

PROLETARIAN NEWS



WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!
YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT
YOUR CHAINS! YOU HAVE A WORLD
TO GAIN! — Karl Marx

A JOURNAL FOR THE WORKING CLASS

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE PROLETARIAN PARTY OF AMERICA

Vol. XXV, No. 12, Whole No. 285

Chicago, Ill., December 1956

618

Price 10c a Copy

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 action. She has been 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 strafing and massacring the Egyptian people. But even in the ranks of the communist movement, in some countries, the U.S. communists, for instance, there was much uneasiness and resentment. They, too, chimed in labelling 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 unMarxian. It would appear also as in contradiction to the principle of "peoples rule" and self determination.

But when we look into the chronology of events, the behavior of the Soviet Union in relation, first to Poland, then to Hungary, and see it bending 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 Khrushchev line, his public and flamboyant "de-Stalinization," reapproachment with Tito and "Titoism," inauguration of a liberalization policy which presumably meant more freedom of criticism

and a general relaxation from the old strict Stalin methods, more concessions to the workers, peasants, etc.

This liberalization or relaxation policy may have had some merit, provided it was kept within limited 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 replaced one after another, and others, of the Titoist label, were advanced, Gomulka of Poland,

(Continued on Page 2)

"Voice of America"

A question was put to President Eisenhower at a Washington news conference (according to the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 15) which was prompted by protests that the United States "encouraged the satellites," like Hungary, to rebel against Soviet Russia but "failed to help them when they staged an actual revolt."

Eisenhower was asked "specifically about an Oct. 20 speech in which Vice President Nixon said the Hungarian revolt justified the administration's 'liberation' policy toward the satellites."

In answering the question, the

President was reported to have said that this country feels "the hope of freedom" must be kept alive "in satellite peoples," but, however, the United States "does not now and never has" advocated armed rebellion by the satellites against "force over which they cannot prevail." He also pointed out that the U. S. had no intention of sending troops to support the rebellion, as some of the Hungarian rebels had urged.

One is inclined to reflect, on the basis of his statements, whether Eisenhower would have been in favor of U. S. intervention with an American armed force hurled against the Soviet troops in Hungary if he thought such a venture would result in an American victory. However, officially, he was careful not to commit the government to such a drastic step but confined his attack against the Soviet Union to oral denunciation.

There is no doubt that many of the Hungarian "rebels" had expected the United States to intervene in their behalf. They were led to expect such help by the intense American propaganda against communism that they had been deluged with during all these post-war years of capitalism's "cold war" against the Soviet Union and its allies.

The "Voice of America" (capitalism's voice) thru "Radio Free Europe" extended to them (to quote its own words), "the hope of their eventual liberation from Soviet domination." In short, eventual restoration of capitalism was promised them. Ballons were also sent up in the air "over the iron curtain" showering the "peoples of the satellites" with propaganda leaflets. And how many agents of capitalism had been able to slip thru the "iron curtain" only the American "central intelligence agency" could reveal that "secret." This much everyone knows: that many American dollars have been and are being spent in its "crusade" against communism.

All this capitalist propaganda must certainly have had a powerful effect, and in the case of Hungary especially on the declassed elements, former property owners

(Continued on Page 2)

HOME SCENE

Small Business

The existing lot of the nation's small business element is hardly an enviable one, let alone mentioning that its future is dark. This may not coincide with the generally 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 how far he wants to go, etc. Reality reduces all this loose talk and hope into nothingness, frustration and failure. Facts and figures point in the direction 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 ingredient for economic success. Something more material and tangible is required, especially in this day and age.

We are living in a stage of capitalism that is very highly developed, with immense concentrations of wealth and power, its forces of production, technique and organization far overshadowing the capacity of the individual to cope with. The free competitive economy of the 19th century with its small-scale production has decades back been superseded by giant monopoly capital and mass production. 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 capital.

It follows that in the basic industries 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. The last ditch of small business, the field of merchandising, has in the last few years been seriously hit. Witness the tremendous inroads recently made by the supermarkets, literally exploding what remains of the small grocery market. This accounts for the growing number of business failures and consequent transformation of small proprietors into employees for the larger corporations.

