

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

## Five Prisoners Appeal to World Opinion from the Depths of KENYA'S HELL PRISONS

IT is five years since the Mau Mau troubles in Kenya were at their height; and since the public memory is short the record of mass punishments, beatings and attacks by heavy bombers is long-forgotten by almost everyone. Kenya is again a lawfully abiding Colony in which white minority rule is unchallenged and peaceful exploitation continues its ordered course.

But what of those men who were unfortunate enough to be captured and still remain within the walls of Her Majesty's prisons in Kenya? Some of these men are political prisoners who have been incarcerated for about five years at Lokitaung in the desert of the Northern Province, 600 miles from their homes.

A letter (about 900 words in length) was published in the *Observer* of June 8th from five such men, which if it is true (and to judge from past records there is no reason to doubt its validity), is a further telling indictment of the sort of treatment meted out by British representatives in Crown Colonies to those who fall foul of the laws, regulations and prohibitions which govern the lives of so many unwilling subjects of the British Government.

The letter outlines some of the conditions which exist in Lokitaung, starting by making the point that the prison is in the Twkana District which is closed to all except those with special permits, and the families and friends of prisoners are not permitted to visit them—nor in fact is the Prison Visiting Committee.

Writing and receiving letters (theoretically once a month) is a farce, and mail may take months in either direction. In Britain this state of affairs alone would create a *fièvre* in the press.

But the letter has much more to tell:

"During the past five years we have suffered a great deal. We have been beaten in the most brutal manner. Our rations are inadequate, we do not get vegetables or fruits. We live on mealie meal and beans of the worst quality. Owing to insufficient and unbalanced diet we have become prone to many kinds of diseases. Most of us have been ill many times, and some for long periods. Some have almost lost their eyesight. In all these diseases no adequate medical examination and treatment is provided, and the Government do not provide spectacles for those who need them except in the worst cases."

Brutality, appalling food and almost no medical attention. Democratic man's inhumanity to man. But men can continue to live in such conditions, if only as animals. The letter however does not end there:

"... about five months ago, water became so scarce in Lokitaung that it had to be rationed. We prisoners were allowed four gallons per person a day, which is insufficient for people doing hard labour in hot climate.

On April 23 the District Officer, Mr. C. L. Ryland, who is in charge of our prison, curtailed our water ration to two gallons per person. We appealed to him but he refused to listen to us. The following day the D.O. said we were not to get any water at all. We demanded to see him, but he refused.

On the twenty-fifth we went to the well for our share of water. The D.O. came to the well and told us to draw our water from a nearby old and discarded well which had long ago been condemned by the doctors and in which dogs' carcasses and filth have been thrown for years. Vehicles are also washed on the top of the well, the dirty and oily water and petrol returning into the well. The well has no lid and when it rains the flood collects rubbish and excrement into it.

The D.O. told us the clean well is for

Europeans only. Knowing very well that the water is unfit for human beings, we refused, and demanded the clean water which we have been drinking in the past five years and which is now reserved for six Europeans only. The D.O. maintains that we cannot get any water from the clean well. Now as we write this letter we are entering our fourth day without water in a desert while the now 'European' well is full of clean water."

No further information as to the results of this treatment of prisoners in Lokitaung is forthcoming as yet. If it is true, then the history of barbarism in the twentieth century, which has generally been regarded as the prerogative of outright Fascist countries, is still ignobly continued in the dark, festering corners of the lands which are ruled by Her

Majesty's duly elected Government. It is the kind of barbarism which must inevitably lead to the deaths of those on whom it is inflicted. Death by starvation, thirst or disease. It is little different from the barbarism which took place in the savage hell-holes of Europe, in the gas-chambers of the German Reich. The effects can be the same.

The writers of the letter, after four days without water have few doubts left:

"It now appears to us that it is the intention of the Kenya Government to starve us to death... If that is not the Government intention we cannot understand why they should continue to keep us here without water when there are many other prisons in other parts of the country where water is plentiful."

