Soviet Action in Hungary—Right or Wrong?

The recent Soviet suppression of the insurrection in Hungary has raised world-wide condemnation and criticism of its policy and actions. The West has variously charged with barbaric brutality and butchery, communist imperialism, with aggression and violation of the freedom and independence of the Hungarian people.

The most violent protests came, naturally, from the outright class enemies of socialism generally and the Soviet Union in particular. The capitalists, thru their press and other propaganda mediums, took full advantage of this regrettable situation to heap all its wrath upon their opponent, the Soviet Union, this even while some of them, Britain, France and Israel, were involved in stirring and mani­ festing the Egyptian people. But even in the ranks of the commu­ nist movement, in some countries, the U.S. communists, for instance, there was much uneasiness and re­ sentment. They, too, chimed in la­ belling the Soviet action as a “tragic error.” We are not so sure that it was error even if it was tragic, and no one denies the latter.

The question is an involved one in socialist theory and practice. Was the Soviet Union in its right to step in with its armed forces and suppress a rebellion within Hun­gary, another fraternal socialist nation? Is it within the province of one socialist nation to interfere, militarily, with the “sovereignty” and “independence” of another socialist nation? Offhand, it certainly would appear as a violation and an Marxism. It would appear just as in contradiction to the principle of “peoples rule” and self deter­ mination.

But when we look into the chron­ ology of events, the behavior of the Soviet Union in relation, first to Poland, then to Hungary, and see it belling over backwards, as it were, expressing willingness to yield, to withdraw its occupying forces in time — it needs closer analysis.

It all stems back to the new Kruschev line, his public and and flamboyant “de-Stalinization,” reappraisal with the Tito and “Di­ tocin,” inauguration of a liberaliza­ tion policy which presumably meant more freedom of criticism and a general relaxation from the old strict Stalin methods, more concessions to the workers, peas­ ants, etc.,

This liberalization or relaxation policy may have had some merit, provided it was kept within lim­ ited bounds, that is, provided it didn’t go beyond the bounds of and contrary to the interests of socialism itself. The old Stalinist leaders, so-called, were purged or re­ placed one after another, and others, of the Titoist label, more and more advanced, Gomulka of Poland, (Continued on Page 2)

Small Business

The existing hot of the nation’s small business elements is an enviable one, let alone mention­ ing that its future is dark. This may not coincide with the gener­ ally optimistic sentiments expressed and compliments paid to it as constituting “the bulwark of our economy” and how wonderful it is that in our “free” economy the small man has an equal chance to go places, it all being up to the individual and his ability to go, etc. Reality reduces all this loose talk and hope into nothing­ ness, frustration and failure. Facts and figures point in the direc­ tion of extreme difficulties and increasing­ casualties. They drive home the lesson that brains, will-power and hard work, however necessary, are not the most essential ingredi­ ent for economic success. Some­ thing more material and tangible is required, especially in this day and age.

We are living in a stage of capi­ talism that is very highly devel­ oped, with immense concentrations of wealth and power, its forces of production, technique and organi­ zation far overshadowing the capa­ city of the individual to cope with. The free competitive econ­ omy of the 19th century with its small-scale production has decades back been superceded by giant monopoly capital and mass produc­ tion. The dominant positions in industry, banking, transportation and commerce are now held by big monopoly capital. Due to the vast size, organization and cost of the production apparatus, in the very nature of things, individual and small proprietorship is excluded, leaving the field exclusively to the operation of large combined capi­ talism.

It follows that in the basic in­ dustries such as steel, chemicals, automobiles and others, a very few, in some cases less than a half dozen concerns control the major output in production. In the field of banking and distribution, also, is to be seen an intensified merging process going on, substantially displacing smaller competitors from the field. Now far be it to say that small business, the field of mer­ chandising, has in the last few years been seriously hit. Witness the tremendous inroads recently made by the supermarkets, liter­ ally destroying what remains of the small grocery market. This ac­ counts for the growing number of business failures and consequent transformation of small proprie­ tors into employees for the larger corporations.

