

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"I have remarked over and over again that a democracy cannot govern an empire. Empire is a despotism."
—THUCYDIDES.

THE GERMAN PEOPLE - AND THE WORLD - HAVE BEEN WARNED AGAIN,

GERMAN NUCLEAR SCIENTISTS REFUSE!

THE statement by 18 German scientists opposing West German participation in the nuclear arms race is welcome news and an important first step in awakening human consciences throughout the world against the suicidal policies of the political leaders on both sides in the present power political struggle.

The German scientists, who include in their number four Nobel prize winners, have warned against all plans for the arming of the forces of the Federal Republic with nuclear weapons. They consider that

a small country like Germany can make its best contribution to European stability and world peace by expressly renouncing the use of nuclear weapons of all kinds. This renunciation should apply to so-called "tactical" nuclear weapons as well as to a major weapon like the hydrogen bomb.

They declare that an atomic grenade or shell would have the same destructive effect as the bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945, while the dropping of a single hydrogen bomb could make all the Ruhr uninhabitable. The annihilation of the population of the whole of Western Germany might be possible by the systematic use of this weapon. For these reasons the 18 scientists declare their refusal to take any part in the manufacture, testing or destructive use of nuclear weapons. They are, on the other hand, prepared to develop the peaceful application of nuclear science in all possible ways.

A PARTIAL VICTORY FOR AFRICANS

THE boycott by South African workers of the Johannesburg buses which carries them into the city from the locations is over with a partial victory for the Negroes.

The Government-subsidized bus company are not the losers since employers, worried about their overtired staff, have raised a fund to pay the extra penny in fares demanded by the company—a considerable sum for underpaid workers.

The real gain of the boycott has been the display of unity exercised by 145,000 Africans over the weeks which has echoed the determination of the Negroes in the Southern States of Africa over segregated public transport.

One should not be over critical of the African workers for the compromise they have made because many of them were left poorly equipped for the long daily trek to their jobs.

The lessons of the boycott are valuable for the future struggles, the Africans have shown their ability to sustain an organised protest. This would be a good time for them to commit themselves to support for the anti-segregation groups now organised against the Government proposal to segregate the universities, reported elsewhere in this issue.

The Nationalist Government is in an unenviable position; it cannot go on for ever holding the people down. Unfortunately when the balloon goes up white South Africans who are in sympathy with the black population are likely to suffer the same fate.

One primary reason for their declaration is that in their estimation the population of the Federal Republic has been insufficiently informed as to the deplorable consequences of nuclear warfare. They do not claim to be able to think as politicians but only to act in a spirit of responsibility for the possible consequences of their work.

Within hours of this statement being made public, Dr. Adenauer replied in a speech that

if the scientists had intended a ban on atomic weapons valid for all countries "it would completely coincide with the views of the Government. If, however, they meant to say that a small country like the Federal Republic should renounce such weapons, then I must say that has nothing to do with physical science. It is a purely foreign policy matter."

The logic of these remarks is somewhat difficult to follow. Adenauer would have approved of the scientists' statement if it were directed to all countries since "it would completely coincide with the views of the government". But because it does not coincide with these views, the statement has nothing to do "with physical science" and since the problem is "purely a foreign policy matter" scientists have no

right to express themselves! As if the declaration had it been directed to all countries, rather than simply to the people of W. Germany, would have had anything to do with "physical science" anyway.

But Adenauer, who apparently believes that "physical science" and "politics" are two distinct departments each with its specialists, nevertheless attacks the scientists even on scientific matters when it suits his convenience! To their statement that there is no "known protection against the H-bomb where great masses of population are concerned" he replied in his speech that

it would appear that the scientists did not know the results of tests made in the United States for the protection of civilians and soldiers. The German people would learn from a Parliamentary debate on atomic matters, to be held after Easter, that the Government was doing everything possible to protect them from the consequences of atomic war.