According to economists there are 4,250,000 business concerns in the nation. Of these, 98 per cent constitute small business. They define small business as those who employ 500 or less. This when compared with the larger enterprises which employ tens and hundreds of thousands indicates at once a wide disparity. There are other important disparities, dominantly 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)

"Voice of America"

(Continued from Page 1)
 (bourgeoisie), as well as on some of the ignorant and religious peasants and workers. This capitalist "brain-washing" had the effect of "fanning the flames of discontent," causing in the discontented individuals a mood receptive for and responsive to rebellion. Furthermore, they were encouraged by the thought of the U. S. immediately coming to their aid on the day they struck.

But now, many of these Hungarian "rebels" are suffering from bitter disillusionment, of being "let-down" by the U. S. This was evidenced by the remarks of some of them who had managed to es-

cape from Hungary, as 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 "tragedy," (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 however much it would like to do so.

Al Wysocki.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from Page 1)
 also fall into the big lap, thus further weakening the position of small business.

To sum it up small business is suffering from SMALLNESS, lack of capital, technical facilities and credit access. Working with outmoded means of production and higher production costs it is unable to successfully compete on the market. It is forced to fall by the wayside. In other words it is a historic casualty of the laws of capitalist evolution itself in which the forces of production have assumed a mass socialized scale.

Small business, whether it be in industry or in agriculture, is fighting a losing battle. For 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.

Tho 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 holdings in general, 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, Ford 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 dead for some time now. 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 intensified. A process of displacement is going on among them as well. What the outcome of that will be, and how soon, we don't know in detail. We do know, however, that they are geared to an ever and greatly expanding economy which is not quite in sight, that is, barring another war. These same economic forces that have worked against small business and in favor of big business are simultaneously presenting problems for big business itself. What can and must follow that goes beyond the domain of the economy of business itself. The economy with private property as its basis is fast approaching a point beyond which it cannot go. The competitive system, free and monopolistic both, is being outmoded by the economic force of socialized production. From here on the question of control and ownership of this socialized production is awaiting solution. Some may bemoan the plight and fate of small business, which involves the lives of so many millions. But it is in the "cards." Economic history is sealing its fate. We might as well recognize reality. Undoubtedly it hurts for the moment, but 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 assured the people 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 failed.

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)

Soviet Action in Hungary — Right or Wrong?

(Continued from Page 1)

Nagy in Hungary. Now, the Soviet Union seemed quite willing to go along with that, seeing that it itself had inaugurated this anti-Stalin movement and criticism.

Obviously, however, a contradiction, which the Khrushchev group may or may not have anticipated, had developed which we now know has gone beyond their original calculation. It was likely presumed 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, possibly in the other East European nations too, commenced stretching this point of liberalization and national freedom a little too soon and far. The Poznan riots were the first manifestation. For the time being, at least, it seems that in Poland the situation is in hand. The people want reforms, and likely they'll get them. But in Hungary, the demonstration for reforms soon got out of hand. Whatever legitimate grievances existed, and no one denies such, including the Soviet Union, were soon grabbed onto and exploited by the class enemies of socialism and the peoples government. Dissident students, peasants, we presume some workers too and some sections of the armed Hungarian forces who joined in the rebellion commenced an armed fight for the overthrow of the existing government and socialism. They raised the banner of freedom and independence, all right, but it was a different kind of freedom, bourgeois freedom; a return to capitalist freedom is what they sought. Premier Nagy pleaded for restoration of order, by yielding one reform after another, promising withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungarian soil.

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

At this point Soviet forces stepped into Budapest and crushed the

counter-revolution. Was the Soviet Union correct in crushing counter-revolution outside its borders? Suppose they didn't, what could logically have followed?

With the forces of reaction and Catholicism triumphant in Hungary, the principal of self-determination would indeed have been honored, but at what cost? At the cost of a socialism that's already been functioning, admitted, with all its hardship and mistakes. But what of any worth and consequence has been won without hardship 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 even backfired to the Soviet Union itself. It is even possible that accepting defeat here thru non-interference might have led to the formation of an armed ring of 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 leaders have considered all such possibilities before they opened attack.

In our opinion it is an action the Soviet Union had little stomach for knowing the undermining effect it would have upon world sentiment. They had crises of this type before, its unpopular war with Finland, the pact with Hitler in 1939. Those, too, had cost them much world sympathy and support. But practical obstacles often dictate a course which is contrary to popular sentiment.

It is certain, as proved by the Soviet Union's hesitancy and 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 rebellion.

