

In this Issue :

Reflections on Law and Liberty - p. 3

Harnessing the Wind - p. 3

Monarchy & Bad Taste - p. 4

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"A little rebellion, now and then, is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical."

—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Vol. 18, No. 28

July 13th, 1957

Threepence

Let ONE Flower Bloom—

## NIKITA GIGANTICA

MAO TSE-TUNG may be liberal with his horticultural advice—more liberal than he is with his own dissidents—but his plea for variety in the Communist garden ('Let a hundred flowers bloom!') is being spectacularly ignored by that well-known expert on agriculture, Nikita Khrushchev.

No-one could accuse Khrushchev of being a hot-house plant himself, but the results of his forcing techniques are the pride of the Kremlin nursery, while his skill with the pruning knife shows how well he has assimilated the skills of his old master. But still he is a specialist—almost a one-plant man, you might say. For in spite of the vast areas available in the Soviet Union, the wide open spaces in which such diversity of plant life could be cultivated, Khrushchev remains stubbornly of the opinion that there is only one flower worth growing—the quick-flowering, long-rooted *Nikita Gigantica*.

In the glasshouse of the Kremlin, the relentless sun of ambition and paranoia creates an over-heated, humid atmosphere in which everything grows a good deal larger than life, and parasitic growths have long since taken control, turning the place into a science-fiction laboratory.

### The Myth of Unity

In such an atmosphere, collective leadership is a myth. The struggle for survival entails the fight to get to the very top, to bathe alone in the full glare of the sun, strangling, depriving, pulling up by the roots any other contender for supremacy.

The latest 'purge' in the Russian Communist Party is only one more example in this never-ending process—never-ending that is, where power structures provide the hot-bed for plot and counter-plot. The process goes on everywhere—in commercial competition as well as in 'democratic' politics. It takes an extreme

form in totalitarian countries because power there is extreme, absolute. And in the Soviet Union above all the myth of monolithic unity must be maintained.

This means that expression of diverse opinion takes on the aspect of treachery. In a no-party set-up, the party can never be wrong. Failures must always be blamed upon individuals who have worked against the party, deliberately sabotaging its wise decisions. Any hint that the party can be wrong strikes at the very foundation of the régime: the infallibility of the Party.

In democracies, popular elections provide the people with the myth that they are infallible. Their choice is always right, and since they choose only figure-heads, the real work of government being carried on by permanent bureaucrats, it doesn't really matter who they choose. If one party lets them down, then it's the infallible people who have been betrayed by the rascally politicians—so they throw them out and put the other bunch in. It's done constitutionally, legally, and the State goes on.

In a totalitarian State, no popular elections are allowed. The government myth here is the infallibility of the party, and when things go wrong and a change of policy is necessary, then the character assassination of individuals has to be

carried out to demonstrate that it was not the party which was wrong but only these traitors who had wheedled their way into its ranks in order to harm the people. Since the State makes the laws, this process can be done constitutionally, legally, and the State goes on.

### They Know the Game

In the Soviet Union, Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovitch, Shepilov, and the minor officials who have been axed with them, have played this game many times before. Now it is their turn.

They surely could not have believed that 'collective leadership' was going to work? They who know the game from the inside must also have known that such ideas are strictly for the innocents. Indeed, the evidence seems to be that they were out for Khrushchev, but he beat them to it.

Those party members who thought that the purge had passed out with Stalin (or at least with Beria) might now think again. And in their bewilderment we advise them to give thought to the effects of power upon individuals and its results in social structures.

Let's weep no tears for Molotov and Co. Let us wait to see who will snatch the pruning knife from Khrushchev's hand and start cutting him back!

## Partition for Cyprus?

CYPRUS has slipped into the news again, eclipsed, not accidentally we feel, by the more startling revelations from Moscow. Had "one of our boys" been shot while defending British interests in Cyprus screaming headlines would have reminded us that terrorism still flourishes in the streets of Nicosia. Instead Sir John Harding sneaked into London this week to discuss once again the future of Cyprus, this time, it is whispered, to oppose any proposals which might be made for the partition of the island.

The fact that the Government is making preparations to shift its main Middle East base from Cyprus to East Africa does not alter the position of the Cypriot people since part of the island is still required for an RAF base, but it does mean that the British Government can afford to play for time over the demands made by the Cypriots and the conflicting one of the Turkish minority. In the event of war Cyprus will still be a target for the enemy even though airfields will be limited to one part of the island. In the meantime Britain's new military plans in East Africa strengthen her bargaining power over Cyprus. There is cunning in the Government manoeuvre discussed by an *Observer* correspondent (July 7th):

There is a likelihood that the British Government, while safeguarding its rights to a base, will announce its willingness to establish first self-government and eventually an independent State in

Cyprus, on condition that its sovereignty will be limited to the extent that it may not join either Greece or Turkey.

There are various versions of such a scheme. Its merit is that the onus would then be put on the Greeks or Turks to refuse Britain's offer of conferring political freedom on the Cypriots—an idea strongly favoured by India.

Having first established a military base in Kenya the British Government no longer finds Cyprus so vitally important. This is therefore a useful time to reverse its previous dictatorial methods in Cyprus and show willingness to encourage self-government. The fact that Britain has resisted by brutal force any claims to independence on the part of the Cypriots for so long will be forgotten, except of course by the families of the victims of British justice. If, as seems to be expected, either the Greeks or the Turks refuse Britain's offer of "conferring" political freedom on the Cypriots, then who is to blame if they cannot agree over the generous terms laid down by Britain?

### Sir John's Anxiety?

A private report opposing any suggestion of partition has been submitted to the Government by Sir John Harding. FREEDOM has no private lines to Whitehall so we have no way of getting information except that which we read in the press and only then what the Government deems it expedient to release. One of the reasons put forward by Sir John against partition is that it will uproot family and business life! We have seen no evidence during his period as military governor of Cyprus that he has been over-anxious to safeguard the sanctity of family life. His refusal on the other hand to allow a private inquiry into the allegations of violence on Cypriot prisoners looks suspiciously as though he is afraid of what might be disclosed about the abuse of prisoners by men directly or indirectly under his command. We cannot see Sir John as the defender of family life when the families consist of people who are opposed to his dictatorial rule.

## T.V. DIPLOMACY

IN this modern electronic age it is now an established fact that the way to make more friends and influence even more people is to appear on television. Sure enough the politicians have realised this, and Khrushchev became a number one attraction on American TV (and subsequently ITN), followed by

Egypt's leading man, President Nasser, a few days ago. These performances pulled in very large audiences and have undoubtedly been successful from the points of view of both Khrushchev and Nasser.

There can be no question that television enables a suitable personality to make an enormous impact on a mass scale. Providing the personality is reasonably photogenic and apparently sincere his words will be accepted on their face value, and though they may not be remembered by most viewers the *general impression* will remain whether it is true or false. If the personality is fortunate enough to possess an interesting mannerism of speech or movement then the effect will be even greater.