According to economists there are 4,250,000 business concerns in the nation. Of these, 80 per cent constitute small business. They de­ fine small business as those who employ 500 or less. This when compared with the larger enter­ prises which employ tens and hun­ dreds of thousands indicates at once a wide disparity. There are many important disparities, domi­ nantly the access to capital, credit, research and technical facilities. All these plus the organization at their command give big business almost exclusive control over the major bulk of business. Inevitably because of their huge setups and facilities, as well as their political influence, most government orders (Continued on Page 2)
(Continued from Page 1) Budapest and crushed the situation, or one of the many these Hungarian "rebels" are suffering from bitter disillusionment, of being "let-down" by the U.S. S. This was evinced by the remarks of some of them who had managed to escape from Hungary, for example, that of a Hungarian, revolt leader (quoted in the Chicago Sun Times of Nov. 14) who deplored failure of the West to aid the rebels as follows: "The Western broadcasts have pushed us into this. Now they do nothing." So when we look for some one to blame for the Hungarian "tra¬gedy" of the dead and the wounded, we must remember that capitalism's "Voice of America" thru "Radio Free Europe" cannot escape its share of the blame, for even much it would like to do so.

Al Wysocki.
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(Continued from Page 1) also fall into the big hop, thus further weakening the position of small business. To sum it up small business is suffering from SMALLNESS, lack of facilities and credit access. Working with outmoded means of production and higher production costs it is unable to compete on the market. It is forced to fall by the wayside. In other words it is an historic casualty of the laws of capitalist evolution in which the forces of production have assumed a mass socialized scale. Small business, whether it be in industry or in agriculture, is fighting for its life. This is the day of bigness, mechanization, electronics and automation. They might as well recognize that economic evolution is against them, having outmoded small-scale production and localism. To the extent that they are still holding on it is not easy now and will become even more difficult as time goes on.

To quantitatively they outnumber the larger enterprises, qualitatively, as far as vitality and solvency is concerned, they are losing the battle of competition. By custom we still refer to modern capitalism as a free competitive economy, but it is more monopolistic than free. Its formal freedom has in practice become much limited. It is limited by the extent of capital homogeneity, generally, specifically by the strong encroachment of monopoly capital. It is an unfair competitive struggle between the powerful and weak. To the extent that competition is at all meaningful it is that between the giants themselves, such as General Motors and Chrysler. But the latter competition is of a higher, modified form, that of monopoly capital.

Traditional free competitive capital is virtually dead. In fact it has been given shot into the foot. Only the remains or forms are carried over. And even this higher rivalry, that is between the giants themselves, is now taking on serious proportions, having become intense. With the collapse of display last month, going on among them as well. What the outcome of that will be, and how soon we don't know in the case of even smaller companies, they are geared to an ever and greatly expanding economy which is not quite in sight, that is, bar¬ring actual collapse of some. These economic forces that have worked against small business and in favor of big business are simultane¬ously presenting problems for big business itself. What can and must follow that goes beyond the domain of the economy of business into the economy with property as its basis is fast approach¬ing a point beyond which it cannot go. The competitive system, free and monopolistic both, is being outmoded by the economic forces of socialized production. From here on the question of control and ownership of this socialized pro¬duction is the only way of ensuing solution. Some may bemoan the plight and fate of small business, which involves the lives of so many millions. But it is true that there is much sealing its fate. We might as well recognize as manifest. Undoubtedly it hurts the market, for in the long run it may be for the general social betterment. In any event the process seems inevitable. • • •

Politics and War

The number one question in the minds of the voters when they went to the polls last month was: Can the U.S. avoid the war that broke out in the Middle East on the eve of the elections? President Eisenhower however assured the history of this nation that the U.S. would not get involved in the shooting. The electorate responded by overwhelmingly voting Ike to a second term in the presidency. We recall two other presidents who made similar promises before election and hoping.

President Woodrow Wilson ran for a second term, like Eisenhower now, on the slogan, "He Kept Us Out of War." That was in the fall of 1916 and in the spring of 1917 (Continued on Page 4)
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Nagy in Hungary. Now, the Soviet Union seemed quite willing to accept with that, seemingly it had itself inaugurated this anti-Stalin movement and criticism. Obviously, however, a contradic¬tion, which the Khrushchev group, may not have anticipated, had developed which now know has gone beyond their original calculation. It was likely pre¬sumed that in the present stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the world relations between the two camps of capitalism and socialism, it was possible to relax such dictatorship, simultaneously toning down the cold war and the possibilities of war, to gain more neutral nations away from the imperialist camp; in other words to develop a weak spot as between the capitalists.