It is more to the disgrace of the Hungarian workers that they didn't see fit nor were organized sufficiently themselves 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 people" and "freedom" in general when in reality it is a class war, with the "rights of labor" pitted against the "rights of capital." And if one socialist nation can come into another socialist nation and defend it against its internal enemies, should that be regarded as an act of aggression and domination, or one of socialist fraternity?

(Continued on Page 4)

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class

Devoted to the Education of Workers and
Their Struggle for PowerPublished Monthly by the
Proletarian Party of America

Subscriptions—12 issues for \$1.00

Send All Subscriptions, Contributions, Etc., to

PROLETARIAN NEWS

333 W. North Avenue, Chicago 10, Illinois

Oil And The Brink Of War

"Thar's gold in them thar deserts"—black liquid gold—without which the industries of Western Europe would be brought to a standstill, or reduced to a crawl. This none too pleasant prospect confronts the European capitalists. To forestall such possibility — altho 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 blasting 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 up a costly and indecisive 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 Israel. Its armed forces penetrated Egypt's Sinai Peninsula. British and French aggression immediately followed. Egyptian territory was shelled and bombed and partly occupied. One of the first results has been the closing of the Suez Canal, and by the nations that proclaimed as their objective the keeping of the Canal open to world trade.

When Egypt nationalized the Canal in July, spokesmen for the western powers contended that failure to operate would ensue, but despite efforts by France and Britain to sabotage its operation, traffic flowed through the Canal as usual, until it was closed by Franco-British gunfire. The outstanding fact is that Egypt did not start the hostilities. Apparently they were taken by surprise and hence got the worst of it.

According to press reports, Egypt's airfields and much of its military supplies were destroyed or badly damaged. The loss of life must have been considerable. However, this was all in the interest of "peace and progress," we are told. As a result of this action, the Arab nations have drawn closer together. For several days the Arab League held a meeting in Beirut, the capital of Lebanon. They decided to support Egypt to the limit, and to accept aid from any nation willing to provide it.

Meantime, the United Nations condemned the invasion of Egypt and called for a cease-fire, and the sending in of an "international police force," drawn from various small nations. Its proclaimed aim is to prevent war between Egypt and Israel. The British and French have accepted that procedure, and apparently Egypt has, provided that the invading forces withdraw, leaving the "police force" on the border between Israel and Egypt.

What seemingly caused the British to resort to force was a realization that they had erred when they agreed to withdraw from Egypt in 1954. At that time they were pressured to take such a course by President Eisenhower and

Secretary of State Dulles. That, undoubtedly, is the reason why France and Britain did not first consult with the U.S. before invading Egypt. Nevertheless, in view of the results, it was a second blunder, this trying to regain possession of the Suez, and the driving of a wedge between the Arab nations and the Soviet Union. The indications are that their scheme has miscarried. Moreover, the Eden government has a fight on its hands at home as the labour movement is definitely opposed and there have been mass demonstrations in opposition.

That part of the world—the Middle East—was long regarded by the western imperialists as just a desert waste, with a great historic past but no future. Oil has changed their opinion. All unknown to the Arab peoples, or the capitalists of the west, great lakes of petroleum lay beneath its yellow sands, fully half of the world's known oil reserves. This is the economic prize to be won.

Those oil-rich nations are not in a position to make full use of the vast supply, but the highly developed nations of Western Europe are now depending upon it to keep their industries and transportation running. Millions of gallons daily flow through the pipelines to the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, and large quantities have been transported through the Suez in tankers. The immediate effect of the Franco-British action has been to practically shut off this traffic.

It has been said that "gold is where you find it." That is equally true of oil. It is often discovered in regions remote from the centers of industry. Those who are in possession can exact a heavy toll. The big users would like a reduction in that toll, or its entire removal, but the trend is not in that direction. There is a potential danger that those Middle East nations might follow the lead of Iran and nationalize their entire oil supply and appropriate a larger share of that natural wealth. This possibility has much to do with the aggression of imperialist Britain and France, as well as the maneuvers of imperialist Yankeeland.