If the despotic, mono-maniac Joseph Stalin had appeared on television this side of the iron curtain speaking in English, with his kindly-uncle appearance and a script to match, with just the faintest suspicion of a moustache twitch and a delightful Russian accent, he would have been hailed as a jolly old man, who, until his TV appearance had not been properly understood. (President Roosevelt practically held this opinion of him after their various personal meetings—and Stalin did not even have the benefit of a prepared script).

### Nasser's Sorry

What for example is the British public's reaction to Nasser's TV answer to the question: "What is your feeling towards Britain now?" He replied:

"I'm sorry about the period of bad relations between Britain and Egypt and hope that both countries will work for good relations in order to be friendly again."

Our guess is that ninety-five per cent. of the viewers concluded that he was not a bad chap after all, just doing the best he could for his country and his people, his one aim in life to be friendly with the great British people. The fact that he hates British imperialism and is in reality another power-seeking, dictatorial politician who has so far done little or nothing for the Egyptian people, is forgotten. He looks ordinary (and is therefore quite acceptable), he sounds reasonable (and therefore to the viewer he is reasonable). TV enthusiasts are seldom endowed with a faculty for criticism—if they were, programmes would have to be a great deal better.

### Something for Nothing

Can these international TV speeches be regarded as the beginning of a new era in diplomacy? We suspect not except in special instances. Normally, diplomacy is a matter of hard-bargaining, either between countries with mutual interests who wish to agree on a common policy against an economic or political competitor, or between countries with conflicting interests attempting to come to terms without actually going to war. Usually, in either case, the terms of discussion are so despicable (since they never take into account the human element), that the greatest possible secrecy is required, and of course it would be foolhardy to allow another country, whose interests are probably being ignored or de-valued, to discover what is afoot until after the event.

The only occasions which call for international television speech-making are those where it is deemed advisable in the political interest to

Continued on p. 4

## The Old Monk is Criticised

SOME of Mao Tse-tung's comrades, more trusting than we are, ventured to express criticism invited by Mao in his now famous speech.

Chu An Ping, editor of the *Kwangming Daily*, indiscreetly commented: "People have raised many opinions against the junior monks, but no one has yet said anything about the old monks."

Criticism of the bureaucrats is reasonable but to suggest that big brother is in any way responsible for conditions in China (other than that which is good) is a heresy not to be tolerated. Editor Chu An Ping was suspended from his party—as far as we know he has not been beheaded, but how can one tell when all our information comes from controlled communist sources? But it is likely that no severe action will be taken at the moment since leniency is all part of the 'new look'.

General Lung Yun, vice chairman of China's National Defence Council, said something which may well have been cooked up behind secret doors in collaboration with Mao but for reasons of expediency will not be given official endorsement:

"It is totally unfair for the People's Republic of China to pay all the ex-

penses of the Korean War. The U.S. has given up her claims for loans she granted to her allies during the first and second world wars, yet the Soviet Union insists that China must pay interest on Soviet loans." He would like to know, Lung added, whether the U.S.S.R. intended to reimburse China for the "huge quantities of industrial equipment" which were carted out of Manchuria by Soviet troops after World War II.

General Lung's punishment consisted of a public rebuke from his co-workers for slandering the Soviet Union.

Whatever the final outcome of China's new policy, there is no doubt that events in Hungary have put fear into the Chinese leaders about their own people, and the Soviet leaders must be feeling more than a little uneasy.

It is easier for people to successfully revolt in a small country where communications are accessible than in a vast area where the same language is not always spoken. But hatred springing from years of misery will often stimulate the most docile people into revolt.

The Soviet leaders cannot go on for ever finding scapegoats over which the people can vent their hate.

## Lest You Forget A REMINDER!

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 27	
Deficit on Freedom	£540
Contributions received	£387
DEFICIT	£153

June 28 to July 4

London: S.B.\* 2/3; London: Anon. 1/10; Fresno: Part proceeds Picnic, May 1, per P.P. £13/14/0; London: J.S.\* 3/-; Toronto: Italian Comrades per A.B. £7; Falmouth: R.W.\* 2/-; London: D.R.\* 10/-; London: R.M. 2/-.

Total	25 13 2
Previously acknowledged	362 0 10
1957 TOTAL TO DATE	£387 14 0

\*Indicates regular contributor.

### Fire Fund

Sydney, N.S.W. & Melbourne: Bulgarian Anarchist Group and other Comrades per G.H. £33/14/0; Toronto: Italian Comrades, per A.B. £14; London: A.F. 2/-.

Total	47 16 0
Previously acknowledged	200 1 3
TOTAL TO DATE	£247 17 3

GIFT OF BOOKS: Bath: H.J.C.

## BOOK NEWS &amp; COMMENT

The Hungarian Revolution. Edited by M. J. Lasky. Secker & Warburg, 25/-.

AN annual literary award entitled the "Liberty and Justice Award" at first sounds most interesting and welcome, but when one learns it is to be given for the "year's finest book in the field of contemporary affairs and problems" one may be excused for doubting whether the lucky book will always be strictly in accord with the award's title. The American Library Association, the donors, have just announced the first winner, *The Organisation Man* by William H. Whyte, recently published in the U.S. and due here in the autumn. In it, we are told, the author "presents the latest American thoughts on the situation which has developed in the U.S.A. through the imposition of welfare state conditions by private enterprise on a broad slice of American society. He maintains this benevolent tyranny is stultifying American inventiveness by crushing individual enterprise..." This may indeed be the year's finest book, but if it is as lacking in originality as it sounds (at least to readers of the British press) it surely has small chance of deserving the adjective.

The celebrated anonymity of contributors to the *Times Literary Supplement* can be maddening: I should like to know the name of the author of the front-page article entitled "Loyalties" in the issue of June 28th. He uses an omnibus review of eight recent books as a peg on which to hang a discussion of breaking loyalties all over the world—loyalties to political parties, nations, religions, moralities, and families—and of the preoccupation of governments and lesser bodies with security. The real interest of the article lies not so much in its exposition of the American hysteria (with which the books reviewed are largely concerned) but with its analysis of the nature, causes, and degrees of disloyalty (from treason to "contracting out of society"), in its awareness of totalitarianism in Britain (quoting Parliamentary "privilege", legislation by Regulations, growth of tribunals, wire-tapping, etc.) and in its reminder of Mill's thesis that only the enlarging of freedoms can cure fear. Though the writer does not discuss the question of how far loyalty as such is a good thing, nor even distinguish between loyalty to society and loyalty to a state, it is an article well worth reading. The books concerned are: *Security through Freedom* by A. T. Mason (Oxford University Press, 24/-) (lectures delivered at Cornell University), *Freedom in Contemporary Society* by S. E. Morison (Oxford Uni-

versity Press, 22/6d.) (lectures delivered at Queen's University, Ontario), *Academic Freedom in Our Time* by R. M. McIver (Oxford University Press, 32/-) (prepared for the American Academic Freedom Project), *The Unquiet Years* by Herbert Agar (Hart-Davis, 15/-) (history of the United States between 1945 and 1955), *Loyalty in America* by J. H. Schaar (Cambridge University Press, 26/-), *Grand Inquest* by Telford Taylor (Simon & Schuster, New York, \$4.50), *The Lamont Case* edited by Philip Wittenberg (Horizon Press, New York, \$5) (i.e. Corliss Lamont, author of *Freedom is as Freedom Does*), and *In the Court of Public Opinion* by Alger Hiss (Calder, 25/-). Any of these books can be obtained on request from good public libraries, but the poorer ones might fight shy of those not published in this country.

