

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University Digital Commons

Individual Action Newsletters, 1952-1953

Axe Collections of Freethought, Socialism,
Radicalism, and Anarchy

2017-02-01

Individual Action - 1953, June 23, Tuesday

John Goldstein

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/ian>

Recommended Citation

Goldstein, John, "Individual Action - 1953, June 23, Tuesday" (2017). *Individual Action Newsletters, 1952-1953*. 13.

<https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/ian/13>

This Newspaper is brought to you for free and open access by the Axe Collections of Freethought, Socialism, Radicalism, and Anarchy at Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Individual Action Newsletters, 1952-1953 by an authorized administrator of Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@pittstate.edu.

INDIVIDUAL ACTION

Vol 1, No. 13

An Anarchist Publication

June 23, 1953

Price Five Cents

EINSTEIN ATTACKS GOVERNMENT TYRANNY

John's Corner

The editorial staff of INDIVIDUAL ACTION has been accused of being intolerant, of acting as inquisitors, and of resorting to acrimony. Our critics contend that we are junior McCarthys, McCarrans and Commissars. If such charges are true, we have no right to use the appellation anarchist.

But we believe that the facts refute these accusations. So far as intolerance is concerned, our record proves that we have been extremely tolerant. Not only have we printed views with which we thoroughly disagree but we have published articles attacking us by name. Certainly we have shown great tolerance towards our contributors.

Our critics state that we are inquisitors and witch hunters because we have assailed such phonies and hypocrites as Sir Herbert Read, the gentleman anarchist. We have not accused Mr. Read of anything that he has not done but, on the contrary, we have exposed his record, a dismal record indeed. This "intellectual" has accepted war decorations in addition to writing a poem glorifying the conscript. He has served British imperialism whenever he was asked to do so and has condemned anarchists who live intransigent lives. We are not assassinating anyones character by uttering statements whose varacity cannot possibly be impugned.

If on occasion we have been a trifle acrimonious it is understandable. A sensitive human being becomes caustic when he is subjected to the indiosyncracies of the bosses, when he cannot find a decent place to live and when he notices millions of human beings being murdered in a stupid senseless war. As a matter of fact, emotional writing has, throughout history, animated the masses. Thus whenever we feel bitter — and we have a right to feel bitter under such a

Rosenbergs Executed!

Under a lynch atmosphere Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were murdered in cold blood by the U.S. Government.

The President asserted that they must die because they were responsible for the possible annihilation of millions; but his government showed no reticence in mutilating 2 Japanese cities with the A-bomb. He who has dirty hands has no moral right to condemn others to death.

choatic social order—we will express our emotions in that vein regardless of contrary opinions.

We know that our critics want us to print long-winded theoretical articles calculated to lull the reader to sleep. They think that we should be methodical and cool in our writings. If they wish to write articles of that sort, they have the perfect right to do so — and we would defend that right with all the fervor at our command. But we will continue to publish the same type of newspaper and write articles which we believe will be of interest to our readers.

* * *

The other night the Committee to defend Franco's labor victims picketed Carnegie Hall where a falangist dancing group was performing. The leaflet made the salient point that the committee was not protesting their admission to the United States but was urging people not to patronize the fascist dancers. Many people who were deceived into buying tick-

Continued on page 3

ADVOCATES NON-COOPERATION

With intellectuals and most other segments of the population submitting to the McCarthyite hysteria it is a pleasure for us to report that the distinguished physicist, Dr. Albert Einstein, has urged his fellow intellectuals not to testify before congressional witch-hunting committees even though by so doing they may risk jail or economic ruin.

Albert Einstein gave this advice in a reply to a letter written to him by William Fraunglass an English teacher who faces dismissal because he refused to tell the Jenner Committee whether or not he is now — or ever was — a Communist. Fraunglass sought Einstein's support of his position.

We have criticized Einstein, rather severely in the past for giving the Government secrets which enabled it to manufacture the atom bomb, the most dreadful instrument of modern war. And if we believe he deserves criticism in the future, we shall not hesitate to criticize him.

Nonetheless we have only praise for his latest message to his fellow human beings. We particularly like his assertion to the effect that if teachers and others do not resist Congressional inquiries, they deserve the slavery which is prepared for them. It has been often said that an individual is helpless before the State. This is not necessarily true since an individual can animate millions of others through his courageous action. Gandhi, for example, inspired the Indian people to fight British rule by his exemplary conduct. It is, as Einstein delineates, necessary for the individual to fight tyranny in any form regardless of the unpleasant consequences.