It is not enough to say that "the Government is doing everything possible" to protect the people from the consequences of atomic war. In Britain millions of pounds have been spent on this "protection"

during the past ten years only for us to be told at the end of it, in the recent Defence White Paper, that:

It must be frankly recognised that there is at present no means of providing adequate protection for the people of this country against the consequences of an attack with nuclear weapons.

★

PROTECTION against nuclear attacks is a matter of scientific fact, not of political demagoguery. The H-bomb is not only more than two thousand times more powerful than the atom bomb, which in turn was say a thousand times more destructive than the largest "conventional" bomb—and therefore something more substantial than a quaint Anderson shelter of recent memory is clearly required to protect the population from the immediate consequences of the explosion!—but unlike the conventional bomb, the nuclear weapon produces secondary results, the full effects of which are not known in detail by science, but enough is known to have provoked a statement addressed not to this or that small nation, but to the World by nine scientists of international eminence nearly two years ago. The scientific content of this statement—

alas forgotten by the people, and pigeon-holed by the politicians—was as follows:

We now know, especially since the Bikini test, that nuclear bombs can gradually spread destruction over a very much wider area than had been supposed.

It is stated on very good authority that a bomb can now be manufactured which will be 2,500 times as powerful as that which destroyed Hiroshima. Such a bomb, if exploded near the ground or under water, sends radio-active particles into the upper air. They sink gradually and reach the surface of the earth in the form of a deadly dust or rain. It was this dust which infected the Japanese fishermen and their catch of fish.

No one knows how widely such lethal radio-active particles might be diffused, but the best authorities are unanimous in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race. It is feared that if many H-bombs are used there will be universal death—sudden only for a minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration.

In the light of this statement we challenge the politicians—the Adenauers and the Eisenhowers—who dare to deny that there is no protec-

Continued on p. 3

THE BRITISH H-TEST

DEAR SIR,
Harold and Sheila Steel, Reginald Reynolds, and other volunteers from this country have expressed their intention, if possible, of going to the Pacific in order to challenge the right of the British Government to carry out the proposed tests with nuclear weapons.

At this late stage an Emergency Committee for Direct Action Against Nuclear War has been established in order to raise funds for this purpose, to co-operate with Japanese and, we hope, American organisations sharing the same general purposes, and to provide the basis for further direct action in future so long as it may be necessary.

The Emergency Committee wishes to hand over its responsibility to a larger and more representative body as soon as this can be done.

In the meantime funds are urgently needed and donations can be sent to J. Allen Skinner, Hon. Secretary, at the address below.

Signed:
Alex Comfort
Laurence Housman
Bertrand Russell
Ruth Fry
Spike Milligan
Horace Alexander
Peggy Rushton.
John Hoyland
Arlo Tatum
Hugh Brock
J. Allen Skinner.
79 Lordship Park,
London, N.16.

control his stewards in a way he can never control the national officials.

Lord Cameron's attack on the stewards is a good indication that he considers their organisation a menace to his interests and those of his class. The workers at Briggs should take courage from this. They have clearly created an organisation which could be of value.

We should like to utter just one comment to the workers of Dagenham. There is quite clearly some communist influence in the Shop Stewards' Committee. As long as the Commies work hard in the day-to-day interests of the workers they are bound to get on the committees.

But the workers should not be blinded to the fact that the Communists, like Catholics, TU officials and all authoritarians, owe their first loyalty to the authority they serve—the Party, the Church, the State.

If it came to a conflict of loyalties, it is the workers' interests which would come second. The rank and file therefore should always be sure that they know where they stand as far as their stewards are concerned, and that they are men whose interest is first and always identical with the men at the bench.

THE BRIGGS ENQUIRY REPORT

The Importance of Stewards

OUR contention that the Court of Inquiry held under Lord Cameron into the recent series of disputes in the Ford factories at Dagenham was, from the point of view of the workers there, a waste of time, has been amply justified.

