

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 17, 1956

FIVE CENTS

## British People Paying Bill for Attack on Egypt

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Dec. 8

While British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden enjoyed the sunshine, rum and cigars of Jamaica the bills for his government's military adventure in the Middle East came tumbling through the letter box of his official residence in London. His minions, left behind to do the dirty work, merely marked them "Passed to the people for payment," and sat back to wait further installments on the sum due.

So far only the first effects of British imperialism in the Middle East have been felt here—but they are sufficient to make even ardent supporters of the Tories wonder whether the cost of trying to keep the Union Jack flying over the Suez Canal was not rather high.

The biggest impact upon Britain's economy is, at the moment, less gasoline at higher prices. Having moved troops into Egypt behind the excuse of preserving Britain's oil supplies the Tory government has succeeded in cutting those supplies by 25 per cent.

This means a big slow-down in transport and industrial activities; it also means that the Tories, who only 18 months ago based their election propaganda on the lie that a Labor government would reintroduce rationing, have themselves been forced to ration gasoline.

In addition to slowing down the wheels of Britain, the cut in gasoline supplies also means a loss of some \$17 million a month to the government in taxes on gasoline sales. This has been overcome by the simple expedient of increasing the tax by 40 per cent.

In addition the oil companies and the gas stations have poked a little more on the price in order to maintain their profits while doing a quarter less business. The total result is that the prices of both gasoline and Diesel fuel oil have risen by more than a third.

### CHAIN REACTION

This has, of course, sparked off a chain reaction.

The road-haulage companies are to increase their freight rates by ten per cent, which ultimately means that every article on sale in the shops will cost more. Passenger fares on public transport are also going to climb; on the first

(Continued on page 4)

### Mortified

The *New Republic's* Washington Wire page (by "T.R.B.") for November 26 gives a liberal's alibi for Stevenson's defeat that should be preserved:

"Stevenson was probably doomed to defeat anyway, but he turned out to be a weak candidate. His speeches were well written but his delivery was poor and in some cases mortifying."

Whereas Eisenhower on the other hand....

Third Phase in the Greatest Revolutionary Struggle in World History:

# Hungarian Quislings Declare War on the Workers Councils

By GORDON HASKELL

The Hungarian Revolution entered its third period of struggle as the Kadar puppet government broke with the Workers' Councils and faced a renewed general-strike call.

Moscow's quislings are now openly at war not simply with the whole population, as has been true since October 23, but specifically also with the Workers' Councils, the organized representative leadership of the working class and the nation in this revolution.

With almost unbelievable tenacity, the Hungarian revolution continues to unfold. The workers of that small country, supported by virtually the whole population, are writing a page of human history which will never be forgotten.

Humanity will remember them not only for their epic heroism, but because their struggle has struck mortal blows at a myth and a vast material power which

has blocked humanity's road forward to socialism and democracy for thirty years.

Every day which passes in which the Hungarian workers refuse to give up, or to be cajoled, browbeaten or terrorized back from the ramparts of freedom into the social prison of Stalinism, weakens their enemies, multiplies their friends, and

## APPEAL FROM BUDAPEST

"The Central Workers Council in Budapest decided to call a general strike after it had protested unavailingly to Premier Kadar against the arrest of many of its members. It called on workers in the whole world to strike in sympathy."

—N. Y. Times, Dec. 10.

The Hungarian workers' councils, leading the bravest struggle for freedom the world has ever seen, here sends an appeal to the American labor movement, as to all "workers in the whole world."

What will American labor do?

There have been floods of anguished words and hours of breast-beating spent on deploring the "inability" of the West to give support to the Hungarian freedom fighters. The desperate and wrong cry for military aid, or "arms to Hungary," is rightly rejected. There has been a ton of print devoted to asking what else could be done.

Here's one thing. Will American labor ignore it, while continuing to beat the drums about supporting the Hungarian fight?

There were other things that could have been done. The biggest was to demand that the U. S. call the Russians on their proposal for a simultaneous withdrawal of all foreign troops by both sides, as has been pointed out by many (discussed in LA Dec. 3).

The labor movement did not raise a peep about that, but its leaders and everybody else went on lamenting the West's inability to "do something."

George Meany or Walter Reuther or David Dubinsky are not being asked to stand up to a Russian tank.

They are not even being asked to stand up to John Foster Dulles.

They are simply being asked to demonstrate their "sympathy" in action, as the Hungarian workers enter a death-struggle phase of their battle.

They are simply being asked for some easy moral support, given demonstratively before the world.

It would not cost them a drop of blood.

They would not even have to skip a meal.

They need not suffer a moment of discomfort in their rich, full, contented lives. It's practically bargain-rate solidarity.

But a sympathy strike demonstration by American labor would help to megaphone to the Hungarian people that the world knows what they are fighting for, that the eyes of all people are on them, that they are not dying uselessly in a forgotten corner but are actors in one of the most inspiring world dramas ever seen.

This is American labor's cue to "do something" right now. It is not anywhere near what should be done, but it is what the Hungarian workers themselves are asking for right now. It is almost literally the least we can do.

## THE POLISH REVOLUTION SEETHES UNDER THE GOMULKA REGIME

Warsaw Fights the 'Second Stage'

... page 2

Poland and the Hungarian Fight

... page 3

Coolie Labor Under the American Flag:  
WHO CARES ABOUT SAMOA?

... page 6

educates a whole generation all over the world to the possibilities of self-emancipation.

Despite the meagerness of the information available, it is now clear that the Hungarian revolution has developed as a classic proletarian revolution against a dictatorial regime.

All the elements are there: the initial weakening and confusion of the government and ruling class following the death of Stalin and the struggle for power inside the Russian government; the growing demands for elementary rights of freedom and self-expression by students and intellectuals; the brutal attack by the regime on a peaceful demonstration; the rallying of the workers and peasants to the struggle; the creation by the workers of spontaneous organizations which take on the attributes, powers and functions of a dual government; the attempt of the government to channel, bribe and cajole the workers to give up the struggle; the intervention of the Russian troops as the sole support of the government; the rallying of the whole nation behind the workers' councils as their institutions of self-rule against the discredited government; the attempt of the government to crush the workers' councils by force.

### SIEGE

Here is a description by the N. Y. Times (Dec. 2), that hard-bitten foe of "soviets," of the forces in the Hungarian revolution:

"The struggle in Hungary took on the aspects of a siege in which two main forces were opposed. On the one side was the Soviet Government, represented by its army and its chief of state security, Gen. Ivan A. Serov.

"On the other side were the workers, represented by the Budapest Workers' Council which emerged as the only authority that the people of Hungary seemed willing to obey. The workers' councils came into being in the early days of the rebellion as workers seized the factories and fortified them as strong points against Soviet tanks. The Budapest council became the principal spokesman for workers' demands.

"Between the two forces stood the

(Turn to last page)

### Free Djilas!

In a quickie trial from which the press was excluded, the Tito regime sentenced Milovan Djilas to 3 years hard labor for committing the crime of expressing disagreements with government policy in the foreign press.

This is the reply of the Tito totalitarians to Djilas' criticisms.

Their secrecy and haste mean that they fear publicity and protest.

That is why "Free Djilas!" must become a world-wide giant cry from the labor and socialist movements of all countries.

## THE POLISH REVOLUTION

# The Warsaw Regime Fights the 'Second Stage'

By PHILIP COBEN

We have mentioned in recent articles that there are hopeful people who, while derogating or even condemning the Hungarian Revolution, point to the Gomulka regime in Poland as exemplifying the better, wiser and more effective way to transform the old Stalinist totalitarianisms into new socialist democracies under revamped national-Communist regimes. It is being called the "Polish way."

The "Polish way" of the Gomulka regime is dictated to it at the present stage by the forces of seething revolution from below which it is striving to keep under control and overmaster. Some well-wishers in the West are trying to convince themselves that, for the regime, the present unsatisfactory extent of "democratization" is only a first installment, a first stage, a beginning toward achieving genuine socialist democracy. That this is the hope or belief of the mass of workers, and also Communist workers, in Poland is beyond doubt; it is the basis for Gomulka's popularity. This hope or belief is indeed one of the driving forces of the Polish revolution.

To bridle this revolution, the Gomulka regime has set out to combat the notion that there can be a "second stage" of democratization which will go further than has been permitted so far.

This fact, now evident from detailed material from Poland available here, will be disconcerting only to those who expect freedom to be handed down from above by the present rulers, rather than won by revolutionary action.

The efforts of the Gomulka regime even serve to show the deep-flowing character of the Polish Revolution which is still on and still alive beneath the surface of events.

Let us see some of the things they are saying in Warsaw, outside of merely general standard-type paeans to democracy and freedom.

## "DISPEL ALL HOPES"

An important exposition of the Gomulka regime's perspective was given by Gomulka himself on November 29 at what was called an "election rally" in Warsaw—that is, a conference of party and regime cadre leaders to consider the problem of how to rig the coming election as painlessly as possible, while giving as much leeway as possible for steam to blow off.

Gomulka's consideration of this problem was presented as usual on the background of first establishing the strong points: the new "equal" relations with Russia, which the regime claims as its own victory; the desperate economic situation, which is interpreted as requiring "social discipline" and hard work rather than demonstrations; a discreet pointing of the finger toward Hungary as if to say, "That's what you'll get unless..."; a more overt pointing of the finger toward the NATO buildup and militarization in Germany, with a reminder that Poland's western borders depend on the good will of the Russians, because, for example, "Even the German parties which consider themselves democratic and workers' parties have not yet taken any attitude against revisionism [of the borders]."