The final paragraph of the letter

"Inequality is the source of all revolutions, for no compensation can make up for inequality."

—ARISTOTLE.

is a desperate application to an abstraction which can, but seldom does, exert its influence for the good of suffering humanity.

"We consider this the most brutal and inhuman treatment ever compared to that of the Nazi concentration camp. As we have nowhere to appeal we now appeal to the High Court of the World Public opinion—Yours faithfully,

(sgd.) B. M. KAGGIA, PAUL J. JVGEL, FRED KUBAI, KUNGA KARUMBA, KARIOKI I. CHATARA, C/o H.M. Prison, Lokitaung N.F.D., Via Kitale, Kenya."

An appeal to nowhere and yet to everywhere, and to everyone. Let us hope that a sufficiently great proportion of "everyone" in Britain can break free from the morass of indifference which is the general characteristic, and force the responsible authorities to have the facts investigated and give an accurate report of the findings, and take action to prove at least that inhumanity may still be subdued by the conscience of public opinion and disgust.

## The Bus Strike in Perspective

THE dispute which has brought about the current bus strike is not by any means a remarkable one. The workers in nationalised industries perhaps more than others have become accustomed to regular, almost annual wage increases designed to compensate them for losses in real living standards caused by the upward trend in prices. They must by now also be well used to the position where the authority in question hedges, offers half the increase claimed by the union, and at a later date, and not applied to all the workers for whom it was claimed, the union issues solemn threats regarding industrial action, and after relays of negotiators have disputed the matter in board room and council chamber, and perhaps the Minister of Labour has made appeals and interventions, a compromise is reached, and the affair rests for a year, while other unions are taking their turn.

Before considering more closely the particular problems of the London bus strike, let us notice some of the assumptions, made by both sides in accepting this situation of claim-refusal-threat-negotiations-compromise. Besides the general assumption on the part of the unions that the exploitation of workers by private capitalists and by the State is going to be a permanent feature of society, which is implicit in the whole structure of the Labour movement, there are more specific assumptions about the economics of capitalism. One of these is that inflation is a necessary feature, another that it is quite an adequate way of "fighting" it to simply put 3 per cent., or 5 per cent. more money into everyone's pay packets each year, to compensate for whatever increase in the cost of living has been calculated. Both parties to the above set up, more than anything else, depend on the gentlemanly agreement of the other side, and the confidence that they will not break the unwritten rules.

Whereas, however, the unions, to their discredit, are essentially national organisations whose fraternal delegates would never dream of advocating real international action on vital matters, governments are involved in international politics, and cannot follow the routine so doggedly. It has been decided, and it

is only by electoral luck that it happens to be a Tory government, that the time has come when assumption one must go, the rising price spiral must at least be slowed down, and with it assumption two; no more automatic wage increases. Hence the collapse of assumption three; the government is no longer going to adhere to the rules!

This action presents a challenge on two levels. To the bus workers it is a blow to the pocket. Where prices have gone up over the past eighteen months, the worker and his family will have to do with less, instead of having a little more money to spend on that commodity. To the union leader the blow comes to his position. From the General Secretary through the serried ranks of minor officials the fear spreads that "the accepted machinery is breaking down", that no longer will the duties of a union leader consist of friendly conversations with employers, having as foregone conclusions an increase of half what was asked for.

The result was that the bus strike, although supported by the majority of the workers, was launched officially, and under the firm control of the leaders. It is not a strike of workers against definite grievances which demand correction, although the grievances are there true enough. It is largely a "political" strike, caused by a combination of bluff and counter-bluff breaking down, and forcing a reluctant Mr. Cousins to carry out threats which he had been making more or less as a matter of form. This is why so much emphasis has been placed on what seems like a 'mystique' of striking. Having been content for years to regard industrial action as something of the past, which could only be dusted up and used again under the greatest provocation, they have forgotten what in practice a large-scale strike is.