Published last week, the Court's findings have come down nearly 100 per cent. on the side of the management, and the utterings of Lord Cameron have shown more class bias than objectivity.

True, he has said that 'both sides are to blame' for the record of bad relations at Dagenham, but 'substantially the greater measure of responsibility' for the continued bad relations 'rests on the side of the workpeople.'

Especially does Lord Cameron blame the shop stewards. Now in our report on the Inquiry in progress (*Anarchy at Dagenham 10/3/57*) we pointed out that the Shop Stewards had asked through counsel that they should be allowed to take part in the proceedings 'as a party'. That is, that they be able to call witnesses, cross-examine and make representations in the same way as the employers and the top trade union officials. They were refused.

Counsel had asked for these rights on behalf of both John McLoughlin, the steward whose bell-ringing started the rumpus, and the Joint Shop Stewards' Committee. For reasons not stated, Lord Cameron decided not to allow them, and yet now, when the Court's rulings were published, we find the learned judge has devoted a considerable proportion of his report to criticism of the shop stewards' organisation and of McLoughlin.

In other words, he is castigating those whom he considers important parties to the disputes at Dagenham, but whom he refused representation as parties at the Inquiry. He is

strongly criticising and condemning people who were not allowed to put their case before the Court.

We hardly think that this kind of procedure will endear such Courts to the workers at Dagenham or anywhere else.

The Stewards' Function

It is not as though Lord Cameron was at any time unaware of the importance of the shop stewards. Of them, he writes in his report:

At Briggs, as elsewhere the day-to-day duties of a shop steward are responsible and important, often thankless, and the financial reward is negligible. . . . The importance of the function of the shop stewards as a channel of communication, as representatives of the workers, and as a necessary and vital element in the chain of trade union organisation is well recognised, and when fairly and properly discharged is of the highest value.

It does not seem to occur to the noble Lord that there may be a difference of opinion between himself and the workers at Briggs and elsewhere, as to what is implied in the fair and proper discharge of the shop stewards' function.

We pointed out at the time of the dispute that agreements had been reached at 'top' level, between the unions and the management, and had been handed down to the workers in the factories. The unions see the shop stewards as a means of funneling their decisions and agreements down to factory level. But for the workers themselves the shop stewards are far more significant.

At shop steward level the workers can see their organisation. It is not something amorphous, going on at TU headquarters while they keep their noses to the grindstone—for the workers the shop stewards are their direct representatives and by and large they do a far better job than the highly-paid permanent officials at head office.

But Lord Cameron can't—or

won't—see this. Quite naturally, since he is a judge, he is a firm believer in authority, and showing through his Report is his conception of the workers thoroughly subjugated to constitution duties. Anything which appears to him to step outside the bounds of this legality threatens the proper relationship between master and man.

For instance, he complains: 'The shop stewards' organisation as operated at Briggs, by itself and in association with other organisations, undertakes functions and exercises powers, including the raising and disbursement of substantial funds, which appear to lie outside the scope or requirements of its constitutional duties and in respect of which it is not subject to any effective control by the respective unions. . . . The continued existence of such an uncontrolled organisation at Briggs is undesirable in the interests of the unions, the company, and the work-people employed there alike, and is a potential obstacle to the creation or continuance of harmonious labour relations there.'

Accept Subservience

For Lord Cameron, for the Government, for the Ford's management, the worker's function is to do as he is told, conform to institutions sanctioned by law and adhere to agreements arranged above his head. And, one may say, this is the attitude of the official trade unions as well.

There is no-one who really speaks for the worker to-day. And there is no influence at work which holds out for him any alternative to the wage slavery against which he unconsciously rebels. All known and established organisations—managements and unions, political parties—accept, and thus get the worker to accept, his subservient position.

Through his shop stewards the worker can express some direct responsibility for his own conditions. He can see what goes on and can

PEOPLE AND IDEAS
WET IS WET

"It is unfortunate that popular knowledge about water vapour stopped short at James Watt's discovery about his kettle and did not include what happened to his mother's decorations. As a St. Pancras tenant wrote to the Mayor, 'Whatever the Housing Manager calls it, wet is—wet!'"