Another case of censorship has occurred in Florida. Because its author has been convicted of contempt of court, booksellers there are unable to sell W. B. Huie's *The Crime of Ruby McCollum*. Ruby McCollum, a negress, was condemned to death for killing her lover, and the contempt arose when Huie, a journalist, interviewed a witness during the trial. The book is published here by Jarrolds. It is to be hoped that attention will be paid to this kind of censorship, and not only political censorship, in the campaign now launched by the American National Book Committee against limitation of the freedom of expression. In connection with the campaign the Committee has published a survey of such limitations, undertaken during autumn and winter 1955/56 by Richard McKeon, R. K. Merton and Walter Gellhorn, and entitled *Freedom to Read*.

Though William Morris was no anarchist, readers will be well enough acquainted with his association with the Socialist League, his editorship of *Commonweal*, his *Dream of John Ball* and *News from Nowhere*. Some of them will soon have a chance of seeing something of his services to printing, particularly the beautiful books he produced at

his Kelmescott Press. The William Morris Society is holding an exhibition at the following places: St. Bride's Institute, Bride Lane, E.C.4. (first three weeks in August), Leighton House, Kensington (August 19th to September 7th), Manchester Central Library (September 16th to October 5th), and Glasgow (dates not yet announced).

## Reviews in Brief of Recent Books

*Abbé Pierre Speaks*. Published by Sheed & Ward, 12/6d.

The Abbé Pierre, Resistance worker and post-war Deputy, dismayed by the ignorance of the politicians about housing conditions and appalled by the state of the homeless, launched a campaign of broadcasts and public appeals, and when these were not enough he resorted to direct action. This book contains his speeches and appeals, but the story itself is told by one of his helpers, Boris Simon, in *Ragman's City* (Harvill Press, 18/-).

*The Challenge of Co-Existence*. By Hugh Gaitskell. Methuen, 7/6d.

This consists of Gaitskell's three lectures which he delivered at Harvard University in the series of Godkin Lectures. They were not fully reported at the time by the papers, occupied as they were with Suez and Hungary. The titles sufficiently express their subjects: "Co-Existence and the United Nations", "Co-Existence in Europe", and "The Uncommitted Areas".

*Children of the Sun*. By Morris West. Heinemann, 16/-.

The author went to live with the slum-dwellers of Naples, and tells the story of the daily round of the beggars, prostitutes, pimps, homosexuals, drug-addicts and others who make up such a large proportion of the population. He attacks the Church, State and civic authorities for their apathy. Only one or two men were prepared to do any-

thing at all, and one of them, Father Borelli, lived as a beggar and pimp himself in order to learn the full extent of the corruption and to gain the confidence of the unfortunates. His House of Urethins became for many children a way out of their misery, but the author recognises the inadequacy of this kind of help. He believes only large-scale emigration can deal with such poverty.

*Democracy in England*. By Diana Spearman. Rockliff, 30/-.

A study of the origins and growth of democracy in England from the 18th Century and an analysis of the present situation. The historical part is interesting in correcting the conventional picture of a steady increase in the influence exercised by the people, but the latter part says nothing really new—that the rule of the majority can be as tyrannical as the rule of a minority, etc.—but we do get this: "When the socialist ideal caught the imagination of enlightened spirits it was thought that government could do little harm and much good. To-day we know that the evils government can produce are without limit and that their powers for good are strictly circumscribed."

*Family and Kinship in East London*. By Michael Young and Peter Willmott. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 25/-.

This badly wanted writing. "Greenleigh" is the pseudonym of a housing estate where many Bethnal Green people have been rehoused, and the book is a comparison of family life and neighbourly relations in the two places. Those who have experienced the dispiriting effect of removal to a new estate, albeit clean and healthy, will endorse the statement that people's needs in housing should be assessed by themselves, not by others. The lack of communal feelings, distance from former friends and associations, the destruction of the three-generation structure of the family are reasons for asking whether the typical housing estate in the outer suburbs is the right answer.

A record of the events leading to the uprising and the revolt itself, consisting of newspaper reports, broadcasts, Hungarian leaflets, letters, official documents, despatches and other material taken from sources on both sides of the Curtain (unlike the U.N. report). They form a connected story and the reader draws his own conclusions. The book, which was commissioned by the Congress for Cultural Freedom, follows the U.N. report and the books by J. A. Michéner (*The Bridge at Andau*, Secker & Warburg, 15/-), G. Mikes (*The Hungarian Revolution*, Deutsch, 12/6d.), and Peter Fryer (*Hungarian Tragedy*, Dennis Dobson).

*Khrushchev and Stalin's Ghost*. By Bertram D. Wolfe. Atlantic Press, 25/-.

Those who missed the *Observer* issue which printed the "secret speech" will find it here, together with a wealth of commentary and Kremlinology. Part 1 relates developments in the U.S.S.R. between Stalin's death and the speech, part 2 prints the speech on the left-hand page with an explanation of all the references on the right-hand page, part 3 prints the "secret" documents distributed to the delegates who heard the speech, and the author includes relevant passages from some published writings.

*Rebels Daughters*. By E. S. Sachs. MacGibbon & Kee, 21/-.

How Solly Sachs helped to form and build up the South African Garment Workers' Union is told here. The members were largely white Afrikaner girls and apart from the usual struggle against exploitation the Union leaders had to contend with government attacks and the race prejudices of the members (who had Nationalist backgrounds). Despite the efforts to educate them out of this, it was not possible to form an inter-racial union and a separate branch had to be formed for coloured workers. Sachs was forbidden in 1950 to hold any public office and came to this country in 1952.

R.B.

## Anarchism and Religion—2

## Kropotkin's Reservations

(Continued from previous issue)

KROPOTKIN wrote quite a bit about Christianity in his last book (which he died before he could finish), *Ethics*. He took the view that there was nothing at all objectionable in the teachings of Jesus Himself, but that Christianity as it is does not follow the teachings of Jesus. It follows rather the teachings of the early Christian fathers, particularly the apostles Peter and Paul, who have considerably modified the original doctrines.

The principle commandment of Christ, the "true greatness of Christianity" as Kropotkin calls it, was "Do not take vengeance on your enemies," a commandment which the Christians stopped obeying very early in their history. Jesus said, "Resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." [Mat. 5:39]. Paul said, "wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself" [Romans 2:1] which is a very feeble hint at the forgiveness of sin. The doctrine progressed from the rejection of vengeance to the postponement of vengeance until after death, and finally to the acceptance of vengeance through the courts, even in its cruellest forms, in Christian states and the Christian church.