So long as each Arab state pursued its individual course, that suited the West, but with the recent role of Egypt, under the man they call "Nasser the dictator," there has been a tendency for the Arab states to act together, and the possibility of the whole Moslem world uniting. For the imperialists, this is a frightening prospect. France is now strained to the breaking point by guerrilla warfare in Algeria and it has been forced to loosen its grip upon other African nations. Britain's "little wars," and its forced retreat from a number of its colonies and dependencies, have annoyed its rich parasites who, in the past, drew substantial incomes from such sources. The Tory party is now riding the war-horse, and its old imperialist war-cry are again being heard, but the British workers also are being heard from.

Some weeks ago, when it became obvious that the government was preparing to make war upon Egypt over the Canal situation, a few of the Labourites seemed ready to support Eden's action, but the majority of the Labour party's members, and the workers in general, opposed such a course. Officially, the Labour party has denounced the government's war actions. Large mass meetings have been held in London and elsewhere and the government's policies have been assailed. Eden's resignation from the premiership has been called for and a peaceful settlement in Egypt demanded. This certainly is a force to be reckoned with. The British workers don't want war. There is danger that it will involve too much, including the bombing of the British Isles.

It may seem strange that Britain and France should make war on Egypt over the national-

izing of the Canal, especially as the lease will run out in twelve years, unless we conclude that they had no intention of recognizing the termination of the lease. It is more likely that checkmating the awakening of the Arab states is the real issue. Oil is the economic basis of this awakening, just as it is the cause for the vigorous renewal of British imperialism. Britain is so plainly in the wrong, so selfish that the whole world can see it, and they are left almost without support. Of course, America is not turning its back upon its imperialistic associate, neither is it endorsing 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 U.S.S.R. and to China for aid. All this means a deeper cleavage between capitalist imperialism and the U.S.S.R. The neutral nations of the world—a considerable number—have moved to the side of the Soviet Union and China rather than toward Britain and the U.S.A. The profit-system nations are losing ground in proportion to the growing recognition that profit is the incentive that motivates the action of the "democratic nations" of the self-styled "free world." They are beginning to see that the "free world" is the nations that want everything "for free," and, of course, at the expense of the weaker nations and the toiling 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 vast oil supply and its lines of transportation to the west. In other words, the oily cat is out of the bag. The issue now has to be compromised by allowing the Arab states a bigger share of the profits and a greater hold on their resources. The alternative is a Middle East war, which could become a long and costly struggle.

American capitalist imperialists, who 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 investments in that 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 Soviet Union. That is why "notes" and semi-ultimatums are flying back and forth between Washington and Moscow. The giants have been forced out in front. Peace or war, is 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 sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labor. Wage-labor rests exclusively on competition between the laborers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the laborers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

—Communist Manifesto, Marx & Engels.

HOME SCENE

(Continued from Page 2)

America was involved in the shooting of World War One. We were told it was a "war for democracy" and a "war to end war." When it was over, Americans disgustingly cried "never again." Oh Yea!

On the eve of the 1940 elections, when President Franklin Roosevelt was campaigning for a third term, he said our boys would not be sent "to fight in a foreign war." We all know what happened to that seeming promise. Is Eisenhower's promise more valuable? Could he be trusted any more than his predecessors who made similar promises?

President Wilson and Roosevelt may have had the best of intentions to keep this nation out of those wars but as the saying goes, "the road to hell is paved with the best of intentions." These two presidents were regarded as the most honorable, trusted and honest leaders in American history, yet their promises were worthless. Why?

It is true that wars are man-made. They are not the result of natural forces but are the product of social forces, man-made. They do not, however, come about thru the fancy of an individual, even from an individual like Hitler. Nor do these holocausts come about as a fight between democratic, freedom-loving nations against dictatorships and tyrannical nations. In World War Two, little Finland, a democracy in the eyes of even their opponents was on the side of Hitler and Mussolini, while Soviet Russia, a dictatorship, in the eyes of even their allies, U. S., France and Great Britain, were together on one side fighting the fascist nations. Now, it has to be noted, that the former fascist nations, Germany, Italy and Japan are on the U.S. side in the cold war against the Soviet Union and its allies. In the Mid-East crises, we find the U.S. in seeming opposition to its

lifelong allies, France and England. So what then is the basis of war?

When World War One was over, President Wilson speaking in St. Louis, Missouri, Sept. 5, 1919, said: "Why my fellow citizens, is there any man here, or any woman—let me say, is there any child here—who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and industrial and commercial rivalry? . . . This war, in its inception, was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war. . . . The real reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial 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 not successful commercial rivalry."