—E. COLLYER,
Condensation in
Council Dwellings.

ONE of the London evening papers came out a few weeks ago with a front-page headline in two-inch high letters 'The Shame of London',—the kind of title to win anybody's tuppence. This time it related to none of the usual newspaper 'revelations', prostitution, teenagers or traffic jams, nor to any of the things we might get worked up about, road accidents, the housing of 'problem families', the state of prisons and mental hospitals, or of doctors' waiting rooms, the overcrowding in schools, the whole mess and muddle of our urban surroundings. It was in fact about 'dampness in flats at the LCC's prize-winning Ackroyd Estate at Putney.

My first reaction was to regard this as a newspaper sensation, though one closer to reality than most. Tons of water are used in putting up a building—in the mortar, in the concrete and in the plaster, and really it should be dried out before occupation. But if these flats had been left to dry for six months before occupation, there would have been headlines about the LCC allowing flats to stand empty while thousands are homeless, while if the Council had heated them there would have been more screaming headlines about the waste of fuel in warming empty flats. If houses or flats are decorated and occupied immediately they are completed, you may be sure that the decorations will be damp-stained and that the tenants will hold out mouldy pairs of shoes or rashers of bacon to the visiting architect as a reproachful comment on the usefulness of his built-in cupboards. He will advise them to keep their rooms as warm and well-ventilated as possible, assuring them hopefully that these troubles are temporary and will disappear when the building has had time to dry, when since the structure itself will be less saturated with water, it will be able to absorb more of the water vapour from the air inside. And quite often it comes true.

Often, on the other hand, it doesn't. Partly as Mr. Collyer of St. Pancras says, because of the unpredictable ways of the

occupiers. "Some tenants never open windows, some never close them, some live on stews and take in washing—others just go out". And partly because although modern buildings are actually more prone to condensation troubles than old ones, we don't take enough precautions against it. Think of an old house. The surfaces are absorbent, it is built of soft bricks in lime mortar, lined with soft plaster, the floors are of wood and the ceilings of lath and plaster. There is a fireplace in every room, and however inefficient the open fire is, the flue is a highly efficient ventilator. Think of a new flat. The surfaces are much less able to absorb moisture from the air, the walls are of dense brick in cement mortar, lined with hard plaster, the ceilings are of hard plaster on concrete, the floors are of plastic tiles or sheet laid on concrete. The only flue, if there is one, is in the living room; any permanent ventilation is from one of those little grilles that gets stuffed with old socks against the draught.

IN the actual instance that hit the headlines, it seems, from the remedial measures that the Council is taking, that the walls or roofs have inadequate thermal insulation, which means, quite apart from the loss of heat from the room, that in cold weather the inside surface of the outside walls is so much colder than the air in the room itself that drops of water are bound to form on them.

The London County Council is always a good butt for newspaper attacks. In fact, since the internal upheavals of six or seven years ago, it has built some of the best housing in the country. But what instances like this do show, is the strangely amateur and hit-and-miss attitude to house-building—one of the very oldest human activities after all—which architects, not to mention speculative builders, still have. Perhaps it is the nagging question of cost—an unwillingness to spend enough of a limited budget on insulation or on appropriate but ex-

"The State calls the violence of the individual 'crime'; its own violence it calls 'law'."

—MAX STIRNER.

PEJORATIVES, or depreciatory words, have a useful linguistic function to perform. When, for instance, a literary critic mentions "W. McGonagall, the noted poetaster", it is a useful short way of saying "W. McGonagall, the noted poet—or rather one who thinks he is a poet, but who in the opinion of all whose opinion I respect is nothing but . . ." etc., etc. Words like "hypocrite", "ba-

loney", "contemptible" and "wrong", and metaphors like "ostrich" applied to a man and "drivel" applied to a newspaper article, are all useful items of vocabulary. Indeed, the English language would be a more efficient means of communication if a few more pejoratives, like say the Latin "philosophaster" and the German "stinkfaul", were incorporated into it.