"It is significant," Kropotkin said, "that priest and executioner are together at the scaffold."

Another fundamental of Christ's teaching was equality. For Him, a slave and a free citizen were equally brothers, children of God; "Whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all" [Mark 10:44]. But as early as the Apostles, the teaching was different. Saints Peter and Paul taught that slaves and their masters were equal "in Christ", but they presented the obedience of slaves to their masters as a fundamental Christian virtue, and they did not object to Christians being slave-owners, provided they were kind to their servants. They preached obedience to the Roman Emperors "as to God's anointed", no doubt, Kropotkin says, in order to guard their followers from persecution. But in the doctrine of obedience "Christianity dealt itself a blow from which it has not recovered to this day. It became the religion of the state."

Slavery, and slavish obedience to rulers, endured with the strong support of the Church for nearly fifteen centuries. And the rebels who eventually overthrew slavery were rebels against the Church too. The peasant revolts of Western Europe were inspired by heretics, the French revolution by atheists. The Churches did not object to slavery until the nineteenth century, when in fact

it had become more profitable for the rich to hire day-labour than to own slaves.

Equality and forgiveness are fundamentally doctrines of Christianity, but throughout its history it has been the champion of inequality and redistribution. Further, it has confirmed the ancient belief in the devil, and the Power of Evil, and so allowed the leaders of Churches to condemn their opponents as servants of the devil.

Wherever the Christian Church has been in power, there has been interference, intolerance and cruelty. Kropotkin gives as an example the

Roman Church, which tortured those suspected of heresy and burned alive those convicted of it, especially in Spain where it was most powerful. We may add the instance of the New England Puritans (the Pilgrim Fathers and all those people) who instituted public floggings for the mothers of illegitimate children, and incidentally for the mothers of all children born less than nine months after marriage. Even the Society of Friends, when they were in power in Pennsylvania, sent the Quaker printer William Bradford to gaol for printing a religious work not quite on the Quaker "Party Line".

By and large, in Kropotkin's opinion, Christianity was a pleasant idea at first, but in practice it has done very little good and a great deal of harm.

## Bakunin's Rejection of God

MICHAEL BAKUNIN would not have agreed that Christianity was a pleasant idea at first. A recent *FREEDOM* (June 8) quotes Dr. Lampert as saying that for him "the existence of God was irreconcilable with the happiness, dignity, morality and freedom of man". And his own most quoted remark is, of course, "If God really existed, it would be necessary to destroy him."

Bakunin is reputed among those who have not read his work to be a "difficult" writer, and rambling and haphazard he certainly is; but he is not, like so many of his contemporaries, heavy, humourless and longwinded. The following summary of Christianity is taken from *God and the State*. "The Bible, which is a very interesting and here and there very profound book when considered as one of the oldest surviving manifestations of human wisdom and fancy, expresses this truth [that the power to think and the desire to rebel are essential to humanity] very naively in the myth of original sin. Jehovah, who of all the good gods adored by men was certainly the most jealous, the most vain, the most ferocious, the most unjust, the most bloodthirsty, the most despotic, and the most hostile to human dignity and liberty—Jehovah had just created Adam and Eve, to satisfy we know not what caprice; no doubt to while away his time, which must weigh heavy on his hands in his eternal egoistic solitude, or that he might have some new slaves. He generously placed at their disposal the whole earth, with all its fruits and animals, and set but a single limit to this complete enjoyment. He expressly forbade them from touching the fruit of the tree of knowledge. He wished, therefore, that man, destitute of all understanding of himself, should remain an eternal beast, ever on all-fours before the eternal God, his creator and his master. But here steps in Satan, the eternal rebel, the first freethinker and the emancipator of worlds. He makes man ashamed of his bestial ignorance and obedience; he emancipates him, stamps upon his brow

the seal of liberty and humanity, in urging him to disobey and eat of the fruit of knowledge.

"We know what followed. The good God, whose foresight, which is one of the divine faculties, should have warned him of what would happen, flew into a terrible and ridiculous rage; he cursed Satan, man, and the world created by himself, striking himself so to speak in his own creation, as children do when they get angry; and, not content with smiting our ancestors themselves, he cursed them in all the generations to come, innocent of the crime committed by their forefathers. Our Catholic and Protestant theologians look upon that as very profound and very just, precisely because it is monstrously iniquitous and absurd. Then remembering that he was not only a God of vengeance and wrath, but also a God of love, after having tormented the existence of a few milliards of poor human beings and condemned them to an eternal hell, he took pity on the rest, and, to save them and reconcile his eternal and divine love with his eternal and divine anger, always greedy for victims and blood, he sent into the world, as an expiatory victim, his only son, that he might be killed by men. That is called the mystery of the Redemption, the basis of all the Christian religions. Still, if the divine Saviour had saved the human world! But no; in the paradise promised by Christ, as we know, such being the formal announcement, the elect will number very few. The rest, the immense majority of the generations present and to come, will burn eternally in hell. In the meantime, to console us, God, ever just, ever good, hands over the earth to the government of the Napoleon Third, of the William First, of the Ferdinands of Austria, and of the Alexanders of all the Russias.

"Such are the absurd tales that are told and the monstrous doctrines that are taught, in the full light of the nineteenth century, in all the public schools of Europe, at the express command of the governments. They call this civilising the people! Is it not plain that all these governments are systematic poisoners, interested stupefiers of the masses?" D.R.

(To be continued)

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP  
OPEN DAILY

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

## New Books . . .

- The Cotton Pickers B. Traven 10/6  
The Prometheus Alec Craig 6/-  
Ravens and Prophets  
George Woodcock 4/6  
To the City of the Dead  
George Woodcock 25/-  
The London Years  
Rudolf Rocker 25/-

## Remainders . . .

- A Hundred Years of Revolution  
Woodcock, Beloff, Jackson 3/6  
William Godwin  
George Woodcock 5/-  
Notes on Democracy  
H. L. Mencken 4/6  
Recollections of the Assize  
Court André Gide 3/6  
On Art and Socialism  
William Morris 7/6

## Cheap Editions . . .

- The Ignoble Art  
Edith Summerskill 2/-  
Naught for Your Comfort  
Trevor Huddleston 2/6  
The Cage  
Dan Billany 2/-

## Second-Hand . . .

- The Mind and Face of Bolshevism  
(soiled) Rene Fulop Muller 6/-  
The Russo-German Alliance  
A. Rossi 5/-  
Portrait of a Genius, but . . .  
(D. H. Lawrence)  
Richard Aldington 7/6  
Prescription for Rebellion  
Robert Lindner 4/-  
The Devils of Loudon  
Aldous Huxley 7/6  
A New Slavery: Forced Labour  
(ed.) Roger Baldwin 6/-  
Art and Industry Herbert Read 10/-  
Education Through Art  
Herbert Read 20/-  
The Changing Scene  
Arthur Calder-Marshall 3/6

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!