But the people in Poland and Hungary were possibly also thinking of other East European nations too, com¬menced stretching this point of liberalization and national freedom a step further and aid. These other riots were the first manifestation. For the time being, at least, it seems that in Poland the situation is in hand. The people want re¬forms very much and they're sure the USS. But in Hungary, the demonstration for reforms soon got out of hand. Whatever legitimate grievances were involved in the demonstration, including the Soviet Union, were soon grabbed onto and exploited by the class enemies of socialism and the peoples government. Dissi¬dent students, peasants, we pre¬sume some workers too and some sections of the armed Hungarian forces who joined the riots. The demonstration that followed was likely an armed fight for the overthrow of the existing govern¬ment and socialism. They realized the injustice of freedom and indepen¬dence, all right, but it was a different kind of freedom, bour¬geois freedom; a return to capi¬talist freedom is what they sought. Premier Nagy pleaded for restora¬tion of order, by yielding one re¬form after another, promising withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary.

The Soviet forces were there, watchful waiting, making no move, hoping all the time that the Nagy government could enforce order again. The Soviet Union was ready to let Hungary, as Poland, travel an independent but a social¬ist path. But when Premier Nagy, over ran out of promises, called for Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact, and appealed to the UN for assistance to help Hun¬gary become a "neutral" power, the jig was up. Then it became clear that Nagy was ready to brea¬ch the socialist revolution and capitalism. He was ready to yield to counter-revolution and capitalism.

At this point Soviet forces step¬ped into Budapest and crushed the counter-revolution. Was the Soviet Union correct in crushing counter-revolution outside its borders? This was a question that could logically have followed?

With the forces of reaction and Catholicism triumphant in Hun¬gary, the Soviet Union's act would indeed have been honored, but at what cost? At the cost of a socialism that's already been functioning, admitted, with some weaknesses. Was it even possible to say of what any worth and conse¬quence has been won without hard¬ship and mistakes? The point is they were building socialism, a future workers society free from exploitation.

But even more danger was in sight than the loss of Hungary to socialism. Other nations were almost certain to develop civil war, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, East Germany. All this could possibly have had nothing to do with the Soviet Union itself. It is even possible that accepting defeat here thus non-interference might have led to the downfall of all the so-called hostile nations with Germany at the head in a war against the Soviet Union. This may have been speculative calculation, still, it is not illogical that the Soviet lead¬ers have considered all such possi¬bilities before they opened at¬tacks.

In our opinion it is an action the Soviet Union had little stomach for knowing the undermining ef¬fect it would have upon world sent¬iment. They had crises of this type before, its unpopular war with Finland, the pact with Hitler in 1939. Those, too, had cost them much in relations of the world, but at the same time little good in terms of real power. But practical obstacles often dictate a course which is contrary to popular sentiment.

It is certain, as proved by the Soviet Union's foreign policy, that it is a watchful waiting policy earlier in the rebellion, that it counted on and hoped the Hungarian government would itself be able and strong enough to put down the re¬bellion.

It is more to the disgrace of the Hungarian workers that they didn't see it nor were organized sufficiently to fight for the defense of socialism. It was their failure and weakness, their readiness to yield to the forces of reaction and capitalism that forced the Soviet Union to step in and do the "dirty" work for them.

Finally only fools could defend the principle of the "rights of peo¬ple" and "freedom" in general when in reality it is a class war, with the "rights of labor" pitted against the "black market." And if one socialist nation can come into another socialist nation and defend it against its internal ene¬mies, shouldn't every socialist be in an act of aggression and domina¬tion, or one of socialist fraternity?

(Continued on Page 4)
Oil and The Brink of War

"That's gold in them there deserts"—black liquid gold—without which the industries of the world toil, has been turned to a crawl. This none too pleasant prospect confronts the European capitalists. To forestall such possibility—albeit there was no immediate threat—the British and French have made an onslaught upon Egypt. They call it a "police action." This is a new imperialist excuse for bombarding and blotting a nation without a formal declaration of war.

America made this term famous during the Truman administration when it intervened in Korea's civil war in 1950, and, in so doing, opened a new chapter of war. Since then, its Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, has made its "brink of war" strategy famous. However, it is Britain and France, with their "police action," that have now brought the world to "the brink of war." They have created a situation that could explode into World War III. And this despite the fact that they, as well as other nations, dread such an outcome.