But one of the most common fallacies of reasoning is that pejoratives, and their opposites the melioratives or words expressing approval, are misused. It is too often forgotten that pejoratives and melioratives are neither facts nor arguments, but in themselves expressions of opinion, and therefore quite useless in arguing or explaining an opinion.

Thus a patriotic Tory among my work-mates, last November: "The British action in Egypt is not an attack; it's a police action." Now if "police action" has any objective meaning at all, it means the action of a sovereign body against a subject body, and in this particular case the body acted against was admitted to be a sovereign state. So the term "police action" must here be a meliorative meaning "an attack of which I approve" (your patriotic Tory approves of police action in the objective sense, unless they are undertaken by Britain's enemies in which case he calls them something else), and the term "attack" a pejorative meaning "an attack of which I do not approve".

So my colleague's argument may be restated: "The British action in Egypt is not an attack of which I do not approve; it's an attack of which I approve," which is clear enough as a statement of opinion but no argument at all!

It would take a full-length dictionary to enumerate all the words expressing opinions, which are used as facts and arguments by the supporters of statesmen. (There are no supporters of politicians; politicians are always in the other party). We support a particular statesman over a particular issue because, by gad Sir, he's in the right. The Fascist insurrectionaries (or, if you prefer, counter-revolutionaries), who are occasionally executed by the forces of law and order in the

territories under our protection, are different in every respect from the fighters for freedom, who are murdered by armed thugs in the nations labouring under Fascist tyranny. "Fascist", which once meant the holder of certain political opinions, is now such a pejorative that a Fascist would sue you for slander if you called him one; and "Socialist", which once meant the holder of opinions roughly contrary to those of the Fascist, has become such a meliorative that even the Fascist applies it to himself.

The people who accept such words as facts and arguments, while not necessarily moronic, are obviously not given to pondering the meanings of words; but this cannot always be said of those who originate such argumentasters. Josef Goebbels, doctor of literature, wrote in his private diaries how proud he was to use his considerable linguistic skill in the service of the Führer. We have no access to the private diaries of the ingenious Russian who, in 1917, first used the words "communism" and "soviet" to mean support for the totalitarian Social Democratic Party; but surely only a clever word-manipulator could think of a stunt like that.

The men who write the Colonial Office news bulletins, in which the deaths in battle of nationalist troops are listed as "armed men killed" and the deaths in battle of British troops are listed as "murders", must know what they are doing. And whoever dreamed up the idea of calling the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt a police action probably spent the whole night working out his story, and found "police action" in a dictionary of melioratives at about four in the morning.

It does not follow, however, that everyone who invents such an argument is a cold-blooded twister. Proudhon, for instance, was undoubtedly an honest and simple-hearted man; but, as his contemporary Stirner pointed out, his famous sentence "Property is theft" is not the condemnation of property that Proudhon thought it was, but simply an expression of dislike for property in the form of a

Continued on p. 4

STICKS AND STONES

AMERICA BY COMPARISON

by Emma Goldman

(This contribution by Emma Goldman in 1932 to "Americans Abroad" published in Holland has relevance to-day in view of America's leading role in world affairs).

I HAVE been asked to write about the "good points" of America as seen by me through my European experience. Surely the United States must appear "better" to me now—I am told—than when I was in that country.

It may be true that those who have grasped the remote may be better equipped to understand the near; and if that be so, my twelve years' travel through foreign lands ought to enable me to see both the good and the evil of America in much sharper outline than before.

In my childhood I was taught that people are imbued with two conflicting impulses; one which makes for good, the other for evil, and that he who is strong enough to overcome "evil" is good. In that conception the saints and holy men were good, for which they were rewarded—if not on earth then surely in heaven. The others were bad and would suffer dire punishment.