Postage free on all items  
Obtainable from

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

## Reflections on LAW AND LIBERTY

IN last week's *New Statesman*, "Critic" (Kingsley Martin) points out that before discussing wire tapping from the point of view of expediency we should first be clear whether in fact it is legal. He goes on to add, however, that even if it can be shown to be illegal, "telephone tapping can, of course, be legalised by act of parliament". Thus apart from the purely nuisance value of Mr. Martin's argument (for if tapping is illegal then both Mr. Billy Hill and Mr. Marrinan are in a position to claim damages from the Home Secretary), it is if anything, less "practical" than that of the government's critics who argue against wire tapping on the grounds of expediency: for whereas on these grounds wire-tapping might conceivably be abolished (just as identity cards were), legal arguments will only inform the government whether it already has the Law on its side or whether it needs to introduce legislation to be in the clear—legally speaking!

Let us honestly recognise that when we use such high sounding expressions as "civil liberties" we are not talking of basic, inviolable human rights, which are to the spirit and dignity of man, what food and air are to the healthy growth of the human body. When we talk of defending our civil liberties we are doing no more than attempting either to insist that certain laws should be respected by those in authority who seek to abuse them, or to mobilise some kind of public pressure on governments to oblige them to, or prevent them from, introducing legislation which might or might not curtail our freedom of action as individuals. Such agitation, we would maintain, is purely negative (however much we would support it in the present circumstances\*) in that what one is doing is attempting to curb the powers of those in authority rather than widening the horizons of human freedom.

It is surely an extraordinary concept that freedom of the majority of the community or nation should require legislation to be made, presumably, by that minority which dominates and subjects it. The conscious concept of freedom only arises in unfree surroundings, in a society in which an élite, a minority aided by guile and protected by the instruments of force, can dominate and exploit the majority. "Civil liberties" only exists in the vocabulary of an authoritarian and unfree society, just as "hunger in the midst of plenty" is possible only in a society based on profit, or in which bread is a weapon of politics.

**R**ESPECT of the Law is not respect of human freedom or dignity. To be murdered, or extinguished by "the due process of law" are only distinctions in terminology; and curiously enough more people have been legally killed than illegally (that is, murdered) in our time. The same action can be both sanctioned and condemned by the Law. Thus the conscript who kills an unknown enemy in time of war is a hero, but is also the murderer when he kills the person who intrudes into the routine of his domestic life. The spy is both a hero and a traitor, just

\*Much of the activity of the "Freedom Defence Committee" (1945-1950) with which members of the Freedom Press was concerned with defending individuals against abuses by those in authority.

"The one condition essential to the establishment of such bucolic anarchists is the availability of cheap power. And the source of the power must, of course, be beyond the control of the tyrant, the power-maniac, whether he be a monopoly capitalist or a civil servant.

"How did we manage at St. Maëls? We erected windmills and made them drive generators. They were not the graceful windmills of the traditional Dutch landscape, by machines as efficient as the airscrew of a Spitfire, and designed on the same principles, mathematically perfect and delivering a well-nigh inexhaustible supply of power . . ."

—EDWARD HYAMS:  
"William Medium".

**A**S *Mayflower II* sailed at last into Provincetown, Massachusetts, the radio announcer boomed unctuously, "She has proved that the oldest source of motive power harnessed by mankind is still capable of serving men's needs". He didn't say who had suggested that the wind would cease to blow simply because we no longer need it as a source of power, but it is of course true that the wind means very much less to us than to our ancestors, as first the steam engine, then oil and electricity, and soon presumably, nuclear power, have displaced it.

Wind-using appliances reached their peak, mechanically, in the nineteenth century in such beautiful and functionally perfect objects as the clipper ships at sea, and on land, the windmill. Before their long and gradual decline began, there were about ten thousand grist mills (for flour-milling) in England, and another two thousand marsh mills, for pumping water by wind power, draining the East Anglian fens. The millwrights with the materials of their day, timber and wrought iron, were in the forefront of technological advance. Many of the technicians whose inventions made the industrial revolution were millwrights or millwrights' sons — Smeaton, Cubitt, Meikle and Murdoch. They introduced ball-bearings in the eighteenth century and airbrakes in the nineteenth. The

as is the rebel or the assassin. In our society it is not the action itself which is condemned as much as the timing of it. One is reminded of the wisdom and pertinence of John Harington's remark:

*Treason doth never prosper:  
what's the reason?  
For if it prosper, none dare call  
it treason.*

The Law is not concerned with justice or human freedom. "Justice", in our society is in fact the upholding of the sanctity of Law. To assume that that which is legal is just, is to assume that apartheid in South Africa, Franco's régime in Spain or even the Rent Act in Britain are just. It is to assume that telephone tapping is opposed to our ideas of justice when not sanctioned by Law but just when supported by the seal of legality! As Kingsley Martin points out telephone tapping—and any other such despicable practises—can be "legalised by act of parliament". Is Parliament then, the repository of freedom and the pulse of our aspirations to freedom? Or is it no more than the symbol of our conditioned hopelessness and the expression of party rule and "working majorities" within a ruling minority? If we are to advance towards real freedom we must first answer these questions, for if the yearnings after freedom are as old as Man, yet its achievement has eluded him because, perhaps, he has not really understood who are the enemies and what are the obstacles he has to overcome. Authority is the antithesis of freedom, and Law is authority, or at last, a justification for the use of force. As Turgot, a French statesman of the 18th century with experience of the political machine, so succinctly put it:

*Everywhere the strong have made  
the laws and oppressed the weak;  
and if they have sometimes consulted  
the interests of society, they  
have always forgotten those of  
humanity.*

## PEOPLE AND IDEAS HARNESSING THE WIND

fan-tail device for swinging the mill into the wind (ancestor of the tail rotor in helicopters), was invented in 1750, and by 1780 Smeaton (the builder of the Eddystone lighthouse) was experimenting on the relationship between the speed of the tips of the sails or blades and that of the wind.

The steam engine and the growing dependency on imported grain (which resulted in the ports becoming milling centres) slowly killed the windmill, and only a handful are working to-day for either flour-milling or water pumping. But the growth of the aircraft industry in the present century, and the greatly increased knowledge of aerodynamics and of metallurgy which have resulted from it, together with the development of the generation and use of electricity, and with the growing awareness that fuel resources are not inexhaustible, have given a new impetus to efforts to harness the wind.