From this, Gomulka launches his attack on those who think that there should be further democratization—a notion which, in a well-known manner, he discusses most often under the pseudonym "restoration of bourgeois democracy," against "the line of the 8th Plenum," which saw the Gomulka restoration, now a code-word meaning the current line.

"The decisions of the 8th Plenum... are regarded by them as only a transitional stage, which is to be followed by a second stage... We must therefore dispel all the hopes of the stage-by-stage politicians—that is, bourgeois politicians, ir-

respective of their label... Our policy has no 'stages' of any kind and will have no such 'stages,' stages which might deal a blow to the basic foundations of socialism in Poland... Whoever works against this puts himself on the other side of the barricades."

## IN A GROOVE

This is interlarded with continued references to alleged but anonymous bourgeois-restorationists. In fact, however, what concerns him is that the aspiration for further "stages" is powerful among the mass of workers, and not because friends of the émigré Mikolajczyk are causing him to lose sleep. It is the workers and students and pro-democratic forces in the streets that he is threatening with barricades.

This was certified by his ensuing blistering denunciation of the "social dregs" who were "provoking brawls at Bydgoszcz" (for which, see last week's LA). In the standard Stalinist fashion, he painted the latter as if they were simply common hoodlums.

If Gomulka is going to democratize Poland just as fast as he can, as some hope, he is not showing great facility at avoiding the stereotyped Stalinist manner of pinning the label of venal criminals on revolutionary elements.

It is interesting to note that he does not dare to label the Bydgoszcz demonstrators as pro-bourgeois or pro-fascist or anti-working-class, or what have you. He takes the approach that was taken by his predecessors in the Poznan trials, before these trials were dumped under the pressure of revolutionary action in the streets. That is, the offenders are represented to be simply house-burners, property-destroyers, hoodlums.

We are back in a groove. He proclaims that they will be punished "with ruthlessness and determination."

## STALINISTS TO STAY

He throws another thunderbolt against the democratic opposition: they are "political opportunists" because "their entire attention is focused on the so-called democratic freedoms, political independence, and the opening of the gates for them to take over offices and positions."

What is the insinuation in the last phrase? He is defending the fact that his regime has taken over en masse the old Stalinist bureaucracy which operated the now discredited Bierut regime, and he is slyly smearing the democratic opposition with the charge that they want to purge the discredited bureaucrats only because they want the jobs for themselves.

This theme of defending the old Stalinist (i.e., Bierut) bureaucracy, now taken over by Gomulka, is a persistent one, which we have not hitherto seen reported here.

In the November 29 speech mentioned, Gomulka does it and not for the first time: he blasts the "slanders" and "attacks [which] are made against all who in past years have been active in various state, party, and economic organs, attacks branding them as so-called Stalinists."

Who are being branded as Stalinists by the people? The old party and state bosses who up to yesterday in every locality and on every local level were executing the crimes which are now being piously renounced in retrospect. The same men who wielded the whip are now smiling greasily.

Gomulka asserts that "the vast majority of these" are now good democrats, "in good faith," in accord with the new line, and therefore must not be purged. He denounces attacks on them as being in reality aimed "against the party as such and the people's government."

## "DIRECTORS IN BARROWS"

Some concretization of this can be seen in the speech, made the day before, by W. Sokorski, chairman of Polskie Radio, entitled "In Defense of Socialist Democracy." Its main theme, under that title, is defense of the Stalinist bureaucracy against the "centrifugal, anarchistic forces within and outside the party."

It should be borne in mind, for background, that in the stormy upheaval of the October days the radio announced from all over the country either (a) resolutions from local groups of workers, students, etc., demanding the removal of their local bureaucrats as being unsympathetic to the new climate and compromised by their past, or (b) the direct action ousting of such bureaucrats without sending resolutions. Listen to Sokorski:

"The defense of the achievements of democracy and socialism requires putting an end to the determined wall of demagoguery and the besmirching of workers' and Party activists, to the public overthrow of local people's authorities, to the carting of directors in barrows out of factories, and to the dismissal at mass meeting of legally appointed representatives of the people's authorities. The hunting down of Party activists, of democratic [sic] leaders, of socialists and communists, in accordance with Party directives must be brought to an end. Not one of us, Party men, men of the Party and state apparatus and the national councils, economic and cultural activists, is ashamed of having built socialism in recent years..."

It is a revealing description, of course. Any one who wishes to claim that it was hoodlums, fascists, arsonists or Mikolajczyk agents who carted factory directors out on wheelbarrows to dump them in the street, while the horrified workers and Communists looked on helplessly, will have no difficulty also in claiming that the "fascists" seized control of the Budapest Workers Council.

## "BOW THE HEAD"

Sikorski, as a matter of fact, doesn't dare say that this was done by "reactionaries." He merely thunders that it must stop, "irrespective of how radical the phraseology with which they cloak their activities."

"It is not true," he argues, "that those who until now were against socialism or those who stood aside have greater rights to the new road." To translate: it is not true that you should put greater trust in those who kept their hands clean of the old and now detested regime of Bierut, and to whom you now tend to turn. (He may well have in mind the fact that in Hungary, in the high point of the revolution, you could scarcely get a cheer from the workers unless you could boast that you'd just come out of jail.)

No, said Sikorski, we must "bow our head" before the "hard, devoted work of the huge numbers of Party activists and state officials..."

All we want from an official is that he follow our line right now, he keeps on stressing. Therefore "the Party at the same time resists with full determination the way of anarchy and demagoguery, the arrogant wave of reactionary, conservative and anarchist [note the typically Stalinist amalgam] elements and their attempts to push us away from the road to socialism and to remove from active and creative work the old, tested Party cadres."

He does not show much sensitivity to the fact that what the people distrust

about the old bureaucrats is precisely that they are old and tested—especially tested. The kind of tests they went through are things the people know.

## "LOYAL" TO WHOM?

In an earlier speech (Nov. 4) Gomulka himself had laid down this line. He explained at some length why the regime was going to retain not only the great mass of the old bureaucrats, but also those specifically who supported the pro-Russian "Natolin group," the unreconstructed Stalinists.

"In the former system of ruling," he began on this point, "... even the best men sometimes went wrong." We all have to "pay for the mistakes of the past, for the system which is called Stalinism." But don't remove officials just because they didn't always act "as it is expected of them today."

The Natolin faction, he explains very gingerly, merely were too afraid of "unfavorable consequences" from the 8th Plenum, that's all. So mistakes were made; for example, "Some comrades approached this problem [of appointments to leading posts] in a very simplified way which could be taken for anti-Semitism." The slap is delicate. But all this is a buildup for the real pitch:

"Today, after the 8th Plenum, digging out the past line of division can harm a number of people. The terms Natolin group and Pulawy group should be eliminated from our language. (Applause)"

We must be loyal, he says—yes, loyal—to "all those comrades who, admittedly slowly and with internal resistance, are honestly and with conviction accepting the new party line." That is, we must defend against the wrath of the people all of those Stalinists who are finding difficulty adapting themselves to our new line but who are trying.

He gives a special scattering of holy water over "the overwhelming majority" of the secret-police cadres, along the same lines, and hails them as "ready to prevent any attempts aimed against the political line mapped out by the leadership of the party."

Of that we can be sure. But it may come as a disagreeable surprise to some who are training themselves to be Gomulkaists (over here) to read this eulogy of a secret police for acting as the prop of the party line. That is because of the verbiage from Gomulka about "reorganizing" the secret police and keeping them out of politics.

## "MONOLITHIC"

What may be even more disagreeable, though unfortunately true, is that Gomulka openly and squarely continues to stand for one-party monolithism, and assigns those who don't to the other side of those barricades he was talking about.

The time-honored Stalinist phrases poured out as he wound up his injunction to forget about the "former" divisions between the Stalinists of the Natolin group and the "Gomulkaists":

"The party must be and will be monolithic from top to bottom, on the basis of putting into life the tasks mapped out by the 8th Plenum. (Applause) Unjust and unjustified, as well as harmful, are all the attempts to divide the Party leadership into old and new people. The leadership of the Party is monolithic." Etc.

But this gets into a subject which we reserve for next week: Gomulka's principled insistence on one-party totalitarianism and the rig-up for the coming elections.

It is not a question of Gomulka personally.

There are people who assure us that, when the chips are down, the good man Wladislaw Gomulka will be found on the right side. One of these is a man who himself went over to the socialist side, Milovan Djilas, in his brilliant article "The Storm in East Europe" (LA, Nov. 26).

Maybe. We are not interested in betting for or against the man, on the personal level, any more than we ever approach political questions from the personal side. It is not Wladislaw Gomulka that is our subject, but the regime he heads and of which he is the spokesman.

All we say is that socialist democracy will never be handed down to the Polish people by the regime, whether or not Gomulka continues to head it, but will have to be taken by revolutionary mass action from below against the regime.

The development of Poland today speaks of this loudly.

## THE POLISH REVOLUTION

# Poland and The Hungarian Revolution

The Gomulka regime in Poland has been treading a cautious line in its treatment of the Hungarian Revolution before its own people. It has severely avoided supporting the freedom fighters of Hungary against the Russian hangmen, but at the same time it cannot follow the Russian line of condemning and smearing them as "fascists."

**Gomulka himself bends this line toward the Russian side—that is, he angles his comments on Hungary to give color to the Russian version—but voices are still heard on the Warsaw radio arguing for a more sympathetic attitude toward the Hungarian people.**

The following is based on texts and summaries of Polish radio broadcasts now available here.