In the simpler periods of capitalism it was possible to strike against a particular employer, and by the pressure of financial loss, force him to give way on

Continued on p. 4

## Discrimination in U.S. & Rhodesia

IT was reported from the United States at the beginning of the week that further acts of brutal violence in Dawson, a small Georgia town, have caused the death of two Negroes. Not caused on this occasion by an unruly mob but by the police in the course of their "duties". The F.B.I. is now investigating a whole series of cases which might well have never come to light if the police had not been involved in the deaths of these two men who, it is claimed, were resisting arrest. One was shot in his back yard the other, "pulled senseless into court and died from a crushed skull".

In Dawson, police enforce a 11 p.m. curfew and any Negro found on the street after this time is jailed. The white man has frightening powers in this little town and justice is strictly his privilege. In "democratic" Britain the power to vote is regarded as every citizen's right (over the age of 21), but in Dawson "twenty-four Negroes who tried to register to vote—most of them teachers—were 'failed'. One teacher, a man with a degree 'failed' a test for illiterate voters and was sacked from his job".

But the British people should not be too complacent about British democracy, or how well-treated are 'our' coloured. Britain's refined (and sometimes not so refined) methods of racial repression in the Colonies can be just as horrible as the cruder tactics used in the deep backward South.

In this issue of FREEDOM we reprint a letter written by African prisoners who have enjoyed for five terrible years the benefits of British prison methods in Kenya—for black men.

We could cite innumerable examples of cruelty and deliberate sadistic torture carried out by the British authorities against 'the natives' in countries which they have conquered. We do not suppose that torture has been official policy, but we do know that in many cases which have been made public over the last few years, officialdom has closed its eyes to brutal methods which it knew were being used in Colonial prisons.

Physical suffering is one way of keeping people under. Another is by the deprivation of their basic human dignity by legislating for racial discrimination. British Colonial Administration has little to learn from the South.

In Southern Rhodesia last week any hopes for a more 'liberal' policy died with the total defeat of Garfield Todd's United Rhodesia Party in the elections—all candidates were defeated. The voting for seats went in favour of the United Federal Party which is supposed to be 'moderate'. Nevertheless the Dominion Party which favours South Africa's racial policies gained twelve seats to the United Federal Party's eighteen.

As an example of how this moderate party intends to continue British type democracy in Rhodesia, let us quote from their leader, Sir Edgar Whitehead, on labour relations (*News Chronicle* June 6th):

"A 'Poor White' population cannot be allowed to develop in Southern Rhodesia, says Sir Edgar Whitehead, the Premier, explaining his statement that certain jobs must have to be reserved for whites. 'The growth of a class of unskilled Europeans could result in undercutting by Africans. This would antagonise the whites'."

## And After De Gaulle?

IT was inevitable that once General de Gaulle opened his mouth he stood to lose some of his more fanatical sponsors without necessarily winning support among his opponents. Last week in Algiers in spite of the monster demonstrations that were laid on for his visit, and his (as it turned out, ambiguous) opening words "J'ai compris," de Gaulle, refused to be drawn by his militant sponsors into making the kind of speech which would add fuel to the flames of their rebelliousness. On the contrary, one felt that the General was giving them an elementary lesson in the game of politics. Their *putseh* had provided the psychological climate in metropolitan France for the return of a strong man at the helm of government, but once in power they were the first elements he must needs seek to curb.

It's obvious! In the eyes of the public, French politics and politicians were *pourri* (rotten), and the insurrection in Algeria, followed in Corsica by a hint of the things to come (which we still think was a bluff to hide the rebels' weakness in France itself), precipitated the "legalisation" of de Gaulle without more than vocal resistance from the Left. The General from his reception in

the Assembly and in the Press, knew that he could sleep in peace (for the time being, at least) so far as metropolitan France was concerned. It was his sponsors, in Algeria, who now had to be told that *their* man was in power, and this meant that it was he, and not they, who henceforth would issue the orders!