Dr. Einstein's letter should move many intellectuals, who are rather complacent, to resist government oppression openly. If they identify themselves with Einstein, the politicians will find it difficult to label the resisters Communists, inasmuch as the distinguished scientist is highly venerated throughout the world. We hope that other scientists will soon emulate Dr. Einstein.

Of course, many people contend — with some justification — that we should not defend the liberties of Marxists or other totalitarians. They assert that whenever the proponents of the aforementioned philosophies achieve power, they invariably subject the remainder of the population to utter humiliation. The reasoning of such people is foolish because when the Government begins suppressing one opposition group, it soon liquidates all opposition. The history of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia corroborates our thesis. And so we must defend the rights of Marxists even though we abhor them — and we have good reason to abhor them.

It is up to us to fight for human rights and dignity, for if we fail to do so, the state will totally crush all human expression.

Notice

Because we feel that the editors, printers and readers are entitled to a long deserved vacation from their arduous labors, Individual Action will not be published on July 14. The next issue of I.A. will come out on August 4. We hope that the paper will become more enlightening and entertaining.

Individual Action

Single copies: 5c, Bundle orders of fifty up: 4c, Yearly: \$2.00, Six months: \$1.00, Three months: 50c

Order from Individual Action, Apt. 2F., 15 Sheridan Square, New York, N. Y.

Published every three weeks by John Goldstein and Felix Ortiz;

Address: Apartment 2F, 15 Sheridan Square, New York 14, N. Y.

Editors: John Goldstein and Felix Ortiz

Make all checks and money orders payable to Individual Action

REFORM vs REVOLUTION

by Ammon Hennacy

In these days of atom bombs and tear gas there are no barricades in the revolutionary sense of that word, which is appropriately enough derived from the Spanish "barricado". It is the bourgeois barricades in the minds of most of us which are to be removed. To properly understand this is the difference between a reformer and a revolutionist.

An irresponsible person does not make a good anarchist. And more and more now in the world we find people who want something done for them; they are born with their hands out. Least of all do they want to live by their own efforts. It is less trouble to keep within the law but many people are larceny minded. Something for nothing is their motto. They haunt the giveaway radio programs; are forever buying chances for the current car to the filling station or grocery. The real addicts I see crowding the bus for the dog races and horse races, while the ones with not so much energy fill the church bingo games hoping for a prize. Whether the main subject of their prayers is for a bingo prize I do not know.

This hectic life weakens the body (to say nothing of the mind which is already weak) so that it is a prey to every scare of disease which business minded doctors advertise in their numerous Foundations. The shots and miracle drugs further weaken the body, so that instead of curing them by rest and fasting people are more and more slaves to drugs.

It is just this bourgeois mind that spends beyond its income, "keeping up with the Jones's". It is just this greedy and shiftless mind that falls for the half-promises and warmongering of the demagogue. Debs said that the regular politician told the masses how intelligent they were in order to fool them, while he told them how stupid they were in order to try to get them to help themselves. When Clarence Darrow was introduced to an audience by the chairman who boasted of the intelligent people of the city who had come to hear him he said that there were not that many intelligent people in the whole United States, let alone in this certain city. As close-mouthed a president as Coolidge knew enough to butter up the people and say that he had confidence in the "good sense" of the common man. At least they voted for him.

Tolstoy has shown that the lack of individual responsibility among government officials permits the best of them to sign death warrants and rob the defenseless without any qualms of conscience. If the judge who pronounced the sentence actually had to hang the man he would pronounce only that one sentence. Those who are not in power but who see the evil in the world and seek to overcome it by organizing their fellows into all sorts of groups and associations to make others do differently, by pressure-group and letter-writing activity, are rightly called reformers. By and large they are sentimentalists who want to change the world without changing themselves. If getting the signature on the dotted line, voting for politicians and belonging to unions could have changed the world it would have been done a long time ago. No matter how radical the program it is bogged down when there is not the responsibility of the individual. Tolstoy said also that it seemed an easy matter and a very laudable thing to get others to move in a certain direction, but the place where each person had the most power and authority was in changing himself—but this was seldom done because there was not enough glory in it, and it really required a lot of sweat and effort.