First, as for Gomulka:

On November 29 the Warsaw Radio carried a speech made by Gomulka at a "pre-election conference" in the capital (the same speech which is also considered in an accompanying article in this issue). Gomulka's treatment of "the tragic events in Hungary," showing both the leaning and the ambiguity, went like this:

"As is known, these events have been taken advantage of by all forces hostile to socialism for a mad campaign against the USSR and against the Communist Parties in a number of countries. . . . We are genuinely and deeply pained that the situation in Hungary developed in such a way that, at the wish of the Hungarian government, Soviet military units were used for fighting inside that country."

Note that Gomulka carefully uses a formulation like Tito's—what he is "pained" about is that the situation "developed in such a way," not that his Russian friends were engaged in crushing a revolution in blood—though of course

## ANOTHER FLAREUP IN POLAND

As we go to press, events in Poland confirm that the revolutionary elements have not forgotten Hungary, in spite of Gomulka.

A new outbreak by "students and young factory workers" in the Polish city of Szczecin (Stettin) on December 11 registered the temperature of Polish feeling.

According to the AP, reliable sources in Stettin "said it was the outcome of a planned demonstration by students and young factory workers against events in Hungary."

The stormy demonstration directed itself against the Russian consulate in the city. This was admitted in the Polish official press, which (in accordance with the pattern discussed on page 2 of this issue) called the demonstrators "hooligans" and tried to pretend that "drunkards" were the cause.

The action, however, was obviously even bigger than the one at Bydgoszcz. Large-scale arrests were made, and shooting was reported.

It is important to note that the demonstration had as its object solidarity with the Hungarian Revolution.

Even more important, a resolution unanimously passed by the same steel workers who had spearheaded the Poznan uprising, after three days of demonstrations in Poznan, condemned the Russian intervention in Hungary, called for immediate withdrawal of Russian troops, supported the Budapest general-strike call, and called on the Gomulka regime to support the revolution there. They forced publicity on their resolution by declaring that they would strike if it were suppressed.

The same dispatches from Warsaw also tell of student demonstrations in Wroclaw, a hot spot during the October days, and clashes in "several provincial towns in the last two days."

Tito openly added explicit approval of the second intervention as "necessary." Gomulka cannot afford to do that, at least yet.

To continue with Gomulka, his speech went right on as follows:

"Since this intervention has taken place it is clear to us and to everybody that the USSR does not seek in Hungary a ground for economic exploitation, that it has no intention of deriving material gains from the work of the Hungarian nation, and that it does not intend to transform Hungary into a colony. This intervention is different in nature from the military intervention of the Western powers in Egypt. . . ."

"It is significant that the Soviet intervention in Hungary is opposed most

loudly by those political circles which always base their policy and their hopes on external intervention—but from the other side."

He then took a slap at the "radio propaganda" which "incited hostile elements in Hungary and bears considerable responsibility for the blood shed on Hungarian soil," and wound up with the happy thought that "It is different in Poland" where the Party took the lead in "the process of necessary socialist changes."

**But there is no doubt that this Russian-slanted version does not reflect the feeling of the Polish people. It should be remembered that the Hungarian Revolution, after all, began on October 23 out of a movement of solidarity with the Polish upsurge at a moment when the stormy mass action of the Polish people was being threatened by Russian troop movements.**

The Hungarians came to the aid of their Polish brothers. This act was at least one contribution to the pressure which convinced the Russians to make

a deal with Gomulka, instead of using Rokossovsky's tanks.

But once the deal was made in Warsaw, the Gomulka regime immediately set about using its popularity, in turn, to prevent the Polish people from giving any aid to their Hungarian comrades in their hour of need.

The reader can perhaps imagine how he would feel if he were a militant Polish worker, who yesterday was himself demonstrating in the streets of Warsaw or Wroclaw against the presence of Russian troops, and who has been compelled (or even convinced) to stand by idly while the Hungarian nation is massacred by the common enemy.

So the Hungarian battle is inevitably one of the focal points of irrepressible discontent in Poland which still beset the wished-for stabilization of the Gomulka regime, one of the elements in the seething revolution which the regime has been bridling so far.

The pro-Hungarian viewpoint has been heard on the Warsaw radio from a particularly interesting source, none other than the man who was acting as Polish correspondent in Budapest during the fighting, Marian Bielicki. In the December 3 issue of *LA*, we already quoted from a broadcast of his of November 28. On December 1, he broadcast a second "Letter to a Friend" on the Hungarian events.

We reproduce a good part of it below, all that we have from the available monitored radio broadcast. Most of it is direct quotation from his broadcast, as indicated by the quotation marks.

## A Polish Eye-Witness Tells the Truth About Hungary's Battle

### LETTER TO A FRIEND by Marian Bielicki

(Warsaw Radio, Dec. 1)

Between the first and second Soviet intervention some 40 political parties and groupings were established in Hungary, but they were transient in character.

"However, none doubted that with the consolidation of the victory of the revolution, with the stabilization of the situation in the country—and the first symptoms of this stabilization began to emerge clearly on Thursday, Nov. 1—the small parties and groupings would disappear, leaving only the biggest and most important parties in existence." The political character of the bourgeois parties, such as the Christian Party or the Smallholders Party, did not emerge clearly—"they only used slogans."

The Hungarian nation rejected the whole content of the Rakosi regime which wholly distorted the essence of the socialist system.

"In the previous letter to you I quoted the words of a worker who said that if socialism was to be what he had known from his previous experience, and not from theory, then he did not want socialism. In the consciousness of the working class, peasantry, and youth, the conception of socialism became synonymous with the concept of Stalinism."

"The painful experiences inflamed by the crimes committed in the days of the revolution by Rakosi's successors, the heirs to Stalin's terror who were desperately clinging to office—these cruel experiences gave the nation the right to adopt the attitude it assumed in the days of the revolution."

"Relying on the hatred of the Hungarian nation for that which it was taught to believe was socialism, the reviving political parties could conduct, and in many cases actually did conduct, propaganda suited to their own political interests. This is a fact."

**"But at the same time these parties had to take account of the fact that in rejecting what can be called the Stalinist superstructure the Hungarian nation was not rejecting the truly socialist foundations laid as the result of post-1945 transformations, and not only did not reject but defended them. It was prepared to defend these truly socialist achievements just as much as its right to independence, and right to decide about its own fate without the participation of external influences."**

"In tens of conversations I received a resolute reply to the question about Hungary's future: No one will take the land from us; no one will take away the factories; no one will take away from us the right to universal education, to social welfare."

"On this question, the question of the defense and consolidation of the socialist foundations, the Hungarian people, in the vast majority, took an absolutely clear attitude. That is why party political programs unequivocally formulated the demand for basing Hungary's future on socialist ownership of the means of production."

"There can be no return to the times of capitalism, said the leader of the Smallholders Party, Bela Kovacs, there can be no return to the world of bankers, counts, and factories owners."

"Maybe at this point you will smile, my friend, thinking that the politicians promise many things, but that when they have consolidated their positions they do as they please. This is true—but I have confidence in the Hungarian nation. I firmly believe that regarding the noble fire kindled in its hearts during the revolution no one would have succeeded, and no one would succeed in extinguishing it."

### REFUTES SLANDERS

**"Not the politicians, but the insurgents—workers, youth, peasants—determined the character of the revolution; not the political parties, but the revolutionary committee, insurgent centers, mapped out the direction of the revolution. And that is why at the moment when the Imre Nagy government based itself on the support of this mass revolutionary movement the situation in the country began to be stabilized, chaos began to recede before revolutionary order."**

"Within the revolutionary movement, there were also distinctly retrograde forces at work: Horthyites also began to stir. But these forces were not the determinants of the character of the revolution. Opposed to these forces were the insurgents' masses which decided everything, which determined the popular and not reactionary character of the Hungarian revolution."

"You will ask perhaps about the Christian Party: Did it take sides with that revolution, the real revolution in Hungary? No, it did not, and this had a decisive effect on lowering public interest in that party."

After the publication of the political program of the Christian Party, including the demand for the restoration of church lands, the Smallholders Party stopped worrying about any influence that that party might have on voters who otherwise might have split their votes between the Christian and Smallholders Parties. This shows "the real sentiments of the people, their strength, which even those rallying around that very popular figure, Mindszenty, had to take account of, and when they did not take it into account, they doomed themselves to defeat."

"For this reason the more level-headed

politicians initiated a retreat, and Mindszenty, speaking on November 3, passed over these matters in silence. In Hungary there was certainly the danger that the political parties which in the past represented the interests of the [word unintelligible] classes would at the moment of electoral victory try to revert to their old programs."

**"But I maintain that the Hungarian people did not desire a return to the world of counts and factory owners, that the Hungarian nation had rejected that which was called popular democracy and which had nothing in common either with the people or with democracy, and that it did not desire the return of capitalism and was capable of opposing by its own strength all such forces."**

"And the Communists, the Communist Party? The Hungarian Workers Party ceased to exist. It proved incapable of escaping from the morass of crimes and errors. The conflict between Stalinism and socialism within the party leadership caused on November 1 the declaration of the new party formed by Communists."

"But even then, as it was shown a few days later, the representatives of Stalinism had already penetrated the leadership group and by their deeds once again dealt a terrible blow to the cause of socialism in Hungary, fleeing to the protection of foreign tanks."

### THE "TRUE COMMUNISTS"

"But, believe me, all this time the true Communists, for whom the cause of their own people is dearer than anything else, were on this side of the barricades, where the fight was for truth, against oppression and falsehood. They were and remained on this; the only side of the barricade that had justice behind it and was worthy of the highest respect. Their attitude, their struggle will revive socialism."