It appears that de Gaulle has persuaded the army to toe the line (one no longer reads pronouncements by General Massu; he has presumably returned to his proper task of killing *Muslim* rebels—and with considerable success according to reports). But for politicians such as Soustelle and Delbeque, and the *ultras* among the French colonialists, de Gaulle's programme for Algeria stinks of liberalism and his almost sympathetic references to the courage of the F.L.N. (the Arab resistance movement) were heresies. Delbeque's cry from the heart "Have we crossed the Rubicon to go fishing" must have been echoed by many an Algerian *ultra* since last week's visitation!

On the other hand, the General's promises of integration, referendums and universal suffrage in Algeria are winning him few new friends in France. His critics declare that in-

Continued on p. 8

**FREEDOM needs  
Money & New  
Readers?  
please!**

# REPORT ON THE CO-OPS - 5

(Continued from previous issue)

ALTHOUGH the Co-operative Independent Commission claim that their proposals for management, which I discussed last week, would not detract from democratic control but, on the contrary, enhance it, they made no attempt to analyse the meaning of democracy. Their whole argument, in fact, is based on an implicit theory of democracy which is by no means universally accepted, least of all in the Co-operative Movement.

If one examines critically the verbiage which passes as the literature on democracy, it is clear that there are two main theories of democracy competing to-day. The first, or 'classical' theory sees democracy as essentially a system of self-government—an institutional arrangement whereby men, either directly or indirectly, through representatives, govern themselves. The second and more fashionable theory sees democracy as essentially a system of responsible government. The protagonists of the latter theory accept, or more commonly assume, that self-government is impossible; all government is government by the few, whether in the name of the one, the few, or the many. The theory is really a theory of oligarchy but this term is avoided because of its emotive associations and also because it is believed that oligarchy is all right so long as the rulers act responsibly, i.e. in the interests of the ruled.

It is this second theory which the Commission employs when they argue that their management proposals are democratic. And the substance of my argument last week challenging this conclusion might be re-phrased by saying that their proposals would in practice result, not in responsible but in irresponsible oligarchy—the ruling few in this instance being the chief officials or managers of the Co-ops.

It is patently clear that whatever theorists have hitherto meant when they talked of 'Co-operative democracy' they have not meant 'Co-operative responsible oligarchy'. Co-operative government (in theory at least) is a blend of direct and indirect self-government: direct in that the members may participate in the government process by attending the sovereign assembly or business meeting; indirect in that the members elect an executive body—the management committee—to act on their behalf in between business meetings. No amount of talk about 'democratic control' can alter the fact that the management proposals of the Commission would involve a radical diminution of the element of self-government that still exists, however imperfectly, in most retail Co-ops. at the present time.

While the Commission clearly assumes in this part of its Report that democracy means responsible rather than self-government, it is not really aware of what it is doing. This becomes obvious when one looks at their proposals on amalgamation. On this question they accept the traditional Co-operative principle of the local autonomous society. They reject therefore the proposal in the Minority Report by Col. S. J. L. Hardie, ex-boss of the ex-Socialist Iron and Steel Corpora-

tion, which calls for two national societies—one for Scotland and one for England and Wales—and ultimately for just one national (or should it be international?) society. (Hardie's proposal, incidentally, is not novel. It was made as long ago as 1906 but it has not gained in attractiveness in the intervening 50-odd years. The Minority Report reads like a bureaucrat's paradise and an anarchist's nightmare.) In rejecting the idea of a national society in favour of local societies, the majority of the Commission uses arguments which only make sense in terms of the classical theory of democracy. In short, the Commission assumes both competing theories of democracy, using in turn the theory which happens to suit their particular argument.