**W**HEN you arrive at the islands off the north of Scotland, almost the first things to catch your eye are the little propellers raised above the houses and crofts, charging accumulators. They are mostly Lucas 'Freelites' or home-made versions of them. I once dismantled one made by James Isbister, blacksmith, of Brig O' Waithe in Orkney. In its way it was a masterpiece of simple ingenuity. As soon as you have seen a few of these little wind generators which provide a 12-volt electricity supply, or the paddle-wheel type of 5 h.p. wind-pump that you sometimes see used for pumping water on farms, you begin to think about the possibility of making them on a grand scale, or connecting them in series, or of developing some more efficient means of storing the electricity they produce than accumulators. And many back-yard inventors have had a go at it, using old hardwood aircraft propellers. But serious attempts to apply new knowledge to the problems of electrical generation from the wind have been applied to units generating up

to 100 kilowatts (134 h.p.) and giant windmills of about 1,500 kW (2,000 h.p.).

In the nineteen-twenties efforts at building wind turbines aimed at doing without propellers or sails. Flettner in Germany and Máderas in America sought to utilise what is known as the Magnus effect—the thrust exerted by a cylinder spinning in a wind-stream, while Savonius in Finland built vertical S-shaped rotors. But experience showed that these rotor-type turbines were considerably less efficient, per unit area swept, than the propeller type, which itself can only extract about 59 per cent. of the energy passing through the area swept. (This low mechanical efficiency of any kind of windmill is offset by the fact that the power is free, but it does mean that capital and maintenance costs must be kept low if the units are to be economically feasible).

In 1929 a French firm built the Darrieux wind-turbine with two blades with a diameter of 67 feet, and in 1931 a 100-foot diameter windmill was put into operation near Yalta on the Black Sea. It drove a 100 kW, 220 volt generator feeding power to the peat-burning power station at Sevastopol, and it functioned for 10 years until destroyed in the war. During the war, experiments in Denmark resulted in the building of a considerable number of small generators of 30-70 kW, which have been operating successfully since then, used in conjunction with diesel generators. Like most things designed in Denmark, and unlike most of the other wind-turbines, they are very elegant in appearance.

**B**UT the most ambitious experiment in wind-generation was that undertaken by an American engineer, P. C. Putnam, backed by the S. Morgan Smith Company, manufacturers of hydraulic turbines. Putnam designed a windmill with two stainless steel blades, 175 feet in diameter and a generating capacity of 1,250 kW. This was erected in 1941,

## THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS

**R**EADERS may remember that we recently referred to the attempts being made by the Committee for International Anarchist Relations (CIA) in France to organise an international congress this year.

Our latest information on this is that it has been decided to postpone the congress until next Spring and arrangements will be going ahead accordingly.

The intervening time can now be used by anarchist movements in all countries to discuss and prepare matter for presentation at the congress and we shall publish any agenda or decided issues as they come to hand and seem to us suitable for public discussion.

First of these to hand is the following resolution approved by the Libertarian League of North America, which they hope to present to Congress. We welcome readers' comments.

### STATEMENT ON ORGANIZATIONAL CONCEPTS FOR PRESENTATION TO THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS

Upon the question of organization rests the future effectiveness or impotence of the Anarchist Movement. A pernicious confusion as to the nature and rôle of organization has long existed in our movement, and an all too prevalent anti-organizational bias has paralyzed whole sectors of our movement at various times. We mean by anti-organizationalists those who are opposed to all forms of effective organized action, especially within the labour movement.

Wherever our ideas have had any measure of continuing success, as in Spain, Argentina, Bulgaria and other countries at different times, they have always expressed themselves through well-defined organizations with clearly stated principles.

It is generally agreed in our movement that organization will be necessary in any conceivable form of libertarian society, but always federative organization with power going from the bottom up, as distinguished from centralized, monolithic and undemocratic capitalist and Marxist forms of organization.

Why then, the total rejection of organization on the part of some? This comes from the erroneous belief in a fundamental antagonism between society (that is, organization) and the individual. Such an antagonism exists now, but it need not exist. The libertarian society towards which we are striving is one in which there will be no conflict between society and the individual.

Life outside of society is impossible, and society is impossible without organized activity. Mankind's problem is to develop a form of society which is harmonious, in which the individual can live in peace and freedom. To quote Michael Bakunin: ". . . man realizes his individual freedom only by rounding out his personality with the aid of other individuals belonging to the same social environment . . . society, far from limiting and detracting from the freedom of individuals, creates, on the contrary, this freedom. Society is the root and tree, and freedom is its fruit."

The beginning of the development of a libertarian society lies in the formation of an effectively organized anarchist movement. We fully agree with Errico Malatesta that ". . . to remain isolated, each one acting on his own without getting together with others, without preparation, without unifying the weak and isolated forces, means to condemn themselves to impotence, to fritter away their energies in petty, ineffective actions and very quickly end by falling into complete inaction." Indeed, the hallmark of the anti-organizationalists has been complete isolation from other sections of society, and especially from the labour movement, the very section we must reach if we are ever to attain our ideals.

Therefore we urge the effective organization of the national movements and of the international movement as a whole, always basing our organizations on the Anarchist principle of free federalism.

after a great deal of pioneering research into the nature and behaviour of wind, in a hill called Grandpa's Knob in Vermont. It fed electricity into the public supply until 1945 when one of the 8-ton blades broke. Under wartime conditions it would have taken four years to get a new one made, and the sponsors abandoned the project, placing their patents in the public domain, and declaring that "we have satisfied ourselves that Putnam's ideas are practical . . . We think that we could now design, with confidence, 2,000 kilowatt wind-turbines incorporating important improvements leading to smoother operation, simpler maintenance, and lower cost". Putnam's researches were published in an exhaustive technical and financial report in 1948.

After the war, the Electrical Research Association in this country began investigations into wind-power generation, led by Mr. T. G. Haldane. They reported after 18 months' work that a chain of aero-generators along the north and western seaboard (Cornwall, North Wales, the Hebrides and Orkney) would amount to between one and two million kilowatts, producing from 3,750 to 7,500 million kilowatt-hours a year. This means a saving of from two to four million tons of coal yearly. The ERA made a wind-velocity survey of the whole country, and, profiting from Putnam's experience ('Putnam's Effect' is the fact that where a hill summit of aerofoil shape is selected the wind velocity is amplified by 20 per cent. and the compression of the wind-streamlines removes turbulence), they selected two experimental sites, one at Costa Head in Orkney, where a 100 kW generator made at John Brown's shipyard, was erected in 1951, and the other on the Caernarvonshire coast where another 100 kW generator made by Enfield Cables was erected in 1953. I saw the Enfield-Andreau when it was put up at St. Alban's for testing. It works on a different principle from all other types. The propeller is not connected by gearing to the turbine; instead, it is mounted on a hollow tower with holes at the base. The two blades of the propeller are hollow, with holes at their tips, and when it rotates, air is drawn by centrifugal force through these holes, and the suction in the tower drives a turbine at its base.

**B**OTH these generators have been found to be a practical proposition, but whether the Electrical Research Association will get backing for experiments with the giant aero-generators that it believes are economically possible, remains to be seen. How near do the accomplished facts bring us to Mr. Hyams' fantasy of cheap, decentralised and inexhaustible power from windmills?