The person who makes the one-man-revolution and thus changes himself has really done his bit toward changing the world. He is a true revolutionist. Inasmuch as he secedes from the system and approximates his revolutionary ideal, to that extent he wakes up others who are ready to take a first step. The pacifist who slaps his children, the vegetarian who consumes shrimp and hamburgers on the side, the anarchist who damns the state yet boasts of cheating in the amount of social security or

Continued on page 4

THE CORONATION

Although the press coverage of Queen Lizze's Coronation was enormous, still I find that a very important event was omitted. As you well know every critter in the Kingdom was religiously drilled for months before the show, including the 450 horses. As you may know a horse is an intelligent animal. Even the most prominent of Western Statesmen, Winston Churchill, supposedly possesses only a small degree of Horse-Sense.

Now these 450 horses in the Coronation drama presented a problem. The Archbishop of Canterbury warned the Minister of State that these horses were the only unsteady and unreliable element in the Domain and he had a hunch they would improvise in this Holy Procession.

The Minister advised to notify McCarthy to investigate if there were any subversives amongst the herd. But His Holiness the Archbishop said: "I know they are of doubtful character, they do not follow the Westminster Shorter Catechism; they are sure to improvise."

So the Prime Minister suggested three solid days of a strict fast for all the critters who appear at the ceremony without a silk knee-pants, except a measure of brandy. But Her Majesty the Queen objected by saying: "I saw my Prime Minister inebriated and I do not wish to see my Aureole (her race-horse) smell, look or act like my Prime Minister".

Finally, when the crisis was about to get serious, the Chief of the Royal Medical Staff intervened. He prescribed an enema for all the critters without a silk knee-pants before they joined the parade. Thus this Medic saved the Kingdom from a serious crisis of State. Long live the Queen!

—S. DZIENGIELEWSKY

HONESTY

Once I was asked by the fairest of the fair sex: why I bother about the Biblical stories. Due to her sincerity I gave her an honest answer:

I am liable

My Friends

to confirm

That when Djablo, runs out of stunts

to perform

He grabs the Bible.

In other words:

as normal man

I love to sin

And she says,

"honesty pays",

and it did,

indeed.

—S. DZIENGIELEWSKY

Felix says . . .

The existence of **Individual Action** has been a great vexation to a small group of persons in New York. This group has, from the very beginning, hoped for this paper's demise.

Great was their mortification when they saw this humble journal continue to come out regularly with no end in sight!

In their last and most desperate attempt to stop it they tried to cause a split between the editors. This endeavor has met with utter failure. The editors are getting along — and will continue to get along — smoothly. In fact, no editorial staff has ever worked more harmoniously than we.

So give up your silly game boys and girls. You're wasting your time. **Individual Action**, like sex, is here to stay.

* * *

During my vacation this year (first two weeks of July) I will do some roaming, but I won't go far from the city this time.

On or about July 4th I will visit Maryfarm, the Catholic Workers' place near Newburgh, N. Y. — but I won't attend Mass. I went there with John Goldstein about two years ago to attend a conference on conscientious objection to war. John was at that time preparing a series on "American Communities" for the **Industrial Worker**. Dwight McDonald was there writing a profile of Dorothy Day for the **New Yorker** magazine. When Michael Harrington spoke, he made a couple of what we believe to be heretical remarks. I still don't like the presence of a priest at Maryfarm. But what can you do? Ammon Hennacy is coming to Maryfarm in August after he does his picketing and fasting in Phoenix, Arizona.

After Maryfarm I will go to Washington, D. C. to inspect enemy headquarters.

I will spend the last few days at a deserted beach in Staten Island—a few days of Utopia—and then back to Hell.

Thought Control

Many books have been removed from the shelves of American libraries in Germany. Among those deleted from the shelves were ones extremely critical of the Chinese Nationalist Government. The books were removed as a result of pressure from McCarthy's boy scouts. Thought control is not only exercised by the Iron Curtain countries but also by the Great Democracies.

Malatesta . . .