While the Commission accepts the principle of the local autonomous society, it proposes a wholesale plan of amalgamation by which the number of retail societies would be reduced from the present 950-odd to an 'ideal number' of 200-300, each society being based on a 'natural' shopping catchment area. It is at this point that the Commission's inconsistency or muddle about democracy really becomes evident. It the members of the Commission had been clearer in their own minds about the meaning of democracy, it

is possible that they would have faced squarely the fact that self-government works best—can indeed only work—in a small society. The smaller the society, the more chance of real self-government—the limiting case being the anarchist ideal of self-government or the sovereignty of the individual. (In this respect anarchism may be seen as a form of radical classical democracy.) As it is, the Commission touch the matter only obliquely when they discuss the possibility that amalgamation on the scale envisaged will lead to a decline in member participation in the government of their societies.

The possibility is a very real one. The decline over the last 30 years in the already abysmally low level of participation in Co-operatives, revealed in a recent study of Messrs. Banks and Ostergaard, is undoubtedly partly accounted for by such amalgamation as there has been during that period—roughly 10 societies per year. If the future Co-op. Movement envisaged in the Report has, say, 250 societies the average society (on current membership figures) will have a membership of 50,000. If present experience is any guide—which of course, in the changed circumstances it may not be—we may expect the proportion attending business meetings to be roughly halved. The Commission does not, to use its own language, take 'too serious' a view of this. The reasons it gives for this somewhat complacent attitude are: first, size is not the only factor accounting for low participation; secondly, amalgamation might be accompanied by an intensified effort to increase participation; and, thirdly, if a choice has to be made between amalgamation and participation, it should not 'automatically' be made in favour of the latter. Each of these reasons deserves an obvious retort: first, while size is not the only factor accounting for low participation, all the evidence points to it being the most important single factor; secondly, no one has yet found the way to halt the decline in, let alone to increase, participation; and, thirdly, 'Oh, yeah!' The last retort needs

to be expressed with the maximum of irony. Whenever the question of amalgamation has been discussed in the past, its effect on participation has not even been the *last* thing to be considered: it has not been considered at all: the discussion has invariably been exclusively in terms of business efficiency or in terms of its effect on the 'vested interests' involved—the position of the displaced employees, officials and committeemen.

However, the Commission's point that the possibility of lower participation is not an insuperable objection to amalgamation may be accepted. The proportion participating may be halved, but, then, this will only mean that 0.25% of the members will attend rather than 0.5%! One may well doubt whether this will make much difference. In any case, it is clear that the level of participation is only a crude index of the extent of democracy in an organisation. A low level of participation does not necessarily mean that a voluntary association is undemocratic, just as a high level does not necessarily mean the opposite—we are all, in this day and age, familiar enough with polls of 99.9% or, in the case of the T.G.W.U., with polls of 105%. At the most, the level of participation is an index of democratic potential.

Apart from lowering participation, amalgamation is likely to have important consequential effects on the character of Co-op. democracy. If we extrapolate the results of a current investigation of the social composition of the Co-op. management committees and assume that the future large societies will be similar to the present large societies, we may expect the Commission's reorganised Movement to display the following characteristics. The average age of Co-op. directors will be reduced: a halt will be called to the 'gerontological revolution' which is so marked a feature of present day Co-ops., especially the smaller ones. Proportionately more women directors will be elected and, perhaps as a consequence, the amount

Continued on p. 3

## BOOK REVIEWS

### Juvenile Delinquency

**DELINQUENT BOYS** by A. Cohen. The Free Press, Glencot, Illinois, \$3.50.

**THE CIRCLE OF GUILT**, by F. Wertham. Dobson, 18s.

SOME youths meet on a New York street. A gun goes off and one of them drops dead. Who is to blame?

According to Dr. Wertham, blood-thirsty comics are at the root of it all. Social workers who maintain that these macabre pulp magazines are a symptom of a sick society rather than a primary cause of delinquency are dismissed with contempt. If Dr. Wertham practises medicine along the same lines, all his patients presenting the symptom of a fever will one day be dug out of a deep freeze, very dead.