In later years I realized that the impulses that move the individual as well as the masses are not quite so simple and easily defined as I had been led to believe by my well-intentioned parents and teachers. I found that there is no straight and clearly-marked line between good and evil. Both are interwoven and overlap each other. Surely neither good or evil can be chosen by one's mere "free will". I have found that good and evil are terms for human actions conditioned by various forces outside of man. Their meaning and content are subject to modifications and development in accordance with the changes constantly going on in the social and ethical values at various periods of human life.

The most important lesson, however, that life has taught me is the relativity of things. Every institution, be it ever so evil, may yet become worse. On the other hand, the best in man and society can become better. That is the law of evolution and growth without which life would decay and society become extinct. In this sense every saint was also a sinner, and the greatest sinner has the making of a saint in him.

Now, I cheerfully admit that America is a very great sinner indeed. For this very reason I find much in the United States that has "saintly" qualities. My faith in the fine potentialities of the country has not been dimmed or lessened by my European vantage ground. On the contrary, it has been strengthened. But similarly has also grown my realization of the evil things in America, and the need of speaking out frankly and fearlessly against them.

I think I can best characterize both sides of the American make-up by contrasting that country with Europe. Since the "generous" treatment accorded me by my erstwhile adopted land I had occasion to pitch my tent in various countries in Europe, including Russia, Lettland, Sweden, Germany, Holland, England, and now also France. In some of those countries I lived long enough to make a thorough study of the forces that have made for the mental and spiritual quality of their people, the structure of their social, political and economic struggles of the masses. Everywhere I found

that the fundamental difference between them and America is mostly a difference of age. The difference between juvenility and maturity, with all the special traits and characteristics that represent the two stages of human and social development.

Most of the European countries I found not only mature but well nigh ancient in their life and civilization. Overcautious, conservative, set and not easily moved. But centuries of struggle for political and economic freedom, for ethical ideals, for cultural and artistic values have created there certain traditions more binding than any man-made laws. Among those traditions the most potent is the realization that "man does not live by bread alone". In consequence the achievements of Europe are much more of the spirit than of the flesh. This, more than any other factor, has established certain values that even the great war has not been able to destroy altogether.

To illustrate. The rich of Europe, even as their American brothers, have gotten their wealth at the expense of their fellow-men. Yet the exploitation of the masses is nowhere in Europe quite so intensive as in the United States. Neither are the rich as arbitrary and brazen as with us. To be sure, the line of demarcation between the classes and the masses is more distinct in Europe, the barriers more definite. The millionaire of Europe is not the poor man's son of yesterday. As a general rule, wealth has been handed down from generation to generation. Not having personally experienced the struggle for wealth, the rich man of Europe is less prone to flaunt it in the face of his victims, or to use it to bribe, corrupt and prostitute the sources that aid him in increasing and keeping his fortune.

The political rights established through age-long struggle have solidified into traditions which the plutocracy of Europe cannot so easily and brutally set aside for its convenience and benefit as is done in the United States. To be sure, most democratic liberties are mere makeshifts, a cloak the better to blindfold the exploited masses, a whip to keep them in check. Strange as it may seem this is even much more true of European democracies and republics than some monarchies. I have found more freedom of speech, press and assembly, and greater individual rights in monarchical Sweden, Holland and England than in France or the newer republics of Lettland, Esthonia and Germany. Still it must not be forgotten that the German revolution (1918), superficial though it was, has established certain liberties far beyond anything known under the Wilhelm régime.

However, every government grants only as much liberty and opportunity in social, economic and cultural fields as it considers "good" for the soul of the masses. Yet irrespective of the wishes of the powers that be, the political traditions of Europe have given the social idealist and the political protestant a certain status, which the enemy is willy-nilly bound to recognize. That explains, for instance, the difference in the treatment of political in Europe and America. In Europe they are looked upon as the spokesmen of new social ideals or of the class struggle. The accused often becomes the accuser, and the Court is compelled to

listen to his social indictment. Nowhere in Europe, except in England, are the political considered criminals or treated as such. They enjoy certain rights and privileges in prison, and their protests, in the form of hunger strikes and obstruction tactics, are formidable weapons in the fight for improvement in the prison régime and treatment, and even for political amnesty.