A recent appraisal declared that a 100 kW unit would generate sufficient electrical energy for an isolated community when used alone, or form an auxiliary supply to a conventional grid system when distributed in large numbers, and that a collection of the giant 1,500 kW aero-generators might compare with a hydro-electric station. Whatever the size of the generator it seems that, since wind generation is bound to be intermittent, it is best used in conjunction with conventional generating plant. The cost is low enough to justify its use as a fuel-saver with a steam generator, and in places which have small isolated networks operated by diesel plant, the combination of diesel and wind-power offers considerable economies. Where used in conjunction with hydro-electric schemes, the effect of aero-generators would be that of greater rainfall or increased catchment area. Thus larger generators than the water-power alone would justify, could be installed at a relatively small additional cost and some schemes which would otherwise be economically impracticable could be made practical.

But would wind-generation be limited to a few exceptionally windy places, like the test sites? At the fourth World Power Conference it was reported that "the wind energy resources of Great Britain are greater than those of any country of comparable size and importance. There are probably several hundred sites each of which could accommodate wind plant of several thousand kilowatts capacity. But it could be greatly increased if future developments allowed the use of sites having average wind speeds of between 15 and 20 miles an hour".

So the future of wind-power really depends on the amount of scientific effort which is put into developing windmills of greater sensitivity and flexibility. And the whole future of this and every other means of electrical generation would be changed if some genius could discover an efficient means of storing electric current. C.W.

# Monarchy and Bad Taste

BRITAIN is regarded as something of an anachronism by many foreigners, a country with a powerful and unquestionably dominant middle class, yet with the remnants of a feudal aristocracy, and of all things a Queen with a crown and sceptre who rules over all. Americans look at our still flourishing castles and great manors, supported by the half-crown sightseers and benevolence of the Ministry of Works, and imagine that the magic of the middle ages still persists and is embodied in the person of the sovereign herself. As they shuffle to their feet when God Save the Queen is played, while the less simple of us find our coats and make a getaway to the exits, they imagine that here is a charisma spanning the centuries and uniting the British people as one. It is hard for them to grasp that the monarchy is a middle-class institution rather than an aristocratic one, and that the post-war revival of the monarchic bally-hoo was largely the work of the Labour Party when it came to power. The Atlee government wins full marks for political acumen in playing up the monarchy as a wily dodge by which they stole the mass adulation from Churchill and directed it to harmless puppets, and robbed the Tories of one of their traditional props.

The present popularity of the monarchy with that section of the populace which is avid for all forms of cheese-cake which Fleet Street dispenses, is partly the result of Labour's political acumen, though all political parties and groups who count seek to use the monarchy. History has repeated itself since Queen Victoria was launched as a new kind of monarch in 1837. Queen Victoria was the first really bourgeois monarch and served her purpose well as a figurehead for the new ruling class. Ever since, the monarchy has been held to the model of a middle-class family with all its solid dull virtues and its philistine vulgarities. It has very little to do with the aristocratic tradition of this country, which in middle-class eyes is not quite respectable. Edward VII gave some trouble in his short reign by constantly trying to slip the chain, and when Edward VIII tried to show the aristocratic licence of marrying a woman who had been to bed with two other men, he was simply thrown out. The ruling class know how to stage-manage a middle-class family, and we must give them credit for their efficiency.

Previous to Queen Victoria the monarchy had been notorious for generations for the aristocratic foibles of debauchery, dishonesty and contempt for

middle-class democratic ideas. In France the monarchy and nobility earned the reward of their stupidity at the guillotine. In Britain the middle-class captured the monarchy and used it to their own purposes. After the insufferable Georges and their dreadful progeny, renowned for drunkenness, cheating, whoring, bankrupt extravagance and every aristocratic trait, Victoria came as a break with tradition. She had been educated as a middle-class girl and had a sense of modesty and propriety quite out of keeping with her aristocratic forebears. On first experiencing the gaze of the London crowds about the time of her coronation, she wrote, "The anxiety of the people to see poor stupid me was very great and I must say that I was very touched by it." This must have been the first time that the Throne had ever referred to itself as "poor stupid me". Victoria was a natural for the part she had to play. She and her consort soon cleared the court of the easy-going laxities of the aristocratic way of life, and set the pattern of Christian, middle-class family life which has been sedulously fostered ever since.

There is an extraordinary and peculiarly British humbug which surrounds the Royal Family. They are beyond criticism. It is "bad taste" to suggest that they are no more worthy of special respect than the Prudential Insurance Company or the General Post Office. Bolstered up by wealth and power, yet they are held to be so delicate an institu-

tion that only a cad of the basest sort would say that the monarchy is an insult to reason and a shoddy pretence at grandeur! Leftists and nationalists of the *New Statesman* variety will generally eat mud rather than risk the awful stigma of "bad taste" in being honest about the monarchy. For the main power of the monarchy lies in the plain snobbery of the middle class. While the bitter remnants of the old aristocratic robbers have had to preserve some sort of existence by marrying their children where money is, they have had little part in the vulgar nonsense which surrounds the throne, except to exploit it a little in a practical way, as their living too is partly dependent on the snobbery of their social inferiors.

The monarchy has here been referred to as a middle-class institution; but what of the working class—do they not also crowd to stand and stare, and lap up the nonsense which the newspapers spew out about the royal family? As the barbarian aristocratic class tamed the philistine middle class in Britain by offering them alliances and titles, so the middle-class is now taming the working-class by offering them certain social refinements. As some old political cynic once said in the early days when Labour agitators first started coming to Westminster—one can put these fellows in prison, but it is far pleasanter and more effective simply to invite them to tea.

Many people hold that the monarchy is at least harmless, and that it is a waste

of time to attack it. So much time, energy and money is squandered nowadays on totally useless or evil projects, that the monarchy is surely a very minor affair. But is it? Like the church, it stands for the anti-rational, the deliberate and perverse false sentiment by which the minds of children and simple fools are debauched. Superstition and snobbery are powerful weapons at the disposal of unscrupulous rulers. Young men have been led to do deeds of disgusting inhumanity in the name of their God and Queen—when they would shrink from bestialities were they called upon to do them just for the sake of their own families. Can it be that we are entering a new age of unreason when we had hoped that we were progressing towards an age of enlightenment? The movement which is being fostered by Toynbee and his revolting little sycophants, the growing timidity of left-wing intellectuals and the growing boldness of all the prophets of unreason are signs of the times. It is not considered "good form" to admit publicly what we all know to be true about the monarchy.

Let us indulge in "bad taste" and be honest. It is time people admitted in public what is plain fact—that it is only by the grossest sort of humbug that the royal family is accorded any greater importance than any other family. If there were even a minor clean-up of British politics such as was advocated by the early pioneers of the Labour movement, the royal family would lose their jobs. But such a minor clean-up is as little desired by the Labour Party of to-day as it is by the Tories; they both foster snobbery as a powerful instrument of government.