Dr. Wertham is understandably beside himself with anger, but his indiscriminate flailing at unidentified forces of darkness does his cause more harm than good. Of course there is something wrong with a social system that drives young people to crimes of violence, but in attacking social scientists for their attempt to analyse the problem Dr. Wertham wags his Achilles heel in the air—an undignified posture at the best of times. He is a humanitarian with a training in medicine that is of little use when it comes to understanding human behaviour in a social context.

★  
THOSE who would prefer some real insight into the problems of delinquency to fulminating "agin sin" will find it in an excellent analysis of the culture of the gang by Dr. Cohen. No less of a humanitarian, Dr. Cohen is a well-informed social scientist who knows that unbridled sympathy clouds the sorrowful eye and leads to faulty judgments. If we are to help the delinquent in any radical sense we must understand what it is he is protesting against and why his protest takes such a destructive form. Only then can we hope to put a finger on the relevant faults in the social system. Unfortunately, the remedy proves to be more drastic and less simple-minded than suppressing *Dracula* and *Superman*.

To put matters in an over-polished nutshell, any highly competitive society which handicaps some of its most active members from the word go is asking for trouble. Gangs flourish in the working class areas of cities among adolescents, mainly boys, who are on the threshold of the economic struggle. Not only do they find themselves with a none too firm grip on the bottom rung of the ladder, but the guys above seem to make a point of treading on their bare knuckles with hobnailed boots. Goad someone into competing and deny him a chance to

win with the rules as they are, and you are inviting him to break the rules.

Cohen knows his sociology and his delinquents, having made a first-hand study of both. Given an excess of Cohens over Werthams there is hope for a rational solution. Given an excess of Werthams over Cohens and gang warfare should continue unabated, without the benefit of comics. R.T.G.

### 'Brighter than a Thousand Suns'

WHY did the scientists produce atomic bombs? Why did they allow them to be used? What sort of people are the atomic scientists? These questions are answered by Dr. Robert Jungk's book *Brighter Than a Thousand Suns* (Gollancz, 21s.), which gives the moral and political history of the men who produced the atomic and hydrogen bombs. Of these scientists some were Jews and a number had come to America to escape Nazism. They were afraid that their counterparts in Germany would produce the atomic bomb first and Hitler would get a weapon with which to conquer the world. Einstein appealed to Roosevelt to speed the production of an American bomb. In fact the more eminent scientists in Germany showed great responsibility. They realised the destruction such a weapon could cause and deliberately held up its development there. In America Oppenheimer was given charge of the project at Los Alamos to harness atomic power for war purposes. His associates lost their scruples in the excitement of new invention and in the race to forestall the enemy.

They had put their trust in the 'democratic' state and handed over this terrifying new weapon to the military authorities. Many of them were horrified that the atomic bomb should be dropped on a city, killing men, women and children indiscriminately. They expected some warning to be given, some demonstration of the bomb's power or at least that it would be used only on purely military bases. Other atomic scientists could not escape a sense of elation at the success of their efforts. Robert Brode, an American physicist said: "We were naturally shocked by the effect our weapon had produced and in particular because the bomb had not been aimed, as we had assumed, specifically at the military establishments in Hiroshima, but dropped in the centre of the town. But if I am to tell the whole truth I must confess that our relief was really greater than our horror. For at last our families and friends . . . realised that we, too, had been doing our duty. Finally we

ourselves also learned that our work had not been in vain. Speaking for myself, I can say that I had no feelings of guilt."

On the contrary, Higginbotham, an electronics specialist, wrote to his mother: "I am not a bit proud of the job we have done . . . the only reason for doing it was to beat the rest of the world to a draw . . . perhaps this is so devastating that man will be forced to be peaceful. The alternative to peace is now unthinkable. But unfortunately there will always be some who don't think . . ." A third scientist who worked on the bomb wrote: "I looked forward with dread to the employment of this 'better' bomb. I hoped that it would not be used, and trembled at the mere thought of the devastation it would cause. And yet, to be quite frank, I was desperately anxious to find out whether this type of bomb would also do what was expected of it, in short, whether its intricate mechanism would work. These were dreadful thoughts, I know. But I could not get them out of my head."