World War Two, found Germany and its capitalist allies fighting France, England and its capitalist allies at the start and having near beaten its European competitors, flushed with victory, tore into Soviet 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 interests. Wilson in World War One and Roosevelt in World War Two, despite their election promises of keeping the boys home, were forced or had to act in accordance with the capitalist economic interests which they were sworn to uphold.

Today, the main theater of conflict is between the Soviet Union, China and its allies, as against the world capitalist powers. The growth and expansion of the Soviet Union, China and its allied working class nations has cut deep

into the economic body of capitalism. It isn't only markets the Western 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 possible, the growth and trend toward communism as a system.

But it is apparent that isn't the only fight on the scene. The struggle of natives against colonial powers, such as the Arabs against France in North Africa, the conflict between Great Britain against Egypt in Africa and against the Malaysians in Asia are all economic basically. And the present fight in

the Near East finds the big capitalist powers in discord as between America against France and England. Eisenhower's promise to stay out of war may not hold if the present war over there expands.

Wars are inherent and inevitable under capitalism. It is a warring system as everyone could see. The battle for business in the home market is fierce. In the international 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 business they will have to take hold of the nation and put a stop to this bloodletting.

L. B.

THUMBNAILS

Eastland on Free Elections

Nov. 5th issue of National Guardian reports Sen. James Eastland (D. Miss.) as proposing that the U. S. "lead and rally all genuinely freedom loving nations to press for early elections in Poland."

The Guardian went on to say the NAACP sent a wire to the white supremacy-minded Senator, 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 Mississippi."

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 to cut down, as much as possible, on losses of their original investment. After all, they built and paid for the airfields in the

first place, to say nothing of costly training of Egyptian personnel. And, who knows, they might want that personnel around for future exploitation.

Faint Hope

The U. S. draft resolution before the United Nations General Assembly (Nov. 3) to take a long range view to settlement of matters in Egypt and the Suez Canal clearly showed U. S. readiness to re-align itself with Britain and France by introducing this delaying tactic.

However, the U. S. was forced to backtrack when her resolution was roundly and soundly defeated in favor of the Canadian and Indian resolution calling for immediate 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 never turns out to be the final answer when it comes to power policies.

L. D.

Soviet Action in Hungary—Right or Wrong?

(Continued from Page 2)

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 counter-revolution, let alone creating 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 have much preferred that Hungarians did the job themselves. As it was, circumstances decreed that the Soviet Union step in to do some relief pitching to save the situation. In the name of socialist freedom 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.

R. Daniels

"The principle feature of modern capitalism is the domination of monopolist combines of the big capitalists. These monopolies are most firmly established when all the sources of raw materials are controlled by the one group. And we have seen with what zeal the international capitalist combines exert every effort to make it impossible for their rivals to compete 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 establishing a state monopoly. The more capitalism is developed, the more the need for raw materials is felt, the more bitter competition becomes, and the more feverishly the hunt for raw materials proceeds throughout the world, the more desperate becomes the struggle for the acquisition of colonies."—Imperialism by Lenin.

GET A BOOK FREE

If you send One Dollar for a year's subscription to the PROLETARIAN NEWS (333 W. North Avenue, Chicago, Ill.) you can have any one of the following books free. \$2.00 for a two years' subscription entitles you to pamphlets to the value of 50 cents. Postage paid.

| | |
|--|-----|
| THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO, by Marx and Engels..... | 25c |
| WAGE-LABOR AND CAPITAL, by Karl Marx..... | 25c |
| MONEY AND MONEY REFORMS, by Christ Jelset..... | 25c |
| CRIME, ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES, by John Keracher..... | 15c |
| HOW THE GODS WERE MADE, by John Keracher..... | 25c |
| WAGES AND THE WORKING DAY, by John Keracher..... | 15c |
| ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS, by John Keracher..... | 10c |
| PRODUCERS AND PARASITES, by John Keracher..... | 10c |
| WHY UNEMPLOYMENT, by John Keracher..... | 10c |
| FREDERICK ENGELS, by John Keracher..... | 25c |
| THE HEAD-FIXING INDUSTRY by John Keracher..... | 30c |

Send me PROLETARIAN NEWS for a period of.....

....., for which I here enclose \$.....

Also send me the book (or books) which I have marked.

Subscriber's Name

Address

City..... Zone..... State.....