(Concluded from last issue)

"In the capitalist states, justice is administered by the bourgeois in favor of the bourgeois. In the unique communist State which exists, justice must be administered in favor of the proletariat and stand faithful to the revolution. Piatikoff proclaimed it with force at the beginning of the trial. The tribunal is in the service of the working class attacked by innumerable and implacable enemies, and has for mission to aid it in its victories. The trial is not a question of justice, it is only an episode of civil war."

With these theories, one asks why the Communists take it upon themselves to treat the fascists as that which they are, that is to say, brigands, savage negators of all civilized life. One asks one's self likewise how can they do it, to go all these years at commemorating the Paris Commune and being indignant at the massacres done by the versailles hordes]

It is true that "justice" has always been, in the hands of dominators, a lie for masking private interests or the oppression of a class, for justifying all the violence, all the infamies perpetrated at the expense of the conquered. But the sole fact that governments experience the need of a mask of morality and justice already demonstrates that thru the innumerable struggles which have afflicted humanity it has developed a hi-er moral sensibility which remains or ought to remain a definitive conquest.

The bolsheviks deny even this last homage to virtue and justice which is called hypocrisy. They have the merit of being franc and brazen-faced: just (tout) like the fascists!

But toward what abyss of tyranny do they want to push the world, these pretended revolutionaries?

They say that they represent the interests of the class. We believe that the task of the revolution must be the abolition of classes; but, in fine, since they do not know how to consider the whole population as worthy of concern, what is the part, what is the class they really represent? They speak of proletariat, and by proletariat they mean the industrial workers alone, only the "conscious" ("conscientists") workers, merely those registered in the Communist Party, the sole camarilla of those who govern.

Thus there are some fanatics, surrounded by a limited number of brigands and parasites,

Correction

Because of an unfortunate error in the June 2nd issue of the following material which is in quotes was omitted from column 3 of the article entitled INTOLERANCE AND MUTUAL AID by Jack Hamlin.

It reads after — What is important, however, to deduce from this analysis is that "the eradication of the power motive implicit in government inevitably leads to the eradication of government per se. The power motive is the life blood of government. Deprive government of that functional motivation and government must die as fish do without water. It is entirely different, however, with society. Let the people surmount in them the aged clannish motive for intolerance, and society will be saved. It will now really be alive and growing with communal interest. It will now not only restore the primitive intra-regional mutual aid, but now with an enhanced sociological and moral wisdom will intentionally extend the intra-regional mutual aid to an inter-regional solidaric brotherhood.

"Because our motive for intolerance to alien ideas has no real value for real living, because we really have no need for it, we can discard this prejudice without harming ourselves. Other people's ideas cannot harm us but oppressive action does."

Question

Why did Oatis drop out of the news so fast?

JOHN'S CORNER

Continued from page 1

ets demanded and got their money back. We commend the pickets for their noble and humane activity.

Some People, however, are contending — and wrongly so — that such protests are ineffectual. It so happens that workers in Franco's concentration camp are elated when they hear that there are others who are also opposed to Franco's brutality. Besides such action gives us the opportunity to show that the libertarian idea is not dead. In fact, we need more activity and not less.

who intended to have the right of life and death over all, and dispose of the fate of a people who have made the most glorious of revolutions!

—Joffre Stewart

WHITHER LABOR

Many liberals are propagating various formulas for the purpose of perpetuating a decadent capitalist social order. Among the various schemes are profit sharing, co-determination of industry, and joint governmental and private ownership of the means of production. So far as we are concerned none of the aforementioned ideas would emancipate the human race from the prevailing slavery.

Possibly profit sharing is the most publicized scheme of the lot since many employers, including the most reactionary ones, have indorsed it. And in the long run, profit sharing would help the employers inasmuch as the innocent workers would, in all probability put forth greater effort owing to the fact that they could not receive their bonuses until the company made substantial profits. Fortunately, many workers now realize that such a plan might endanger their health in addition to allowing the employers to retain control of the means of production. We radicals have thoroughly exposed the hypocrisy of profit sharing.

But many of us have been deceived into promoting the dangerous idea of co-determination — and it is indeed very dangerous. To our dismay, we have been reading several radical papers that have spoken about the plan enthusiastically. The writers of these articles seem to believe that co-determination would not only alleviate our suffering but could eventually precipitate the abrogation of wage slavery.