All this is entirely lacking in America because the revolutionary and political traditions are lacking there. In the United States the political and labour prisoners are considered fools and impractical dreamers, even worse than criminals.

But tradition, like everything else, may work for good as well as for evil. While the traditions I have referred to are the very backbone of what is worth while in Europe, it is also tradition that serves to support the conservative, stationary and enslaving tendencies. Such tradition is the paralyzing hand of the dead upon the living. Mature countries, like mature people, are prone to walk in the accustomed groove. Having passed their *Sturm und Drang* period, they resent the adventurous spirit of youth. Having had their "fling", the mature generally cling to respectability. Having lost faith in the coming better day, they dwell in the past. Their lives and their thoughts crystallize into hard moulds.

Still, new forces are ever at work, particularly among the young generation, which the old in mind and spirit lament and resent as immoral and disintegrating. Yet in them is the sole hope of Europe if it is not to die of decay. But for the present most European countries are still ruled by old moralists, old statesmen, old habits, and old traditions.

In comparison with Europe America is unpleasantly young. Indeed, it is almost infantile, with all the good and the evil, the generous impulses and the crude, savage outbursts of extreme youth. The best proof of America's juvenility is its resentment of criticism. Youth is arrogant, self-centred, cocksure and impatient to censure. It is blind in its hate as in its love. It lacks the capacity to understand that love with open eyes is infinitely difficult and more enduring. Or that blind hate is ferocious and never settles anything. Time and growth are necessary to comprehend the "human, all-too-human". Youthful countries, like young people, are not troubled by time; they have no yesterday, they live only in to-day. That alone enables them to plunge forward, head foremost, without regard to consequences to themselves or to others. Yet it is well that this is so, for it is youth and not old age that is the harbinger of new ideas and fundamental changes.

That which is evil in America is due not only to its adolescent crudity and heartlessness. It is due also to the fact that as a pioneer country it was and still is concerned more with material values than with the achievements of the spirit. Of America it can be justly said that it lives by bread alone, and hence its worship of material things, its love of quantity, of bulk, its adoration of the golden calf. In quest of things of the body, America has rushed on at a terrific speed, sweeping everything in its way.

(To be concluded)

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
OPEN DAILY

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

- New Books . . .**
The Bridge at Andau
J. A. Michener 15/-
Proust's Way G. Piroué 15/-
Being and Nothingness: an Essay
On Phenomenological Ontology
Jean-Paul Sartre 50/-
Votes for Women Roger Fulford 25/-
Second-Hand . . .
The Face of a Nation
Thomas Wolfe 4/-
Human History G. Elliot Smith 7/6
Men, Medicine and Myself
S. Vere Pearson 3/-
The Russian Storm-Cloud
Stepniak 6/-
The Kon-ticki Expedition
Thor Heyerdahl 4/-
The World is Mine William Blake 3/6
The City of the Red Plague
George Popoff 3/-
The Film Sense
Serge M. Eisenstein 3/6
The Gospel of Superman
(The Philosophy of Nietzsche)
J. M. Kennedy 8/-
The Abbess of Castro, etc.
Stendhal 2/6
The Left Leg T. F. Powells 3/-
Ape and Essence Aldous Huxley 3/-
Studies in Revolution E. H. Carr 4/6
Faith and Works in Fleet Street
J. W. Robertson Scott 2/6
General from the Jungle
B. Traven 3/6
The Case for African Freedom
Joyce Cary 2/6
The Romance of Trade
H. R. Fox Bourne 3/-
Jim Crow Anton Fairbank 2/-
Pamphlet . . .
Death Stands at Attention
Harold Davies 6d.

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

