombs but test them safely". Since I live among the havebombs I don't know what the feeling is among the havenotbombs, but it is more important to analyse the motives of the former for the following reason: if anarchist interpretation is correct no government will stop testing bombs so long as military, economic or emotional dividends are accruing from the tests—unless the scientists who actually perform the work prevent it. And, repeating what I have suggested before, such scientists will need a well-informed and approving public if they are to move in that direction. This implies the public in the same nation, the havebs.

When we come to genetic effects of the tests objection is very much more valid. In the case of other bodily tissues, if they recover at all, there is either regeneration or repair of the damage done by the ionizing action of radiation, and you can predict with a rough accuracy what the effects of a given dose of radiation are going to be. When radiation hits the reproductive cells there can be no safe lower limit. Perhaps one photon only of gamma ray will be aimed right to cause ionization at a susceptible part of the nucleic acid molecule that makes up the chromosome. "Chromosome breakage" is one result, but someone more of a geneticist than I would need to write on this topic. Suffice to say that the principles formulated through Müller's work 30 years ago on radiation-induced hereditary changes in the fruit fly still stand. These are that an increase rate of mutation results, such mutations being permanently reproduced in offspring, usually unfavourable to the individual and often recessive and not appearing for several generations.

It is a fact that it is not possible now and at no time will it ever be possible to state that a given amount of radiation is safe for the chromosomes. This is simply explained by the impossibility of knowing the track that any wave-particle is taking with relation to the sex gland chromosomes: any wave-particle may be the one that will damage the chromosome. The only possible rebuttal to this is the sort offered by Libby, the one of the five U.S. Atomic Energy Commissioners who seems to have designated himself official radiation pooh-pooher, namely that added to all the sources of radiation in the form of cosmic rays, diagnostic X-rays, dental X-rays and others, what difference is made by the beta ray-emitting and gamma ray-emitting isotopes that "fall out" of the atomic explosions? He claims that the difference is very small and, compared with the danger of loss of U.S. superiority in atomic weapons, negligible.

Available evidence shows that Libby is justified in discounting the public's fears of bomb-test radiation as being due to near-hysteria based on ignorance of the facts in all respects but one. He himself conveniently slides over the irrefutable arguments of geneticists.

J.E.

(To be continued)

How Vital is the Canal?

Sixteen more super-tankers—seven giants of 65,000 tons deadweight and nine of 50,000 tons—have been ordered by the B.P. Tanker Company from British yards.

The orders form part of an £80 million programme for 26 British-built new tankers, to be ready between 1960 and 1963, and totalling about 1,150,000 tons.

The super-tankers, among the largest to be ordered in Britain, will be capable of carrying oil economically round the Cape.

They will be unable to pass fully loaded through the Suez Canal.

Few British ports at present could handle 65,000-ton tankers but the company believe that by the time the ships are delivered the ports will be able to take them.

Nearly all the new ships will be air-conditioned and have swimming pools and cinemas.

Mao and Co-Existence

LAST week when we discussed that part of Mao Tse-tung's recent speech to the Supreme State Conference which dealt with the rôle of the individual capitalist, we noted that no real opposition was directed at the existing private capitalists although it was admitted that there was still a considerable gap between them and the working class. Since then, it is worth mentioning in par-

enthes, that the British Labour Party and the German Social Democrats have declared their doubts about the wisdom of nationalising all industry. The Democrats in Germany have been more definite than their British brothers. With an election just round the corner the German Socialists are taking no chances and have pledged themselves to the safeguarding of free competition. A statement from their manifesto reads:

Social Democracy demands free economic development, free competition and private property working for the common good.

Similarly in Burma, U Nu, a devout socialist, has decided to open up industrial enterprises to people with "profit motives", because, he states, the government has made terrible mistakes which were the result of putting the cart before the ox.

It seems then that the "socialists" (as we have always maintained) are not adverse to taking advantage of the competitive principle in our society for political purposes which are bound up with their own privileged position as political leaders. Under capitalism economic competition is often more beneficial to government than the unwieldy method of centralised State planning. By throwing a large hunk of economic responsibility on to individuals the State can still keep a certain amount of control but can no longer be entirely blamed for any major crisis which might arise. And, as we all know, business men will generally support whichever government happens to be in power as long as they are allowed to rake in the profits.

More Freedom for Science and the Arts?

As a sop to the intellectuals Mao maintains that free discussion should be encouraged and hasty conclusions avoided. He regards it as harmful to the growth of art and science to impose one particular form of art or school of thought and to ban another. In the ideological struggle which would continue for some time crude coercive methods should not be used. As a scientific truth Marxism fears no criticism. If it could be defeated in argument it would be worthless. The idea of long term co-existence with other parties was not impossible. This is a departure from the usual Marxist position in relation to other political parties and embodied in the following statement is the view that parties other than the Communist could be interested in establishing socialism:

"Why should the democratic parties of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie be allowed to exist side by side with the

party of the working class over a long period of time? Because we have no reason not to adopt the policy of long-term co-existence with all other democratic parties which are truly devoted to the task of uniting the people for the cause of socialism and which enjoy the trust of the people . . .