**"I do not know, my friends, whether my arguments have convinced you. A reply to the question of which road Hungary would have taken were it not [few words unintelligible] is not easy. But I profoundly believe that Hungary would have taken the road leading it to a better future, its own future, in accord with the will of the nation, and not for politicians of one kind or another. I am convinced that this road would have taken Hungary to true socialism, where words and deeds constitute an inseparable organic whole."**

"I believe this not because I want to believe or because I like to believe it, but because the trend of events indicates this. This was indicated by the brave and unbreakable Hungarian people who wished, and still wish, to determine the fate of their country alone, for they, and they alone, are entitled to do so."

## When D.W. Editor Said Yes

By H. W. BENSON

The symposium on Hungary and the Middle East at Community Church on December 4 (reported in *LA* last week) was of more than passing interest; it was a political event of real significance.

One of the participants, John Gates, was editor of the *Daily Worker*. Another was Max Shachtman, chairman of the Independent Socialist League. For the first time, a top leader of the Communist Party was ready to debate with a left-wing socialist critic of Stalinism, an opponent of Russian dictatorship.

That alone would be noteworthy, for the CP up to now has adamantly refused to test its line in public against the arguments of Third Camp socialism; it took refuge in epithets, rejecting debates with those whom it freely called "fascists" and "class-enemies."

In his presentation, Gates remained scrupulously within the limits of current official CP policy, but by his very presence he threw the old attitude toward left-socialist opponents into the wastebasket.

There was more than his mere presence; there was also his tone. Not that Gates departed from the official line of his party's national Committee majority; his defense of CP policy was aggressive and firm if deliberately selective. But the attitude toward his critics on the platform was something new.

Any member of the CP, or any sympathizer, would leave the hall with this feeling: Gates did not give in to Shachtman; he rejected the views of the ISL; but he treated his critics as though they and he belonged within the same working-class or socialist "camp."

## British People Paying—

(Continued from page 1)

day of the new year the cheapest fares on all of London's buses and subways will be increased by 20 per cent. Fares in all other parts of the country are going up in a similar fashion.

These increases have caused gasps of dismay all over Britain, and slowly the realization is dawning that the bill for aggression in Egypt is going to be a stiff one.

The price paid by the public so far only covers the cost of the diminished oil supplies; the bill for the actual military operations has yet to be presented; likewise the bill for the increased freightage charges of hauling general cargoes around the longer Cape run now that British actions have succeeded in blocking the Suez Canal.

But this is not all. Apart from the price increases brought about by the Suez adventure the people of Britain are further burdened by price increases due to the activities of the Tory government in other directions.

In the past few weeks the prices of bread and milk have gone up as the Tories have pushed on with their policy of slashing government subsidies on basic foodstuffs. Additional charges have also been levied on drug prescriptions dispensed under the National Health Service.

A big blow of the Tory government's economic policies, however, is yet to come in the shape of increased rents.

Under a bill now going through Parliament some five million tenants of private landlords—who have a maximum level fixed on their rents by legislation under the Rent Restriction Acts—will have to pay the landlord more. Tenants of municipal houses will also find their rents going up in the near future as a consequence of the government's action last month in abolishing the remnants

of the governmental subsidy at one time paid for sixty years on all houses built by local authorities.

To add the finishing touches to this picture of economic mess and muddle, one must take into account the recently announced loss of \$279 million in Britain's gold and dollar reserves last month with its attendant possibilities of devaluation of the pound, a subject now being freely discussed by economic circles.

But Gates had no chance for rejoinder until a question was posed from the audience to him: "Would you favor free elections in Communist countries, including freedom for capitalist parties?" He replied in one word: "Yes."

The answer was brief but its significance should not be missed. This is the first time that a leading member of the CP has come out for free elections in countries dominated by Communist Party governments, elections in which capitalist parties as well as others could freely participate.

of the governmental subsidy at one time paid for sixty years on all houses built by local authorities.

To add the finishing touches to this picture of economic mess and muddle, one must take into account the recently announced loss of \$279 million in Britain's gold and dollar reserves last month with its attendant possibilities of devaluation of the pound, a subject now being freely discussed by economic circles.

These are crucial factors which I think merit more frank consideration. At least, they warrant some humility. The fact that they may lead to unhappy conclusions and pessimistic perspectives in no way disproves them. Life isn't always kind.

These are crucial factors which I think merit more frank consideration. At least, they warrant some humility. The fact that they may lead to unhappy conclusions and pessimistic perspectives in no way disproves them. Life isn't always kind.

These are crucial factors which I think merit more frank consideration. At least, they warrant some humility. The fact that they may lead to unhappy conclusions and pessimistic perspectives in no way disproves them. Life isn't always kind.

These are crucial factors which I think merit more frank consideration. At least, they warrant some humility. The fact that they may lead to unhappy conclusions and pessimistic perspectives in no way disproves them. Life isn't always kind.

These are crucial factors which I think merit more frank consideration. At least, they warrant some humility. The fact that they may lead to unhappy conclusions and pessimistic perspectives in no way disproves them. Life isn't always kind.

These are crucial factors which I think merit more frank consideration. At least, they warrant some humility. The fact that they may lead to unhappy conclusions and pessimistic perspectives in no way disproves them. Life isn't always kind.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### Questions on Israel's Attack

To the Editor:

Much of what H. Draper says in his article "Assault on Egypt" [Nov. 12] is correct. Israel's preventive war, which may or may not have been the result of prior collusion between England, France and Israel, cannot but isolate it further and make it dependent on declining imperialist powers whose days in Africa and Asia are numbered.

Draper shows some awareness that the Israeli action grows out of desperation but points to Israeli policies which contributed to the embittering of relations between the Arab world and Israel.

He appears, however, to write off Nasser's preparations for the destruction of Israel as "declamations" and "threats."

It seems to me that he fails to come to grips with the question whether or not there was a real basis for Israeli desperation. Was a second round launched by Egypt virtually inevitable and fairly imminent or not?

Some of the assumptions implicit in Draper's thinking have yet to be only confronted and established. He implies that if only Israel and the Zionists had not followed chauvinist policies toward the Arabs the deep chasm between Israel and the Arab world would not have existed. Is this really true?

Is it not possible that the Arab drive to destroy Israel would have developed no matter how enlightened Israel's policies toward the Arabs were?

Would emerging Arab nationalism, under any circumstances, have accepted the Jewish aspirations for statehood in Palestine?

May the Palestinian situation not be a tragedy in which two legitimate nationalisms inherently conflict?

These are crucial factors which I think merit more frank consideration. At least, they warrant some humility. The fact that they may lead to unhappy conclusions and pessimistic perspectives in no way disproves them. Life isn't always kind.

A. SOPKON

Correspondent A. Sopkon's questions are to the point in dealing with the Middle East crisis. There are also other aspects which I hope to cover as soon as time and space in *LA* are available; for the situation in East Europe and the Stalinist world has been monopolizing our attention. In the interim, some notes:

For the "assumptions" to which the second question refers, I would like to refer Sopkon to the programmatic article "To Break the Vicious Spiral" in *LA* for March 5. I think it will help to answer questions 2, 3 and 4.

A break with the chauvinist policies of Israeli Zionism would not guarantee anything, any more than socialism guarantees anything. It is simply the

*sine qua non* for an Israeli-Arab rapprochement, and for a policy which could gain the friendship and support of Arab masses as against the military dictators and semi-feudal kings who oppress those same Arab masses. *What has to be made is a beginning.*

There is no evidence that an attack by Egypt on Israel was "fairly imminent"; but this is not the crux. At the same time that Israel was pointing to Nasser's alleged desire to invade Israel, the Egyptians were claiming to be afraid of precisely the same offense by Israel. In point of fact, it was Israel that attacked. Does this help or destroy the possibility of an appeal by Israel to the Arab people?—that is, of a progressive political solution to the isolation of Israel?

This is the point. A destructive war in the Middle East—which could bring the tragedy of the Jews in our time to a terrible culmination—may be "virtually inevitable" only as long as both sides continue in their present chauvinist course, but not otherwise.

In any case, with respect to any war which seems "virtually inevitable" as a consequence of reactionary politics, the problem is how to avert it by political means, not how to precipitate it by one's own aggression.

To be sure the Middle East crisis is a clash of nationalisms (Israeli vs. Arab). Does the fifth question imply that there is no possible solution? and is this the "unhappy conclusion and pessimistic perspective" which Sopkon is thinking over? Well, there is a danger here for the person of divided mind who wants to support Israel in its present course and yet knows the injustices of its anti-Arab policy. He may reason sort of as follows:

*We are right and they are right; it's a question of two legitimate nationalisms; both sides have their justifications; if this is so, then my side is a justified one too; if it is justified then I can support it without too much heartburning about the righteous people on the other side who are saying the same thing to themselves; it's a pity that life will have it so, but we will just have to see who can kill whom first. Obviously a tragedy, but if so let us all play our assigned part in it.*

I set this down, not to ascribe it to our correspondent, but to speak against it as a different form of the politics of desperation, which is the politics that arises out of the blind-alley that the Israeli leadership has gotten itself into.

The question is not whether Israel has a "real basis" for appalling fears; of course it has. The question is whether its present politics of desperation lead it from one desperate recourse into worse and worse. This too is a vicious spiral from which it can break out only by a radically different course. I think socialists ought to consider the problem along these lines, not in terms of resigned acceptance of a terrible calamity.