The initial action was not taken by Egypt, but by Britain, which forces profession failed to operate would ensue, but despite efforts by France and Britain to sabotage its operation, traffic flowed through the Canal as usual, with the exception of the period following the Middle East nations' actions. There was a necessary turn of events in the Middle East. The British and French have been unattractive to the Arab nations. The British and French invasion to checkmate the awakening of the Arab states, to the extent that they had no possibility of recognizing the independent nation of the out in twelve years, unless we conclude that the lease will checkmate the awakening of the Arab states the real issue. Oil is the economic basis of that awakening, just as it is for the very existence of imperialism. Britain is, in itself, is plainly in the wrong. It is worrying that the whole world can see it, and they are left almost without support. Of course, America is BGing its back upon its imperialistic associate, whether is it ends in making its clumsiness.

Britain's "brink of war" strategy does not suit America at this time. American diplomats can see that Britain's actions have driven the Arab states to look to the Soviet Union and China rather than to Britain and the U.S.A. The profit-system nations are losing ground in proportion to the growing recognition that profit is the incentive for the actions of the "democratic nations" of the self-styled "free world." They are beginning to see that the "free world" is the nations that support "free," and, of course, at the expense of others. Consequently, the tolling masses of the world in general.

The action in relation to Egypt, ostensibly to resist "Nasser's high-handed methods" has been unable to conceal the real issue, namely, control of the Suez Canal and its line of transportation to the west. In other words, the oil cut is out of the bag. The issue now has to be compromised by allowing the Arab states a better share of the profits and a greater hold on their resources. The alternative is a Middle East war, which could become and long and costly struggle.

American capitalist imperialism, which would like very much to control the whole world supply of oil—while not depending upon Middle East oil, having ample supply at home—still are deeply involved. They have heavy interests in the past part of the world and they are actively "fishing in troubled waters." John Bull's plight they will exploit to advantage, but they don't want Britain's hold in the Middle East to be replaced by that of the United States. Why is that why "notes" and semi-autonomous flying back and forth between Washington and Moscow. The giants have been forced out from the Middle East in the world and more or less in the hands of the great nuclear-power nations, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

British and French imperialism will, likely take a further loss, but should they decide to fight it out to a finish over the Middle East, and its oil, then World War III, with its disastrous and unpredictable outcome, will be practically inevitable.

John Keracher

"The essential condition for the existence, and for the success of any large-scale form of reform, and the augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labor. Wage-labor rests exclusively on competition between classes in that part of the world, and they are actually "fishing in troubled waters." John Bull's plight they will exploit to advantage, but they don't want Britain's hold in the Middle East to be replaced by that of the United States. Why is that why "notes" and semi-autonomous flying back and forth between Washington and Moscow. The giants have been forced out from the Middle East in the world and more or less in the hands of the great nuclear-power nations, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R."
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America was involved in the shoot-

ting of World War One. We went

to war as a "war for democracy"

and a "war to end war." When it

was over, Americans indignantly
cried "never again." Oh Yea!

On the eve of the 1940 elections,

which President Wilson Roose-

velt was campaigning for a third
term, he said our boys would not

be sent to "fight in a foreign war."

We all know there was no child

here who did not know that the seed

of war in the modern world is in-

dustry and industrial and com-

mercial "privilege." This war, in

its inception, was a commercial

and industrial war. It was not a

political war. The real reason

why we have just finished up was

that Germany was afraid her com-

mercial rivals were going to get the

better of her, and the reason why

some nations went into the war

against Germany was that they

thought Germany would get the

commercial advantage of

them. The seed of jealousy, the

seed of the deep-seated hatred, was

hot successful commercial rival-

ity.

World War Two, found Ger-

many and its capitalist allies

fighting France, England and its ca-

pitallist allies at the start and hav-

ing near beaten its European com-

petitors, flushed with victory, tore

into Russia, where it met its

"Waterloo." The U.S. in both of

these wars, with its fortunes tied

up with England and its allies, was

compelled to get into the fight to

save the "bacon," its economic in-

terests.

Wilson in World War One was

forced to move in World War Two,

despite their election promises of

keeping the boys home, were

forced or had to act in accordance

with basic capitalist economic inter-

ests which they were sworn to up-

hold.