Apparently the proponents of this policy think their plan is revolutionary because some employers have waxed indignant over it. The most dogmatic capitalists would naturally oppose an idea that would permit the unions to usurp some of the prerogatives of "management". Employers of this sort are under the fantastic illusion that they are not constrained to make concessions in order to preserve the capitalist system.

The more intelligent capitalists, however, are cognizant of the fact that they must grant certain reforms if they wish to defend "free enterprise". And they do believe that they can maintain and even extend their power by ostensibly giving the workers a voice in managing industries.

According to the co-determinist's theoreticians, both the unions and the capitalists would have members on the board of directors of a concern. Of course,

the balance would be unequal in view of the fact that the co-determinists concede that the capitalists would have more members on the board than the unions. And thus, in reality, the function of the unions would be limited to that of making suggestions on how the companies could increase profits.

The most salient danger of the scheme is that it might tend to delude the workers into believing that they are owners and therefore have interests in common with their exploiters.

Besides, Co-determination would not eliminate capitalist crises despite the statements of economists, for workers would not receive enough money to purchase their produce. And so co-determination would not — and could not — even safeguard the workers from the hazards of unemployment.

The proponents of co-determination, moreover, do not question the existence of such institutions as Government and landlordism. In fact, they seem to accept the politicians and the landlords, possibly two of the most vicious and noxious parasites. We cannot possibly discern how a radical could propose this scheme when it is obvious that even if industry were managed more efficiently, society would still be premeated with many of the present day social evils. It is, thus, imperative for us to reject co-determination and all other solutions that propose joint ownership of industry.

Other reformers believe that if the state owned the basic industries and the private capitalists controlled the remaining factories, the world's problems would be solved. We are gratified that most radicals understand that this plan could not abrogate a boss-worker relationship but would conversely strengthen the employers, no matter if they were private or state bosses. Our contention is true because the workers themselves would not participate in formulating basic decisions. Anarchists spurn all reforms.

We would, however, have no right to castigate other programs unless we proposed another alternative — and we believe that anarchists offer the most humane, most efficient, and most just program to expunge the exploitation of man by man. We anarchists advocate the abolition of government together with decentralization. We believe that money ought to be eliminated and each person should be able to secure his needs regardless of his occupa-

continued on page 4

WOMEN, WOMAN AND WOMEN

"A smart wife is one who runs things while letting her husband imagine that he is king" — from a letter by a housewife to the NEW YORK POST.

As Max Lerner pointed out in his recent review of the book **The Second Sex** by Simone de Beauvoir the question of man and woman, their relationships and their position in society, has become one of the most discussed subjects in intellectual circles of Europe and America.

We now wish to add our bit to the discussion, knowing very well that it is bound to be very controversial and provocative.

Woman is intellectually inferior to man because her brain is not only smaller, but has less complex convolutions. Woman is, however, vastly more cunning and shrewd than man. This is nature's compensation.

We have been told by historians that man once ruled woman. If we accept this we can only conclude that the situation have very recently been reversed and that woman has turned the table by the use of her cunning. Perhaps these historians, being males, have been hoodwinked all along by outward appearances. Be that as it may it seems to us that women has ruled for quite some time. Why has she ruled?

The answer is to be found in sexual biology. Man's sexual desire is steady, woman's is not. She can remain cold and adamant for long periods of time. She can wait, he cannot. We don't know when people became this way. (We have read in books written by modern "psychological sociologists" that people were not this way in some primitive societies) We do know, however, that man is now in the position of beggar. Unless she happens to be extremely ugly, a young woman can always choose which man to have sex relations with.

It is because of this situation — man as beggar, woman as cunning dispenser of sexual favors — that woman dominates man.

This situation has become more obvious in the United States of America than in any other nation. As a consequence the weak and helpless American male has sold his birthright for a bundle of flesh. Countless times we have seen terrorized husbands run away from their wives, but only to return after a day, a week or a month. When the husband returns he figuratively (sometimes literally) falls to his knees. He confesses

REFORM vs REVOLUTION

Continued from page 2

subsidy he gets from the state are all people who, however radical they may talk or write, are phonies. Their revolutionary words are silenced by their fraudulent actions.

When refuses to follow the crowd he is a marked man, but he is in truth a free man who is not attached to material things. No one could bribe Gandhi because there was nothing they had that he wanted and there was nothing he had that if taken away made much difference. Now in the quietness of our minds, in the simplicity of the child, in ourselves at our best there is this same incorruptible quality which made Gandhi the best revolutionist of his time. We can each seek the company of those who will encourage this revolutionary spirit within us. We can grow in this one-man-revolutionary spirit by reading of real revolutionists. But above all, if we can secede from the system just a little each day and each year then we have made a step toward that build-up that Gandhi and the Hopi say is invulnerable. It was Malatesta who said that it was not the question whether anarchism would arrive at any certain time but the question was whether what we did each day led in the direction of that ideal . . . The capitalist world is falling apart; we don't need to tear it down. If each anarchist ceases his denunciation of capitalism and communism long enough to be quiet and see what attachment to the bourgeois way of life is keeping him from being true to the anarchist ideal, and **changes himself**, accordingly, in keeping with that deal, then we are that much nearer anarchism. We do what we want to, so let us not alibi.

Racket Buster

After conducting the hearings on Water-front rackets, Governor Dewey, that considerate gentleman, announced that under his plan, workers would be compelled to register with the State crime commission if they wished to work on the water-front. In different terms the governor's scheme would subject the workers to more humiliation.

the error of his former ways and offers to do penance for his sins by sacrificing his life, his liberty and his pursuit of happiness. He will then proceed to betray his friends and to suppress truth and justice. In other words, he promises to be a good boy and never again lay claim to his own soul. And all of this for the sake of his tyrannical bundle of flesh! Lest we be misinterpreted we hasten to add that we do not hate all women. In fact, we even love some of them. You can blame Mother-Nature for that.

In the anarchist community which we envision love will be free. Therefore, marriage will not exist. Woman will then be able to develop her brain because there will be no need for her to concentrate on the use of her cunning for the ignoble purpose of "hooking a meal-ticket" into marriage and "run things while letting her husband imagine that he is King".

When she can no longer use sex as a weapon against man her frigidity will disappear and she will regain her sexual equilibrium. Sounds optimistic? We are entitled to hope.

—FELIX ORTIZ

WHITHER LABOR?

Continued from page 3

tion. The factories and farms, of course, must be managed by those who are producing the wealth, and the assembly line, an institution that has caused great frustration to many workers, should be extirpated. And an anarchist society would encourage artisans to revive handicraft production. With the fruition of anarchism, we strongly and firmly believe that workers and farmers will be masters of their own destiny.

—JOHN GOLDSTEIN

Announcement

S. E. Parker, who has written some fine articles for **Individual Action** and **Freedom**, has just published an excellent leaflet called "Anarchism and Communism". If anyone desires to purchase some of them, he may do so by sending a letter to S. E. Parker, c/o 27 Red Lion St., London, W.C. 1, England.

INDIVIDUAL ACTION
Apt. 2F, 15 Sheridan Square
New York 14, N. Y.

MURDER IN THE BRONX

A little Jewish girl was found murdered on the Sabbath night in the intellectual section of the Bronx. Hitler was not her murderer. Stalin was not her murderer. Her murderer was not one of the anti-semites, on whose discovery the Anti-Defamation League spends millions of dollars. She was murdered by her own Jewish brother with the gun of her own Jewish father. These intellectuals of the Bronx tell us (the Jewish Pacifists) that we are visionaries, that we are not practical and that we are cowards who will not defend our grand-mothers.

In the far away past, a Jew on the hills of Judea taught us to turn the swords into plowshares. Men and women, in every corner of the earth, still listen to this voice, and bend energies toward these goals. The practical intellectuals of the Bronx make their ears deaf to this message. They buy guns, practice murder on the innocent little birds. The revenge of God comes to their own children.

If this little girl, bright as she was, beautiful as she was had been born into a pacifist family, a family where mercy, or better yet, loving kindness to all was taught, the girl would have had a radiant face in life. If this little girl had been born into a family where visiting of the sick, aid to the hungry is taught, she would be a blessing in many lives today. These intellectuals tell us we are not practical.

—DAVID BERKINGOFF

Slave Labor

According to the Western Politicians, only the Iron Curtain countries possess such monstrosities as Slave Labor Camps. But, recently the British Government, in Kenya, sentenced the "terrorist" leader to 7 years of hard labor in an humanitarian British prison. Who are the upholders of Slave Labor?

Sec. 34.66 P.L.&R.



Postmaster: Return postage guaranteed