HAL DRAPER

Labor Action FORUM

New York City

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20

Michael Harrington

National Chairman, Young Socialist League

on

### CIVIL LIBERTY AND THE COMMUNISTS

Why do socialists defend the civil liberties of Communists? Is it consistent to defend their rights while attacking them politically? Harrington replies on this question to the recent polemic against him in the CP's magazine *Political Affairs*.

The following week, Thursday, December 27, hear

HAL DRAPER, editor of *Labor Action*, on  
Behind Israel's 'Preventive War': The Role of Zionism in the  
Middle East Crisis

8:30 p.m. — Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

LABOR ACTION • 17<sup>th</sup> YEAR

December 17, 1956 • Vol. 20, No. 51

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Business Mgr: L. G. SMITH. Associate Editors: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

## Hungarian Student Leader, on U.S. Tour, Appeals for Solidarity by American Youth

By RAY WALSH

Chicago, Nov. 19

In an extremely unusual meeting before an American student audience, an authentic spokesman for the revolutionary Hungarian students appealed through an interpreter for American student solidarity with his people's struggle.

Under the assumed name of Istvan Laszlo, the Hungarian student who arrived in the U. S. with Anna Kethly addressed 500 or more students who jammed into International House here at the U. of Chicago tonight. The meeting was arranged by the student government as part of the National Student Association's tour for the speaker.

Laszlo, who took an active part in leading the Hungarian uprising, was a member of the revolutionary students' council of the University of Sopron, and escaped to the West to appeal before the UN and world students.

There can be little doubt that this tour by Laszlo for the NSA (with all sorts of official governmental assists) was intended by the sponsors to be primarily another blow against Russia in support of America's side in the cold war. The remarkable thing is that, despite what must have been intensive official prompting before the tour, Laszlo's words, far from being tired appeals to down "godless Communism" à la NATO, were electrifying and revolutionary throughout.

Referring to the Stalinist murderers of the revolution with bitter hatred and grinding contempt, he found it possible, though surrounded by university and NSA officialdom, to speak out against the invasion of Egypt, and to take passing pot-

shots at official American statements on the uprising.

Thanking the audience for the standing ovation with which he was greeted, Laszlo began by discussing the justification for the revolt. For him only one criterion needed to be applied in this case: foreign subjugation.

"Which of you," he asked, "would not oppose foreign subjugation of any country, anywhere?" Alas, how unfortunately inaccurate a presumption this is about many American students!

### REACHING THE RUSSIANS

"We do not hate the Russians; we are not national chauvinists or fascists," he said. "Especially," he went on, "do we not hate those many ordinary Russian soldiers, who when they found they were fighting the whole Hungarian people, turned over their arms to the revolutionaries."

Here he recounted an incident when a Russian soldier in a tank was handed a rebel leaflet explaining that this was a fight for freedom. "Accepting the leaflet

with a smile of agreement, the soldier, when asked further if he would stay in Hungary if the revolution succeeded, shook his head yes!"

These troops were potential allies of the revolution, Laszlo claimed, but not so the Russian commanders who used the truce period to rush in fresh troops who had had no contact with the revolutionary propaganda. Many of these replacements were Mongolian troops, he said, who were told "they were going to Suez to fight the imperialists!"

Laszlo was particularly bitter at the inability of the UN to do anything effective to save the revolution. He raised a profoundly significant question when he exclaimed, "Why can't one of the well-paid Western diplomats in the UN manage to write a single resolution that the Russians can't wiggle out of?"

Though the speaker gave the impression of one still groping for a formulation of exactly how the people in the rest of the world could have helped save the revolution, he did say that he did not

want U. S. armed intervention or a world war.

"Nevertheless," he added, "we would appreciate it if the U. S. State Department would not say that any citizen volunteering to fight with the Hungarian revolutionaries was liable to lose his U. S. citizenship."

The discussion period opened with a question justifying the Russian attack on Hungary. A campus Stalinist rose to refer to "the widespread allegations" of the prominence of anti-Semitic motivations in the uprisings, and the "shocking photographs" of "mob violence" and "lynchings" in *Life* magazine. This Stalinist claimed that the N. Y. *Post* correspondent in Budapest reported anti-Semitic speeches at revolutionary meetings.

Laszlo replied that any such accusations were absolutely without foundation. He related that in one instance a security policeman was spared execution because he was Jewish, since the revolutionaries did not want to give anyone a chance to slander the struggle.

### FOR DEMOCRACY

A YSLer took the floor to express socialist solidarity with the speaker's remarks and the Hungarian revolution. He went on to ask Laszlo what had been the reaction of the Hungarians to the British-French invasion of Egypt.

Laszlo answered by saying: "Great Britain and France could not have done anything worse to Hungary than to take the action they did in Egypt."

Replying to a question about the ultimate aims of the revolution in social as well as political terms, the speaker declared firmly that Hungarian youth were opposed to any return to the pre-war regime or any fascist system. As for their attitude toward a non-capitalist economic system, Laszlo said they were by no means ready to condemn it out of hand, and that they had to be given time to think about it.

Groping for the best way to express himself on this point, he finally summed it up in the phrase: "The Hungarian Revolution is for complete, 100 per cent democracy in Hungarian society!"

The socialists in the audience felt that there was no mere coincidence in his seizing upon this slogan they had themselves so often used.

## Chicago Rally Condemns Attacks on Suez, Hungary

By NANCY WILDE

Chicago, Nov. 15

A resolution condemning the imperialist attack on Egypt and the Russian attack on Hungary was passed unanimously by a gathering of sixty-five people at the Anti-Imperialist Rally tonight at the University of Chicago.

A sympathetic audience applauded vigorously as S. M. Sheniti, an Egyptian citizen studying at the university, recalled the bitter experiences of life under colonial rule. The colonialist pretense to a disinterested civilizing mission amounted in effect to a systematic attempt to rob the colonial peoples of their dignity as human beings, to destroy any sense of the value of their past, and even to replace their language, while at the same time turning Egypt into the producer of cotton for Manchester's mills.

A student who was born in Rumania and escaped from behind the Iron Curtain drew many parallels between the West's imperialism in Egypt and that of Russia in Eastern Europe. He reported that the Russian language had been forced on students in Rumania and Poland, and Russian culture and ideas

had been taught as superior to those of the satellite countries.

He felt that the East European people, while throwing off the economic and ideological yoke of Russian imperialism, would prefer a system of collective ownership of the means of production to a return to private property. He concluded that both Western and Russian "power blocs" would be surprised at the real power of the people, fighting for freedom.

Charles Chiakulas, international representative of the United Auto Workers, recently returned from a mission to Cyprus for the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, gave an eye-witness report of Britain's imperialist suppression of the Cypriots' desire for self-determination. He named the united labor movement as a prime factor in defending the colonial people against such suppression.

Carl Shier, secretary of the Harvester Council of the United Auto Workers, closed the rally with a condemnation of imperialism, Russian and Western, and said that the labor movement throughout the world is the principal opponent of imperialism. He called for solidarity with the workers' councils of Hungary and the Labor Party of England.

A second resolution from the audience was passed calling for the youth groups in the Socialist Forum—the Socialist Club and the Young Socialist League—to petition Student Government to initiate a fund drive for relief of victims of imperialism in Egypt and Hungary.

The forum's other sponsors are the Independent Socialist League of Chicago and the Socialist Party of Hyde Park. Its other meetings this fall were: Sid Lens, local union leader and NAACP branch president on the Suez crisis, and Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL, on the 1956 elections.

Eric Fromm, now in Mexico, has made arrangements with the Forum to speak some time in April.

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

### GET ACQUAINTED!

Young Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the Young Socialist League and its ideas.

I want to join the Young Socialist League.

NAME.....  
ADDRESS.....  
CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....  
SCHOOL (IF ANY).....TEL.....

**Get the Challenge**  
every week — by subscribing to  
**Labor Action. A student sub is**  
**only \$1 a year!**

# anvil

Winter 1957 Issue Just Out

Articles on politics, literature,  
music, student affairs . . . Single  
copy 25 cents . . . Subscription:  
five issues for \$1.00.

Individual students and student clubs  
who wish to sell *Anvil* on campus can  
obtain bundles of 5 or more copies at  
20 cents per copy.

**ANVIL, 36 East 10 Street**  
**New York 3, N. Y.**

## Coolie Labor Under the American Flag

# WHO CARES ABOUT SAMOA?

By HAL DRAPER

The Pacific island group of American Samoa is by no means the most blatant example of colonialism; there are far worse cases, to put it mildly. But there is one thing about it which makes it important to Americans: the colonialist in this case is the United States government. And no one seems to care about what is going on there.

The U. S. has very few colonial areas over which it exercises direct political domination. That is not the characteristic form that American imperialism takes. The Philippines and Cuba even became white elephants and were turned loose. The main form of American imperialism is usually exercised through economic and indirect-political domination and control—a quite different subject of inquiry. The few exceptions are retained by the U. S. not decisively for reasons of economic exploitation but mainly for military reasons—i.e., ancillary to the bigger problems of American imperialism in the world.

In addition to Okinawa (Ryukyus) and Puerto Rico, to both of which LABOR ACTION has in the past devoted attention, there are also: the Panama Canal Zone; the Virgin Islands; American Samoa; Guam and the Marianas; the Trust Territory of the Pacific, which includes the Marshall Islands and others; and some scattered islands many of which have no native population, like Wake, Midway, etc. (Hawaii and Alaska are different cases.)

The fact that the decisive reason for holding on to these possessions is not economic underlines the meaning of what has been taking place there; for there is nothing that inherently drives the U. S. to exploit their peoples, as France is driven to exploit Algeria. In fact, in many cases Washington would like to be a quite benevolent master—provided that benevolence doesn't cost too much, doesn't get in anybody's way, doesn't annoy the military, doesn't "cause any trouble"—in fact, provided so many things that the best way the native peoples can avoid being a "nuisance" is to take whatever is done to them and not complain.