With the dropping of the bomb Oppenheimer became a public hero. He became closely associated with the military and civil authorities and used his prestige to calm the worries of the young scientists, who wished to press for some public supervision and control of atomic energy. Their suspicions were aroused and only by extensive lobbying and agitation did they prevent atomic research development being handed over to direct military control.

But it was the situation of Pandora's Box. The knowledge of atomic power once let loose into the world was now out of the control of its discoverers. All the old dreams of patriotism and prejudice were brought to bear in quietening the consciences of the scientists. As early as 1946 a group of pacifist workers planned a demonstration at Oak Ridge against the use of atomic power for war purposes only to be stopped by the C.I.O. union organisers who wanted to protect the jobs of their members. Hans Bethe campaigned against the hydrogen bomb and with other leading physicists

sent a statement to Truman in 1950, containing these words: "We believe that no nation has the right to use such a bomb, no matter how righteous its cause. This bomb is no longer a weapon of war but a means of extermination of whole populations."

Other scientists formed the "Society for Social Responsibility in Science", whose members instead of hoping for government initiative in disarmament took personal decisions about their work and even if it meant giving up their jobs, agreed to take no part in the arms race. The Korean War and the fear of communism were used by the authorities to justify their actions. One victim of the witch-hunt was Oppenheimer himself, who had more than anyone served the State's interests.

Dr. Jungk's book gives a calm and factual account that is both fascinating and impressive. His scientists are neither the supermen nor the monsters of popular mythology. They are in fact men with human strengths and weaknesses, cut off by their absorption in their work very often from harsh political realities and from the consequences of their acts. They compare not unfavourably with the writers and the clergy, the accepted mouthpieces and consciences of our specialised modern community.

The author gives no solution to the problem of nuclear power but from his account there emerges clearly the fact that the H-Bomb is just one, though the most terrible, manifestation of modern social ills. It could not have been produced without the centralised State and the willingness of men to serve that State. It could not have been produced without fear of the external enemy, without tension, uneasiness, mental sickness and an unhealthy attitude to sex. The Bomb is one aspect of this vast social problem and the only answer is personal responsibility for all one's actions, concern and aid for one's fellow men irrespective of national frontiers and political divisions.

F.T.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

### New Books . . .

From the Other Shore  
Alexander Herzen 16/-  
The Naked God Howard Fast 25/-  
Private Life Alan Hackney 13/6  
Brighter than a Thousand Suns Robert Jungk 21/-

### Second-Hand . . .

What the Negro Wants W. E. Du Bois &c. 5/-  
Trial of a Judge Stephen Spender 5/-  
Roads to Freedom Bertrand Russell 4/6  
TVA: Democracy on the March David E. Lilienthal 3/6  
The Fields at Evening Ethel Mannin 4/-  
The Man in the Thick Lead Suit Daniel Lang 3/6  
So the World Goes J. W. Sullivan 3/-  
Sailor on Horseback Irving Stone 3/6  
Sasha A. Kuprin 2/6  
Authority and the Individual Bertrand Russell 3/6  
The Healing of Nations Edward Carpenter 3/6  
The Fortune Douglas Goldring 4/-  
Afterthoughts on the U.S.S.R. André Gide 3/6  
The Chinese Communists Stuart Gelder 4/-  
The Smaller Democracies Sir E. D. Simon 2/6  
Letters from an Outpost Alex Comfort 3/-  
England's Voice of Freedom Henry W. Nevins 3/6  
Quack! Quack! Leonard Woolf 3/-  
Programme for Survival Lewis Mumford 2/6  
Back from the U.S.S.R. André Gide 3/6

### Periodicals . . .

Liberation May 1/9

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarcely 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