"It is the desire of the Communist party, also its policy, to exist side by side with the other democratic parties for a long time to come. Whether these democratic parties can long exist depends not merely on what the Communist party itself desires but also on the part played by these democratic parties themselves and on whether they enjoy the confidence of the people.

"Mutual supervision among the various parties has also been a long-established fact, in the sense that they advise and criticise each other."

Acknowledging the disturbances among workers and students in China, it is suggested that these should be turned to advantage by getting rid of bureaucracy. However, there were a small number of

people in China who would take advantage and put forward unreasonable demands in order to stir up the masses! The answer to these wretches (no doubt anarchists and some socialists) is the one given by any government, even one which has just declared in the same breath that problems must be solved by reasonable argument, i.e.: *We do not intend to let these people have their own way.*

The reason it is claimed why there had been so many resignations from the Communist parties was really due to the worldwide anti-Communist campaign of 1956 but the great majority of party members are more firmly united in the struggle. And finally, a declaration of loyalty to the Soviet Union who so generously designed and equipped so many important factories in China.

What of the imperialist countries (excluding Russia)? A sentence squeezed in between the verbiage—we should unite with their peoples and co-exist in peace with these countries—is one of the most important: *we must do business with them.*

It is estimated that between 10 and 15 million people have been killed in China since 1949, and on Mao Tse-tung's own admission 800,000 were liquidated by their own security forces. Fear of a repetition of what happened in Hungary coupled with the economic need to trade with the West are the prime reasons behind this new approach to the "contradictions" within Chinese communism.

We do not think we are carping when we say that unless there is a real social revolution in China there are no safeguards against a return to terroristic methods. This, we maintain, is possible under any government—even those which claim to be democratic—but is an ever-present likelihood under a totalitarian régime.

Clean Bombs

Continued from p. 1

object to dam-busting by TNT you can't object to city-busting by 'clean' hydrogen bombs. All the arguments that have been mustered against the hydrogen bomb by those who are not normally war-resisters have been concerned with its genetic effects. While it is acceptable to blast the living enemy of to-day—military or civilians, men, women, children, babies, it doesn't matter—it is held to be immoral to jeopardise future generations. But remove the threat to the future and the present can look after itself.

2. *They have destroyed the great deterrent.* By making it theoretically possible to destroy the enemy without releasing uncontrollable forces, and thus endangering one's own country with one's own weapons, war becomes once again a mere matter of surprise and superior force.

3. *They have made war more likely.* Governments have never worried about destruction through war—as long as they have survived. After all, reconstruction is a profitable business. In Britain already atom-proof shelters are being built, with priority lists of those to be saved. No doubt the same applies to the other atomic powers. If the clean-bomb war leaves the air fit to breathe, the water fit to drink, the land productive, somehow those who own the land and the water (and would claim the air if they could) will survive. The people will go under, but thanks to automation they are becoming redundant anyway.

★

A gloomy picture? Maybe—but are the arguments far out? They indicate surely the terrible peril of the world, where what appears to be an advance introduces a greater threat, because the horror had gone too far. War had become so terrible to contemplate that it had to be made less terrible in order to be made possible again.

The atomic scientists have done just that.

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE :

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND :

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER :

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :

Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

M. BAKUNIN :

Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.

ALEX COMFORT :

Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.

PHILIP SANSON :

Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

JOHN HEWETSON :

Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

HERBERT READ :

Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.

Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

The Education of Free Men 1s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :

New Life to the Land 6d.

Homes orhovels? 6d.

Railways and Society 3d.

What is Anarchism? 1d.

The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

TONY GIBSON :

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.

Food Production and Population 6d.

Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949:

A Tribute cloth 5s.

Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

27, Red Lion Street,

London, W.C.1.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 26

Deficit on Freedom	£520
Contributions received	£362
DEFICIT	£158

London: S.B.* 4/-; London: H.M.* 1/9;	
London: D.R.* 10/-; Edmonton: W.G. 3/8;	
London: H.O.C. 1/-; Los Angeles: "Man" Group, per A.R. £5/5/0.	
Total	6 5 5
Previously acknowledged	355 15 5
1957 TOTAL TO DATE	£362 0 10

*Indicates regular contributor.

Lincoln: R.L.D.	1 5
Previously acknowledged	199 19 10
TOTAL TO DATE	£200 1 3

Fire Fund	
Lincoln: R.L.D.	1 5
Previously acknowledged	199 19 10
TOTAL TO DATE	£200 1 3

*Indicates regular contributor.