Today, the main theater of con-

flict is between the Soviet Union,

China and its allies, as against

the major capitalist powers. The

growth and expansion of the So-

viet Union, China and its allied

working class nations has cut deep

into the economic body of capita-

lism. It isn't only markets the West-

ern nations or capitalist powers

are losing, but its very existence is

threatened with the expansion of

more communist nations. Hence

their unyielding and aggressive

policies to contain and shrink if

the growth and trend toward

communism as a system.

But it is apparent that isn't the

only fight on the scene. The strug-

gle of natives against colonial

power, as in the Arabs against

France in North Africa, the con-

flict between Great Britain against

Egypt in Africa and against the

Malayans in Asia are all economic

basically. And the present fight in

the Near East finds the big capita-

list powers in discord as between

America against France and Eng-

land. Eisenhower's promise to stay

out of war may not hold if the pre-

sent war over there expands.

Wars are inherent and inevitable

under capitalism. It is a warring

system as everyone could see. The

battle for small bits of Western

market is fierce. In the interna-

tional field it is war. Politicians

may promise the end of war but if

the workers are really interested in

putting a finish to the war busi-

ness they will have to take hold of

the nation and put a stop to this

bloodletting.

L. B.

THUMBNAILS

Eastland on Free Elections

Nov. 9th issue of National

Guardian reports Sen. James

Eastland (D. Miss.) as pro-

posing that the U. S. "lead and ral-

ly all genuinely freedom loving na-

tions to press for early elections

in Poland."

The Guardian went on to say

the NAACP sent a wire to the

Senator with a statement which

said in part: "We have noted

your statement in the press and

are happy to join you in urging

"free elections in Poland," and in

turn we call upon you to join us

in urging free elections in Mis-

sissippi."

Tough But Oh, So Gentle

British bombers reported using

delayed action fuses in bombs

dropped on Egyptian airfields for

the purpose of giving Egyptian

personnel time to get safely away

before the bombs went off.

Now you may think this was a

humane gesture on the part of the

freedom loving British imperialists

but we suspect the real reason

was put down, as much as possi-

ble, on losses of their original

investment. After all, they built

and paid for the airfields in the

first place, to say nothing of cost-

ly training of Egyptian personnel.

And, who knows, they might

want that personnel around for

future exploitation.

Faint Hope

The U. S. draft resolution be-

fore the United Nations Security

Assembly (Nov. 3) to take a long

range view to settlement of mat-

ters in Egypt and the Suez Canal

clearly showed U. S. readiness to

re-assert its right to British dom-

ion over Egypt by introducing this
delaying tactic.

However, the U. S. was forced to

backtrack when it was made

roundly and soundly defeated in

favor of the Canadian and Indian

resolution calling for im-

mediate action.

Looks like all that talk about

less powerful countries breaking

away from spheres of influence

has infected a few of Uncle Sam's

buddies. But, as usual, hope

vanishes after the initial impact

as power and pressure are brought

to bear. The first move almost

sure to be the final answer when it

comes to power policies.

L. D.
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That's what friends are for is to

help one another out in time of

need. The Soviet Union would

have been derelict in its socialist
duty to let a neighboring socialist

state fall into the hands of com-

munist revolution, let alone creat-

ing a menacing situation for the

Soviet Union itself. The building

and defense of socialism is the first

principle of socialism. It is our

opinion that the Soviet Union

would much preferred that Hitlerians
did the job themselves. As it was,

circumstances decreed that the

Soviet Union step in to do some

relief pitching to save the situa-

tion. In the name of socialism for-

dom a crushing blow had to be

delivered to the proponents of

bourgeois freedom. If the Soviet

Union had to do it, circumstances
decreed it so.

"The principle feature of mo-

dern capitalism is the domination

of monopolist combines of the big

capitalists. These monopolists,

most firmly established when all

the sources of raw materials are

controlled by the one group. And

we have seen with pertinacity that

international capitalist combines

evert effort every move to make it

impossible for their rivals to com-

pete with them; for example, by

buying up mineral lands, oil fields,

etc. Colonial possession alone gives

complete guarantee of success to

the monopolies against all the risks

of the struggle with competitors,

including the risk that the latter

will defend themselves by means

of a law ending the state mono-

poly. The more capitalist develop-

ed, the more the need for raw

materials is felt, the more bitter

competition becomes, and the more

favorable conditions for the raw

materials proceeds throughout the

world, the more desperate becomes

the struggle for the acquisition of

colonies." - Lenin in,