If there is any move towards rational conduct of public affairs in Britain, the monarchy will be the first institution to go, not because it is particularly expensive, not because it is particularly dangerous, but simply because it is particularly silly. It is because of its silliness that its defenders have to rely on the "bad taste" criticism of anti-monarchical views. In another context Kenneth Tynan describes this oblique form of criticism very well, "... whenever critics use words like *old-fashioned* and *tasteless* you may begin to suspect that they have been outraged to the core of their being; and if *undergraduate joke* is the phrase qualified by *tasteless* you can be absolutely sure." This was in a review of *The Making of Moo*, which has some true observations on religion. If people are suckers for royalty it is true that they will be shocked to the core of their being by being confronted by a bald statement of its inanity, but if the growing tide of unreason is to be opposed we must be prepared to administer such shocks and not be intimidated by the charge of "bad taste".

The snootier journals like to berate the gutter press with the enormity of publishing the affairs of royalty in a vulgar manner. Such criticism is misplaced. In the modern world royalty depend upon the gutter press for their jobs. If the gutter press with its huge circulation simply did not mention royalty at all where would the quasi-sacred family be in the eyes of the people? Forgotten like outmoded film stars. The Queen of Britain and her middle-class way of life is only important as a figure conveyed by the *News of the World*, *Mirror*, *Express* and their imitators; without them the myth would crumble. Who talks of "bad taste"?

G.

## LETTER TO THE EDITORS

### On Being Against the Bomb

DEAR EDITORS,

Is not J.B. tilting at a windmill in his stern denunciation of the "emotionally over-blown" popular case against H-bomb tests? (I refer to his article "On Being Against the Atom Bomb—3" in *FREEDOM* 6/7/57).

J.B. is writing from New York and perhaps those Americans who are campaigning against the tests are exaggerating the risks to health from Strontium-90—but is it so in this country? My impression is that it is not. Most writers seem to have been careful to stress that much of our "knowledge" of radiation risks is hypothetical. See for example Prof. Lionel Penrose in *Peace News* (5/4/57), Prof. C. H. Waddington in the *New Statesman* (8/6/57), and many other articles in similar journals who have been campaigning against the H-bomb tests.

J.B.'s article suggests that there are a number of clearly defined objects lying about called "facts", for which one only has to look and the true situation regarding radiation risks will be made clear. But to one layman's eye at least, this does not appear to be so.

J.B.'s contention that the Strontium-90 risks from the H-bomb tests are slight seems to be based on the view of most American scientists—he cites an article from the U.S. journal *Science*; but if instead he accepted the view of this country's Medical Research Council he would be less sure. This difference is largely due to the fact that the M.R.C. set as a standard for a maximum safe dose for populations in general one-tenth of the amount they fixed for people engaged in occupations where they are exposed to radiation; whereas the American scientists responsible for fixing safe standards took the occupational standard as applicable to whole populations—this is clearly dangerous since it makes no

allowance for the fact that children absorb Strontium-90 more readily than adults.

It was not surprising then, that when Dr. Libby (of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission) described as "heartening" his conclusion that by 1970 the "body burden" of Strontium-90 in the U.S.A. would be equivalent to four-tenths of what British scientists consider as calling for caution, some scientists were alarmed.

There still appears to be a large amount of guesswork about the amount of damage caused by Strontium-90 because since its effects develop slowly—taking about 20 years in the case of cancer—there is no direct evidence available. Instead a safe standard had to be arrived at on the evidence of diseases induced by radium: obviously this standard cannot be expected to be accurate. There are many "facts" which are still in dispute and it is too early to tell which scientists' facts give the true picture of Strontium-90 hazards.

Under these circumstances, to claim, as J.B. does, that there is "no reason to suppose that the atom-bomb tests at the present rate and degree of control will alter the incidence of cancer" seems very dubious. The evidence suggests that there is every reason to suppose that the incidence of cancer will be increased. Perhaps this increase will only be—in the words of our Prime Minister—"insignificant" (a mere 50,000 additional bone cancers in the world as a whole, in Prof. Waddington's estimate) but it is an increase regarded by many reputable scientists as being at least a strong possibility.

Are not these sufficient grounds to campaign against the tests?

Yours fraternally,

Nazeing, Essex. MICHAEL WACE.  
July 7.

## T.V. Diplomacy

Continued from p. 1

encourage public opinion in one direction or another. It is by no means of great importance that they should take place for if the Governments concerned are either sufficiently friendly or wish to become sufficiently friendly for diplomatic exchanges to take place in their mutual interest, then the condition of public opinion is practically irrelevant except as an additional luxury. In any event it is generally the case that public opinion (excluding politicians of the left or the right—dependent upon which side is in power) is far more friendly towards the other country in question than is the Government itself. Antagonisms are invariably generated between Governments where peoples are always inclined to like and respect other peoples.

We must therefore conclude that the TV appearances of Khrushchev and Nasser were simply permitted (or possibly encouraged) because they suited the Governments concerned. That is to say each TV appearance suited both "sides", for diplomatic reasons, for reasons of public opinion or for some other unknown reason not likely to be of great importance. They indicate a further move in the direction of peaceful co-existence (which is a euphemism for deadlock without war), an effort by the politicians to try and prove what kindly-uncles they really are, misunderstood in the past, working for the future of the world and mankind... If we are foolish enough to believe them they gain something for nothing; if we do not, they are no worse off. Either way it's a good thing for the television companies!

## 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.

### ERRICO MALATESTA :

*Anarchy* 6d.  
*Voie—What For?* 1d.

### M. BAKUNIN :

*Marxism, Freedom and the State.* cloth 5s.

### ALEX COMFORT :

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

### PHILIP SANSOM :

*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.

### GEORGE WOODCOCK :

*New Life to the Land Homes orhovels?* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.

### RUDOLF ROCKER :

*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

### 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.

## Here are the Propagandists!

### MEETINGS AGAIN IN GLASGOW

WE are glad to be able to report that a letter we published a fortnight ago (Where are the Propagandists? 29/6/57) has stimulated a revival of activity in Glasgow.

A couple of comrades wasted no time, for on the day following the appearance of the letter, Sunday 30th, they got out a platform on the old anarchist pitch at Maxwell Street and held a meeting which was, they tell us, 'instrumental in rallying a few young anarchists...'

Glasgow at one time boasted one of the strongest anarchist groups in the country and had a team of brilliant speakers who could draw bigger crowds than any political party. For a variety of personal reasons they have now scattered over the face of the earth, but there must be hundreds of Glaswegians who remember their teachings and would welcome a re-appearance of anarchist speakers.

Can we therefore ask all comrades, sympathisers and readers in Glasgow to support this present revival? Meetings will be held at Maxwell Street, Argyle Street, every Sunday at 7.30 p.m. until further notice.

## 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 14—Jack Robinson on WORK.

JULY 21—David Pude on Problems of the Anarchist Movement: PROLETARIAN ANARCHISM AND PETTY BOURGEOIS INTELLECTUALISM

JULY 28—M. J. Panikkar 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.

#### GLASGOW

OPEN AIR MEETINGS Maxwell Street Every Sunday at 7.30 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