Rebel with a Cause

HOW many people, I wonder, read the edifying account about the "Angry Young Woman" in last week's daily press. In its way it was a pathetic little story tacked up to bring out the "human interest" angle while sedulously avoiding the moral issues involved. Obviously the editor was bending over backwards to obey Fleet Street's Eleventh Commandment, "Offend not thy readers lest thy circulation plummet."

From what could be gathered the girl had been taken into custody on the grounds of "being in need of care and protection". Anyone not familiar with the subtleties of English law might imagine that a fair damsel had been rescued from a fate worse than death and was greatly relieved to be succoured by knights in shining helmets. In this case the girl did express her gratitude to the learned beak who ordered a three week convalescence in a remand home, as she felt this was just the way to make a criminal of her. So anxious was she to avail herself of the magisterial hospitality that she fought her way to the cells. If four strapping policemen and women failed to prevent her from getting in it seems that a team of wild horses will not shift her out after three weeks of leisure and recuperation.

There is no doubt that she was in grave moral danger before finding sanctuary with the guardians of peace and order. Wearing a swimming costume under a duffel coat is bad enough, but when one considers that this was in the company of young men carrying skiffle instruments it is plain that she has long since been lost to Beelzebub; probably before the age of consent, too.

When you come to think of it our democratic system is as wonderful as our policemen. Without committing any offence this girl has nevertheless been saved from the cloying pleasures of

youth by a stroke of judicial genius. At sixteen she thinks she knows her own mind, imagines she can choose her own friends, stay up late at night and walk about eccentrically clad in the presence of skiffle instruments. All her statements and behaviour point inescapably to the conclusion that she believes herself to be a free individual in a free country! If this is not a sure sign of serious mental disorder, then what is?

So, lucky girl, she qualifies for care and protection. Sitting in her private room with free board and lodging and personal attention provided she can no doubt hear the timeless clichés ringing down the dusty, sunless, kipper-reeking corridors: "It's all for your own good, really, you silly, selfish girl". Echoing back to the slap of the bedroom slipper and "this hurts me more than it hurts you".

Her mother complains that she is beyond control. In her wilful way the girl probably has a similar opinion of her mother and the policewomen who wrestle with her for the exercise, but lacks the presumption to tell them how to run their arid lives.

Hungary seems a long way off. The shame and sense of helplessness have nearly faded. It only remains for us to shut our eyes to the AVH men on our doorsteps, stop our ears from the screams of a young girl being cared for and protected, and we can sit down in peace to watch the Duke explaining the mysteries of the Universe on the telly.

Given time we shall all find ourselves in need of care and protection. There will be the deviationists who wear shorts and sandals in the hot weather. Those who neglect to get State permission for their sexual activities. And as for the recidivists who read FREEDOM week after week, their re-education will consist of a daily vigil before a goggle-box showing a continuous performance of the Coronation in Westminster Abbey.

There can be no escape. We all need care and protection. And the same benevolent machine that is providing it for the girl who promenaded with degenerate skiffle instruments will provide it for us. Hungary was a long way off. The girl and the machine are with us here and now. How loud can you turn your radio?

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB,
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

JULY 7.—Laurens Otter on
HISTORICAL DETERMINISM
REVISITED

JULY 14.—Jack Robinson on
WORK.

JULY 21.—David Pude on
Problems of the Anarchist Movement:
PROLETARIAN ANARCHISM AND
PETTY BOURGEOIS INTELLEC-
TUALISM

JULY 28.—M. T. Panikka on
NATIONALISM AND THE NEW
SOCIETY

Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.
(Tel.: MUSEum 7277).

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.
BONAR THOMSON speaks

Every Friday and Saturday:
SOCIAL EVENINGS

Anarchist Summer School 1957

'BLUEPRINTS FOR SANITY'

AS we have already announced, the 1957 Anarchist Summer School will be held at the Malatesta Club, London, on the August Bank Holiday weekend—Saturday, Sunday and Monday, 3rd, 4th and 5th August inclusive.

PROGRAMME

Saturday, Aug. 3

2.30 p.m. Morris Simon on
HEALTH IN A SANE SOCIETY
5.30 p.m. High Tea
8 p.m. Social

Sunday, Aug. 4

11 a.m. Geoffrey Ostergaard on
BEYOND THE WAGE SYSTEM
1.30 p.m. Lunch

3.30 p.m. Hyde Park Meeting

7.30 p.m. Bob Green on
THE CONTRIBUTION OF
THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Monday, Aug. 5

11 a.m. Summing Up
1.30 Lunch.

Please book early

A good attendance is expected at this year's Summer School and accommodation may prove to be limited. Comrades from outside London who wish to attend are therefore urged to write as early as possible and London comrades as well are asked to book their meals in advance.

Visitors to London usually require bed and breakfast for the Saturday and Sunday nights and all London comrades with accommodation available are requested to furnish details to the organiser as soon as possible.

All enquiries and information, please to:

JOAN SCULTHORPE,
c/o Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.2.

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)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364