But that doesn't happen. They complain. But to whom can they come? Who is willing to listen?

In the course of 1956 a disgraceful operation has taken place with respect to Samoa and Guam. It was all public. Yet there has hardly been a peep about it in the United States. After it was all over, there was a letter in the N. Y. Times correspondence column—that's about all.

Congress had passed a law suspending the application of U. S. minimum-wage standards to Samoa; at the last minute Guam was not included in this suspension, but as we shall see in another study, that makes no difference.

To learn what was behind this, one has to go to the two volumes of testimony that came out of the hearings on this law before a House subcommittee during February to April of the past year.

In brief, we learn that for several years, with full knowledge of what was going on, the government has deliberately been permitting the complete ignoring of U. S. labor standards in the exploitation of native labor under the American flag.

There is a real coolie-labor system not only flourishing under the American flag but encouraged by the government!

1

### The Majesty of the Law

The issue became sharp when it was discovered several years ago, to Washington's dismay, that the U. S. minimum-wage law actually applied not only to the 48 states but also to the possessions overseas.

This discovery was very disconcerting, because the law was not being enforced. Not only that: the government had not, and has not, the slightest intention of ever enforcing it.

People who have a mechanical notion of capitalist legality may think this incredible. It happens to be a public fact. And it has been going on for years, and is still going on.

The United States government is openly, publicly and admittedly breaking the law, in order not to interfere with the coolie-wage system which would be blown up if the law were ever enforced.

This went on with no difficulty as long as it was merely up to the executive arm of the government. There would be a difficulty, very likely, however, if the issue ever came up concretely before the courts, which are inclined to be less accommodating. For example,

suppose someone brought suit to collect what was due to the defrauded workers...? A suit could be brought not only for the wages not being paid now, but also to collect for the back wages that should have been paid going all the way back to the Brown-Vermilya decision, or perhaps to the very passage of the minimum-wage law...

So this past year bills were drawn and presented in Congress to do two things: (1) kill the application of the minimum-wage law in the possessions, particularly Guam and Samoa; (2) exempt the affected employers retroactively from their liability for the back wages that they should have been paying.

The first objective was formulated in the bills as a measure to amend the minimum-wage law so as to give the secretary of Labor power to set the minimum-wage level in these places. (It is this change that has already been passed for Samoa.)

One by-product of this mess is that a spotlight was cast on the conditions in these Pacific islands leading up to the situation. For the first time some information came out, when a subcommittee of the House committee on Education and Labor held a series of hearings on the bills, beginning February 15 and ending April 18, 1956.

At these hearings, the AFL-CIO's legislative representative Walter J. Mason quite rightly stressed that "there is an almost total vacuum of down-to-earth reliable factual information about the Samoan economy, the level of wages in Samoa" and many other things, and this is true also of the social and political conditions of the islanders' lives. Anyone can verify the existence of this almost total vacuum by looking up Samoa in New York's best reference library. Nobody seems to care.

But now the two volumes of the congressional hearings themselves constitute an exception. Let's see what they reveal.

2

### 'Irishmen' of the Pacific

American Samoa is the name given to the eastern group of the Samoan Islands; Western Samoa is presently under the New Zealand flag. The history of the imperialist scramble in the Pacific for possession of these lands is a very edifying one, but we skip it at this time.

Suffice to say that in 1878 the U. S. got itself a coaling station for ships at Pago Pago; in 1899 the islands were partitioned between the U. S. and Germany; the U. S. was interested in the Pago Pago harbor and therefore the administration of the islands was turned over to the navy. Although official commissions looked in and reported and plans were drawn, Congress never enacted any legislation setting up a permanent government for Samoa.

After the Second World War, it ceased to be of naval importance and is now not regarded as needed for a base. So in July 1951 the administration was taken over by the Interior Department.

Samoans are not citizens; their status is that of American "nationals" only. The governor, appointed by the Interior Department, is a dictator pure-and-simple. There is a native legislature with advisory status called the Fono, but the governor is the law. He is also the president of the island's bank and the editor of the island's newspaper—Lord Poohbah himself.

For example, at the hearings Mason was asked whether the AFL-CIO has any unions in Samoa; the question was designed to intimate that he had no interest to represent in the matter and was only wasting the committee's time. Mason riposted smartly:

"No... I don't know whether we would be allowed to go there and organize them. Samoa does not have an organic act. The governor is the law. He makes the laws. We do not have a government by law in Samoa; we have a government by men. We think this matter should be the first consideration of this Congress in trying to help to build up the economy of Samoa."

If you have read Margaret Mead's popular *Coming of Age in Samoa*, an anthropologist's study of the native culture, you have some idea of the cultural background of the people. But this study was made in the 1920s in outlying islands, and does not offer a guide to conditions in present-day Tutuila.

One background historical fact is indispensable. The Samoans have not been very docile colonial subjects.

Even before World War I, Western Samoa developed a native dissident movement—the *Mau* (Opinion) movement—which caused the then German masters a good deal of trouble. After that war, under the New Zealand mandate, disaffection increased and the *Mau* movement was revived, with the slogan "Samoa for the Samoans," national symbols and a separate native government. There was stubborn fighting; a native boy-

cott of things European; a disobedience campaign and an anti-tax-payment movement—all for the demand of autonomy and the end of European control and exploitation. Later, under a Labor government, New Zealand made peace with the *Mau* movement through concessions.

The *Mau* movement also appeared in American Samoa, under navy rule. Concessions in form were made, including the setting up of the advisory Fono. It is not for nothing that the Samoans have been called "the Irishmen of the Pacific"—i.e., scrappy trouble-makers from the point of view of the imperialists.

3

### How They Saved Samoa From the \$1 Menace

The current problem in Samoa concerns its economy. It is an intriguing and perhaps a unique case. Everybody has heard of one-industry economies in undeveloped areas. Samoa is not merely a one-industry economy. It is a one-plant economy.

That is, while there is the native agriculture which provides the sustenance for the majority of the people, the industrial economy of the island consists of one solitary plant in Pago Pago, a tunafish cannery of the Van Camp company, whose main plants are in California.

We have here in some respects a laboratory specimen, isolated for easy inquiry, of some typical problems, including the rationalizations used for the exploitation of native labor.

There had been some previous attempt to establish a fishing and cannery industry in Pago Pago, but it did not pan out. The land and buildings, owned by the government, were leased to Van Camp. The following information was contributed by the Van Camp man, William Moore, who testified at the congressional hearings:

Van Camp began by using the cannery equipment, land and buildings owned by the government, though it also had to add to the equipment. For a 5-year lease, it paid a rent in the neighborhood of only \$2500 a year.

The company pays no taxes on the plant. The 300 cannery workers (Samoans) are mostly women. Moore endorsed their energy and aptitude, so he was not complaining about the quality of labor, though of course skill had to be built up.

These workers are not covered by social security, nor by unemployment compensation, nor by several other U. S. labor laws, like the anti-kickback act or the Walsh-Healey Act.

Their wage rates start from 27 cents an hour, the average about 40 cents. And because of layoffs and seasonal work, a worker's total income for the year is about \$450.

This coolie wage scale is in a high-price economy, comparable to the U. S.'s price scale.

In spite of these sweatshop conditions, Moore complained that the company had lost money in its first year of operation—\$200,000, a drop in the bucket. But under questioning, he admitted that "some part" of the loss (how much he didn't know or wouldn't say) was simply due to the capital investment that had to be put in, especially an expensive refrigerator plant. At the end of the second year, the loss was down to \$30,000 and even Moore was hopeful of getting into profitable black. The further mounting of the profit-take would depend, however, on the continuation of the coolie system.

But, like the congressional committee, Moore frankly and fully realized that there was a slight difficulty: *all this was completely illegal!* That in itself would not bother them; but as we explained, what if some trouble-maker should sue?

James Roosevelt (D-Cal.), a member of the subcommittee, for whom Van Camp is a respected constituent, was worried about this situation: "it is something that might become very, very serious to them because there is back pay for 300 people piling up there," he remarked at one point.

And later: it's a risk, he said, because "if an American national could sue, there is always a possibility that some bright lawyer would go down there and sign up enough of these people and file a suit..." An appalling thought, especially since not a single gentleman in the hearing-room had any doubt that the law was being violated.

### SANCTUARY FOR RUNAWAYS

The record shows that not for a split-second did any of them raise any question of getting the workers their due. They were trying to figure out how to quash any liability action. Not for a second did any government representative or congressman ever suggest that the law should be enforced!

The Roosevelt scion had other constituents in California too, and he had to cover himself. At one time he raised the question in effect: Aren't these Samoan cannery workers taking the bread out of the mouth of our California workers? How much of Van Camp's work is shifting to Samoa? "I would want to be awfully sure I was not building up here [Samoa] a low-wage scale competitive operation which in time would ruin the position of the American worker on the West Coast..." But vaguely assured by Moore that it was only a small percentage of Van Camp's operation, he dropped the subject.

Later, however, the committee got a protest from the Seafarers International Union in San Francisco. The union pointed out that Van Camp workers in California get a minimum hourly wage of \$1.65 (women) and \$1.85 (men); the Samoan plant is unfair competition because of the low-wage conditions; other canners

# A South Pacific Tale: What U.S. Colonialism Does to a Possession . . .

would be moved to take advantage of coolie labor in the South Sea island territories; and "the U. S. Congress cannot treat these people as fourth-class citizens."

It is not only a matter of competition for stateside plants. It is also a question of establishing privileged sanctuaries for runaway sweatshops, worse perhaps than the role being played nowadays by the South or by Puerto Rico.

For example, the government has had another proposal for the establishment of a plant in Samoa: from the Exquisite Brassiere Company, which is now operating in Puerto Rico as well as in the states. If the Van Camp experiment is financially successful, then the white man's civilization may register the cultural triumph of putting Samoan women and brassieres into the same picture.

But, complained the Interior Department, the brassiere sweatshop won't come in as long as the minimum-wage provision hangs over its head. A procession of government representatives (Interior, Labor, State, Defense) came before the committee to warn that paying the U. S. wage "would upset the economic balance" in Samoa.

## HOW NOT TO DISRUPT

Well, why do they claim that paying U. S. wages would be so fatal to the Samoan economy? What would be so terrible about giving the people more money? Throughout the hearings, the government spokesmen reply "It is obvious . . ." or "It goes without saying . . ." or "There is no doubt, of course . . ." that paying decent wages would do appalling things to the people, but not one finds it possible to explain.

For example, Interior Department rep Arnold told the committee: "It will readily be seen, we are sure, that any application of stateside wage scales to industrial activity in American Samoa would completely disrupt the local economy, impose price inflation upon the people and create serious personnel and financial problems for the territorial government, to say nothing of the impact which such a situation would exert on the prevailing economic conditions of neighboring islands and territories."

But this "local economy" which would be "disrupted"—remember—consists of one plant. There is no economic mystery about the meaning of the doubletalk.

Governor Lowe, before the committee, also said that "It is evident" that "the American standard of wages" would disrupt the "entire local economy." It is one case where a governor not only can be personally acquainted with "the entire local economy" but even invited him over for dinner.

The governor also explained: "The main commodity which is readily available is that of labor in an area which is surrounded by the territories of other nations, all of whom have pay standards well below the minimums in the U. S. . . . Some day the Territory may be ready for the minimum wages applicable within the U. S. but when that day will be is anybody's guess. Certainly it is not today."

Is the idea, then, that Samoa must wait till the surrounding territories get a comparable wage? Will New Zealand (which runs Western Samoa) have trouble keeping the people in line with a pittance if American Samoans get a decent wage? This is, indeed, part of the government position.

In other words, the terrible things that would happen if the minimum-wage law were enforced would be terrible for sweatshop employers not only in the territory but also in the region; but not for the people who are supposed to be Washington's wards. It is no wonder that the Samoans themselves are not impressed by the arguments about the "disruption" of their economy.

The U. S. has run into this same problem in many other places—for example, Morocco, where the French rulers used to get apoplexy at the idea of permitting high U. S. wages to "spoil" the natives. As long as Morocco was under the French, the U. S. went along with the local imperialist exploiters, as elsewhere.

## WHAT THEY'RE AFRAID OF

Congressman Aspinall lifted a veil on another point: "For decades the Navy controlled the islands. . . . They paid higher wages. And during that time, of course, the economy of the islands was kind of puffed up. Then they went out, and civilian control came in, and we have had trouble ever since then as far as maintaining the right kind of a level in their economy is concerned."

This congressman also made a strange point: "if a small segment of the population [the cannery workers] were the only part that were able to get these desired luxuries . . . the rest of them would be, of course, discontented all the time." Mr. Aspinall seems to be for an equalitarian society in Samoa, so long as it is an equality of poverty.

But the bluntest statement came from Professor Felix Keesing, a thorough imperialist who has also acted as a publicist for the navy. His letter to the committee was put into the record. It is clear what he is afraid of:

"[The minimum wage] would have unfortunate repercussions upon these other territories [of other powers in the South Pacific] and so upon our national friends and allies. It would tend to breed discontent among the peoples in these neighboring islands and complicate problems of trusteeship and welfare. . . .

"The wage-scale issue is part of a larger political problem, that of relations between Samoan leaders and the U. S. executive and Congress. . . . Persons familiar with the South Pacific know that Samoa has a long history of disturbance which can still rise to the surface

when the Samoan stake appears to the people to be threatened. Introduction of the mainland wage scale, putting much larger amounts of money especially into the hands of younger individuals, could be a sudden undermining force to the Samoan economic and social system, and so endanger what otherwise would be an orderly longer-term adjustment to the Western way of life. This would likewise have political repercussions. Political disturbances in such an overseas territory reflect on the good name of the U. S. and open the way to deleterious international criticisms of American administrative policies."

So it is fairly clear that the terrible "danger" to be avoided is not any danger to the Samoan people; rather, it seems to be a danger from the Samoan people.

4

## The White Man's Burden

All of this is based on an assumption: that the speedy industrialization of Samoa is not only a good thing in and of itself but indeed practically vital for the interests of the people, their only practical economic path of progress right here and now.

Is that so? We may tend to take it for granted because we know it is so in many other underdeveloped areas. But the question has to be raised not only on an economic level but also on a cultural one: the impact of one culture on another and its responsibilities.

The only one who showed any consciousness that such a problem exists was the representative of the AFL-CIO, Mason. "I am not too sure," he said, "with the established customs that they have, that they want an industry of this kind. . . ." He made a counter-suggestion: the Samoans already have a native handicraft industry, poorly developed because it is hard to organize export of the products, since few ships stop at the island; why not start with what they have, and help? . . .

The AFL-CIO man, by the way, was not only the only one at the hearings to suggest the cultural problem but also the only one who defended the interests of the Samoans themselves. I find this an illuminating case: this Mason was no anti-imperialist radical but a conservative trade-unionist; yet the material interest of labor in the situation drove him to approach the issue from the broadest social viewpoint, and progressively. Only labor did this, no one else; because of its basic social situation, and despite the immaturity of its political ideas.

Correction: There was one other, apparently brought down by Mason—a Samoan spokesman, Vaiinupo J. Ala'ilima, a young man residing in this country. For the first time the committee heard the viewpoint of the Samoans themselves.

Ala'ilima presented a sort of credential, a letter from his kinsman, the high chief Palepoi (whose grandfather had ceded the island to the U. S. in 1900). It referred to "those wicked officials who are here" and who should leave Samoa, and asked Ala'ilima to "present my case and promote my interest . . . and the interest of your country. . . . Things are in tragic condition at present. . . ."

Ala'ilima, 29, explained that he had been reared in American Samoa "inside the naval station" since 6; worked there during and after the war; had been among the first graduates of the new high school. He had left in 1950, among those who had gone to the U. S. "for the purpose of learning so that we may return home and help our people." In this country he had studied law and civil engineering at a couple of Midwest colleges; at present he was working for the U. S. Engineering Corps, Design Branch, as an engineering aide.

## "A FEW PENNIES . . . AND POLLUTION"

His testimony was that of a highly intelligent, sensitive, and informed person, far superior in every respect to the Southern congressmen with whom the committee is loaded, who so obviously patronized him. He began with a tribute to the AFL-CIO's position in the hearing. "It certainly is encouraging to learn that we have a wise and true friend among your people," he said.

Then he read a paper which brilliantly summarized the case for the Samoans' right to the U. S. minimum dollar wage.

(1) "To help our economy": At present the people getting the substandard wage in Samoa "can hardly provide for food, clothing and shelter for themselves and their families." Unskilled laborers are even worse off. When he was working there, he recounted, "I was only able to buy food and have a little money to give for my religious contribution. I was not able to provide shelter and clothing for myself." Now the cost of living is much higher "and therefore conditions are much worse for the wage-earner."

He explained the family-communal basis of Samoan life: "our economy is based on sharing." If one worker makes the dollar wage, then his family back on the soil will also benefit; all of Samoan society would progress.

"This is promoting and stabilizing our economy, not wrecking it as the Department of the Interior, our governor and others lead you to believe."

(2) The minimum wage will "protect our people from being exploited for cheap labor" and will enable us to bring in industrialization slowly and gradually. It was an unhealthy situation during the war when most of our people were wage-earners. Exempting Samoa from the wage act "in order to attract industries to come down and ruin us is just like asking a respectable citizen to open

his house to attract profiteers. . . . What are we going to offer you? A few pennies and a polluted area, individualism and money madness, poor health and constant worries? . . ."

If the Fono had gone along with the government position, he said, it was because they didn't know better. It is false to claim that the people's "social structure" will be disrupted. "The only social structure and economic conditions that will be upset will be those of the governor and his administration officials, the Van Camp stateside employees and other industries. They will be required to pay more money for their domestic employees."

(3) "It is not fair for unskilled laborers of other territories and possessions to receive better wages than we do when our cost of living is comparably high or even higher."

As for the argument about the effect on neighboring territories run by other powers, he made a shrewd hit: Why doesn't the U. S. worry about that with regard to the neighboring nations with whom you do business and which are directly affected by your industries and labor conditions?

He proceeded to show that the Samoan workers of Van Camp have been setting a high standard of productivity, far beyond their low wages. Also: the stateside people brought in to supervise are less skilled, yet they get infinitely more: "I suppose they feel that the justice and greatness of this nation and democracy is best portrayed by such unjust actions," he added bitingly.

He did not omit a direct assault on Governor Lowe as a dictator with no qualifications whatsoever for the task of governing the Samoan people.

More than once he emphasized that higher wages on the island would mean that the people could afford better education, and thus improve their lot. (The education system provided by the government is pretty miserable, by the way, as shown in other sections of the government hearing. For example, after the 9th grade, only selected children can go to high school, only 70 out of about 200 applicants. Some of the school children go all day without any lunch, and none is provided. Most of the high school teachers are wives of other government employees; that saves the cost of bringing over real teachers. Scholarships are non-existent or meager.)

## BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW

Ala'ilima, it should be noted, did not come out against industrialization; not at all. He was against a quickie and indiscriminate industrialization at the expense of the people's economic conditions and cultural integrity. ("And the culture that we have, the real Samoan culture that we have, many parts of it have been ruined by the coming of the navy, the kind of government that the navy sent to us.")

What he wanted was a gradual industrialization. The committee chairman asked him challengingly: Would you prefer that Van Camp leave the island rather than stay there and pay substandard wages? He answered, "I believe so," and he tried to explain how the economy imported by the navy, in its day, had injured the society.

The people had become dependent on the foreigners. "And they didn't stress much the program whereby we can develop our land to its utmost." They didn't want to educate and lift up the people; they wanted only natives who could understand some minimum things.

The concept he was getting at was this: the white men had come in and, while destroying the old proud independent Samoan, had not replaced him with a new Samoan trained in new civilized ways, but rather with—native coolies whom they could exploit. The best of the old culture was being undermined and the best of the new culture was not being made available.

Ala'ilima's own program for Samoan development was to start with development of agriculture: "the future of the country lies in the land." Let Samoa first develop an agriculture on modern lines, that could really support the island, before it becomes all-dependent on industries that can exploit the people for low wages.

If agriculture were in a healthy state, then the people could resist exploitation when industry came in; it would have to come in on the people's terms, not taking advantage of dire need. "That is not what we need. What we need at present—the almighty dollar will ruin us if it is just for the sake of almighty dollars."

In short: develop agriculture first; then gradually bring in industries "that will meet our conditions and our resources at home."

Whether Ala'ilima's program is the best way is something we certainly can't say; we do not claim to be a Samoan expert. But this is absolutely and unqualifiedly certain from a reading of the record: Not a single one of the government representatives, not a single one of the committee's congressmen, not a single one of the stateside representatives who testified, ever entertained a second's thought on how to develop Samoa for the benefit of the Samoans.

Now that the navy no longer needs Samoa for its purposes, and since the island is in any case no rich plum for exploitation, it is today mainly a nuisance for the U. S. government. Its usefulness has been squeezed, and now let's not be bothered. Its culture has been ruined, but let Van Camp and its sweatshop wages fill the vacuum.

Civilize 'em at 27 cents an hour. Let the Exquisite Brassiere Company bear the White Man's Burden. And above all, they'd better not make any trouble. What's the matter, they think we owe them something maybe?

# Hungarian Quislings —

(Continued from page 1)

Kadar government, whose existence depended wholly on Soviet armed might. Kadar was isolated even from his normal base of support, the Hungarian Workers (Communist) Party... The harsh measures adopted by the Soviet dealt staggering blows to the party organization."

- During the week of November 25, the Budapest Workers' Council agreed to call off the general strike as a test of Kadar's sincerity. The moment the call to resume work had been issued, Kadar made a radio speech in which he denounced Nagy for having countenanced a "murderous counter-revolution," and accused the workers of making "impossible demands."

On Thursday, November 29, leaders of the Budapest Workers' Council renewed their demands for (1) the full story of Nagy's fate; (2) the right to publish their own newspaper; (3) greater powers to the Workers' Council; (4) withdrawal of Russian troops from Hungary. Their demands were refused after several days of negotiations.

On Monday, December 3, workers' demonstrations started again in Budapest. Refused the right to publish their own newspaper, and in the face of the beginnings of confiscations of the mimeograph machines by which they had tried to inform the people of what was going on, the marchers demonstratively burned government newspapers in the streets.

On Tuesday, December 4, one month from the day the Russians launched their armed counter-revolution in their second intervention, thousands of women marched silently to the tomb of Hungary's Unknown Soldier and to other monuments to lay wreaths and drape them with flags in honor of the heroes and martyrs of the Hungarian revolution. In a clash with Russian troops, one woman was killed.

## TOWARD A CLASH

By the end of the week, the uneasy truce between the Kadar government and the Workers' Councils was obviously coming to an end. Reports became widespread of the arrest of Council members all over the country, and of strikes and

demonstrations protesting such arrests, some of them ending in bloody clashes between the people and the Hungarian police, backed by Russian armed might.

At Salgotarjan, on Saturday, December 8, some ten thousand workers paraded silently in front of the local police headquarters in protest against the arrest of two members of the local Workers Council for distributing leaflets.

According to a report of a delegation of three miners from Salgotarjan to the Central Workers Council in Budapest, the crowd was unarmed. A few shots were heard fired and "within a minute or two the Hungarian police began firing. The police kept on firing even when the crowd fled," they added. "We had eighty dead. The Russian soldiers just stood by."

Other clashes were reported from all over the country, as well as fighting by partisan groups in the countryside.

In view of the Salgotarjan massacre and other lesser ones, and the spreading arrests of council members by the police, the Budapest Workers' Council met on Sunday, December 9, and voted to proclaim a two-day general strike, to start Tuesday, December 11.

At this point, the government dropped all pretense of trying to negotiate with the Councils, and struck back in an attempt to crush the revolution once and for all.

On December 9 it ordered dissolution of all regional Worker's Councils, proclaimed martial law and the establishment of military tribunals to try all attempts to resist the authorities. Summary execution was decreed for all found with arms after Tuesday night. Knowledge of the whereabouts of arms not disclosed to the authorities was made subject to heavy penalties. Military tribunals would try all cases of "murder, manslaughter, robbery, looting, illegal possession of weapons and munitions, damage to factories and other state-owned institutions."

## GOVERNMENT BY SMEAR

This was an open declaration of war. It was the last resort to mass terror by a regime with no support in the country, a regime which the Budapest Workers' Council had proclaimed in its general strike call as being incapable of leading the country out of its tragic situation.

It was made amply clear that this government, backed, supported, advised, ordered and inspired by its Russian mentors, would use not only the most brutal terror against the people, but would also employ the typically Stalinist trick of seeking to blacken the name of those it was out to destroy.

This was the meaning of its claim that Workers' Council leaders had been arrested, not for opposition to the government, but for black-marketing food and factory products, and of the inclusion of robbery and looting among the crimes to be tried and summarily executed by military tribunals. The leaders of the Hungarian revolution it proposes to kill as "robbers and looters."

This was also the meaning of its

charge that the Regional Workers' Councils were being dissolved because they had been "infiltrated by reactionary elements."

On Monday, December 10, the workers came to the factories, not so much to work as to debate and discuss their Council's call to the general strike.

Throughout the day, police backed by Russian tanks set up road-blocks throughout Budapest, and carried long lists of names which they checked against the identity-cards of passers-by. It was clear that a major round-up was at hand.

The government demanded not only that all citizens turn in their arms on pain of death before the Tuesday night deadline, but that members of the "national guard," armed by the government, do the same. It appeared that the Kadar government had lost all confidence in anyone but its gendarmes and their Russian backers.

In an effort to disrupt communications among the workers, the government stopped most telephone communication within Budapest, between Budapest and the rest of the country, and to the outside world.

## UNITED IN BATTLE

The Associated Press reports that on its first day the general strike was highly successful. Only a few streetcars and some public utilities were working.

"Western reporters saw a streetcar on one of the main thoroughfares with members of the government officers' corps 'protecting' the conductor with their tommyguns. Trailing the car was a truck packed with other officers. Despite this, the conductor walked out when the car reached the end station."

The iron works at Csepel Island near Budapest was completely closed down. At the Bejolanis electrical factory, normally manned by 6000 workers, only members of the Workers Council and some Communist Party functionaries showed up. The Ganz Railway Car plant was deserted except for a Russian armored car out in front.

Reports from other cities were incomplete, but reports from near-by towns had it that even the schools had closed as the teachers had joined the strike.

As we go to press, the Kadar government and the whole people, led by the workers and organized in their Workers' Councils, are still locked in a struggle to the death. The utter inability of this government to gain any support whatever from the population in a month during which it has been kept in power by Russian tanks was never so clear as in these fateful days.

In the face of such working-class unity, of such overwhelming popular rejection, its attempt to peddle its lies about "fascists," "counter-revolutionaries," and "reactionary elements" infiltrating or leading the struggle will be believed by absolutely no one in the world except some among those denied information in the Communist-controlled countries, or people in the rest of the world who are absolutely determined not to see and not to understand the truth.

But it is not enough to see and to understand. Every socialist, every democrat must do what he can to help, even if it be only to raise his voice as loudly and effectively as he can in support of the Hungarian Revolution.

## Socialist Vote

The final count on the November 6 presidential election also records the socialist vote, which as expected declined considerably. Socialist candidates appeared on the ballot in fewer states than before, in part because of weakness and in part because of new anti-democratic restrictions, as in New York and Michigan. This was particularly true of the Socialist Party candidates, who ran primarily as write-ins, which are more difficult to get counted.

The SP's Hoopes and Friedman are credited, in the record, with 1,991 votes; the Socialist Workers Party's candidates, 5,717; the Socialist Labor Party's, 36,362.

The total national vote was over 61 million.

## The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

## STALINIST RUSSIA

### A MARXIST ANALYSIS

By Tony Cliff

\$2.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The New York ISL and the Young Socialist League

invite you to our joint

# New Year's Eve Party

which by definition is on the non-blue Monday of December 31 and will start at 9 to go on and on into the night . . .

DANCING . . . REFRESHMENTS . . . SOCIALIZING

Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

## Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

## HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2.  6 months at \$1.
  - Payment enclosed.  Bill me.
  - New sub.  Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE