

political affairs

NOVEMBER 1952 • 25 CENTS



M. G. PERVUKHIN

[1] The 35th Anniversary of the Great
October Socialist Revolution

JOHN SWIFT

[18] The Ford Local Union Election

JOSEPH M. HOLDEN

[36] On the 1952 Steel Strike

LEO FIGUERES

[46] A Form of Socialist Democracy:
People's Democratic Power

PETER COLTON

[58] A "New" Theory of Capitalism
(Book Review)

[63] Letters from Readers

New and Recent Titles

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R., <i>by Joseph Stalin</i>	\$.25
ON THE THRESHOLD OF COMMUNISM <i>by G. M. Malenkov</i>	.35
HOW TO BE A GOOD COMMUNIST <i>by Liu Shao-chi</i>	.35
BROADEN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY, <i>by Joseph Rockman</i>	.15
SOVIET LEADERS SPEAK FOR COMMUNISM AND A LASTING PEACE <i>by V. M. Molotov, L. P. Beria, N. A. Bulganin, L. M. Kaganovich, K. Y. Voroshilov</i>	.25
THE TRUCKS ACT: MICHIGAN'S BLUEPRINT FOR A FASCIST STATE, <i>by William Albertson</i>	.10
THE NATION'S BIGGEST RACKET <i>by Adam Lapin</i>	.05
NAZI ARMY OR PEACEFUL GERMANY? <i>by Alan Max</i>	.05
ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN SPEAKS TO THE COURT	.10
PETTIS PERRY SPEAKS TO THE COURT	.10
ON INNER-PARTY STRUGGLE <i>by Liu Shao-chi</i>	.25

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

VOL.

By M

Mem

Com

Th

the t

leade

great

Great

trium

world

radica

of mo

of th

ende

tions

set in

Th

celebr

Sovie

and l

toric

of th

Unio

Th

* Sp

of Mo

Living

14, 19

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

The 35th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*

By M. G. Pervukhin

Member, Presidium, Central Committee, C.P.S.U.

Comrades,

Thirty-five years have passed since the time when, under the brilliant leadership of Lenin and Stalin—the great leaders of the proletariat—the Great October Socialist Revolution triumphed in our country. This world-historic event resulted in a radical change in the development of modern society as a whole. The era of the undivided sway of capitalism ended, the era of proletarian revolutions and of the victories of Socialism set in.

The peoples of the Soviet Union celebrate the 35th anniversary of the Soviet state amid the new political and labor upsurge evoked by the historic decisions of the XIX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The XIX Congress vividly revealed

* Speech delivered at the Celebration Meeting of Moscow Soviet, Nov. 6, 1952, from *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, Nov. 14, 1952.

to the whole world the unprecedented successes won by the Soviet people under the leadership of their Communist Party in an historically brief period of time. Having cast off the yoke of capital, the Soviet people, for the first time in the history of mankind, built a socialist society and have now entered the phase of gradual transition from Socialism to Communism. The Soviet Union has become the indestructible bulwark of peace, progress and democracy.

The XIX Party Congress will go down in the history of the struggle of the Soviet people as the most important milestone on the great highway of building Communist society in our country. The decisions of the Congress are the concrete embodiment of the triumphant theory of Marxism-Leninism enriched on the eve of the Congress with the new classical work of our leader and teacher, Comrade Stalin.

In *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, Comrade Stalin gives a profound analysis of the results of our struggle and of our victories, a profound analysis of the basic problems of the moment and outlines a clear program for the continued onward march. The latest Marxist work of our great leader and teacher is of the greatest international significance; it ideologically equips the world Communist movement and raises it to a new level. The work discloses the motive forces of the world-historic victories won by the Soviet people, reveals to the working people in all countries the way in which we transformed the economy of the country in the spirit of Socialism, how we achieved friendship between the working class and the peasantry and how we transformed our homeland into a rich and mighty country.

Comrade Stalin points out that the victory of the October Revolution and the building of socialist society in our country became possible due to the fact that there was found in our country a social force in the shape of the alliance of the working class and peasantry which smashed the resistance of the outgoing forces of capitalist society and gave free rein to the objective economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces.

Relying on this objective economic law the Soviet power socialized the means of production, made them the property of the entire people, and by so doing abolished the system of

exploitation and founded socialist forms of economy.

The policy of socialist industrialization of the country and of collectivization of agriculture resulted in the fact that our country in the course of the prewar Stalin Five-Year Plans, made a tremendous jump forward. From an agrarian country, backward both technically and economically, it has become a leading, mighty, industrial socialist Power.

The entire course of the three and a half decades has confirmed and demonstrated the invincible vitality of the Soviet social and state system. Our country not only honorably withstood the grim trials of the Great Patriotic War, but, by smashing the Hitler army, it saved the world from the danger of fascist slavery. In the brief interval since the war, the Soviet people rehabilitated the industry, transport, and agriculture which had been destroyed in the course of the war, and considerably surpassed the prewar level in all branches of the national economy.

The Soviet people welcome with great joy the program of Communist construction approved by the XIX Party Congress. They are firmly confident that this grand program will be carried out.

Our triumphant march along the road to Communism daily and on a growing scale strengthens the forces and the international prestige of the camp of democracy and Socialism, inspires the working people of the world in their revolutionary struggle against imperialism.

During these days hundreds of

million
Union
like
for m
anniv
tion i
vance
power
Social

INTE
IN

Dur
fresh
sociali

Pro
of the
ism, o
the Co
Govern
of the
the p
vance
econon
steady
the pe
Party
Plan
U.S.S.

Fulf
Plan m
of adv
in the
Plans,
in his
9, 194
pleted
for oil
ule,—a
current
Social

millions turn their eyes to the Soviet Union which towers over the world like a giant lighthouse, illuminating for mankind the pathway to a radiant future. Together with us the 35th anniversary of the October Revolution is being celebrated by the advanced people of the world, by the powerful camp of democracy and Socialism.

INTERNAL POSITION IN THE U.S.S.R.

During 1952 the Soviet people won fresh successes in all branches of socialist economy and culture.

Proceeding from the requirements of the basic economic law of Socialism, discovered by Comrade Stalin, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government direct the development of the economy of our country along the pathway of uninterrupted advance of all branches of the national economy, an advance which ensures steady growth in the well-being of the people. The directives of the XIX Party Congress for the Five-Year Plan for the development of the U.S.S.R. are a vivid example of this.

Fulfillment of the new Five-Year Plan means that the historic program of advancing our national economy in the three immediate Five-Year Plans, outlined by Comrade Stalin in his election address on February 9, 1946, will, undoubtedly, be completed on time; it will be fulfilled for oil extraction even ahead of schedule,—already in the course of the current five-year period.

Socialist emulation for speedy ful-

filment of the fifth Stalin Five-Year Plan has developed all over the country.

In the course of this emulation thousands and thousands of talented leading workers are coming to the fore, tremendous reserves ensuring a further rise in labor productivity are being disclosed and new forms of emulation found.

In the iron and steel industry fast methods of smelting are being used on an increasingly wider scale, in the coal-mining industry the cyclical method in workings and at the coal face is being introduced, combines and dirt-loading machines are widely utilized, in the oil industry—fast methods of deep drilling, in the machine-building industry — fast methods of metal cutting, in the chemical industry—continuous and highly effective processes.

Utilization of advanced technique, advanced methods of organization of labor, the increased skill of the workers and the further mechanization of arduous and labor-consuming work—all ensure a steady growth of labor productivity in all branches of the national economy: In 1952 labor productivity in industry will rise more than 17 per cent compared with 1950 and in 1955 it is scheduled to rise approximately 50 per cent.

In the Soviet Union, as Comrade Stalin points out, machines save labor for society and ease the labor of workers.

Mechanization of arduous and labor-saving work, and automatization of production processes have considerably eased the labor of work-

ers in industry, transport and agriculture. Arduous trades which only recently were widespread, such as tubdrawers and hand hewers in the coal industry, rollers in the iron and steel industry, and bucket operators in the oil industry, have now disappeared. On the other hand, new trades have appeared, such as coal combine operators, oil extracting and processing mechanics, turbo-drill operators, saw operators in the lumber industry and boiler mechanics at the power stations, among many others.

The workers who have mastered new trades are in most cases people who have had a secondary education and who are well versed in technique. They are the living embodiment of the process of the dying out of the essential distinction between mental and manual labor.

An important index characterizing the work of socialist industry is the lowering of cost of production. The economy arising from lowering cost of production in industry, taking into account the economy accruing from the price cuts, amounted last year to 35.5 billion roubles. In 1952 it will exceed 46 billion roubles.

The plan for industrial output as a whole was fulfilled in the course of 10 months of 1952 by more than 101 per cent. The average annual rate of growth of gross industrial output in 1951 and 1952 will be in excess of 14 per cent, compared with the 12 per cent envisaged in the Five-Year Plan.

Heavy industry is the base for the development of all branches of the national economy. The directives for

the Five-Year Plan fix the rate of growth of output for means of production at 13 per cent. Actually, in the first two years of the new Five-Year Plan it will amount to 15 per cent. At the moment the output of our large-scale industry every nine days is the equivalent of the annual output of Russia on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution...

The uninterrupted advance of the Soviet machine-building industry is the base for the technical progress and for the rapid rate of development in all branches of the national economy. Total output of the machine-building industry will increase in 1952 by more than 40 per cent compared with 1950. The highest rate of development is taking place in the production of electrical and metallurgical equipment and of equipment for the oil industry.

In the sphere of electrification the Five-Year Plan, as is known, envisages a rate of growth in the capacity of the power stations and in generating electrical energy that will ensure an even faster development for electrification than for that of the national economy. The importance of electrification in building Communist society was brilliantly defined by V. I. Lenin in his famous formula: "*Communism is the Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country. . .*"

The output of electrical energy for a single month by the power stations of the Soviet Union is equivalent to the five-year output of the power stations of pre-revolutionary Russia.

Output of consumer goods in 1952

also reg
The av
product
course
new Fi
of 13 pe
per cen
for the

The
develop
the out
of food
dustry
in the
of the fi
ty and
proved

In th
consum
able to
than in
per cen
cent; m
cent; b
fats—31
confect
of hou
chines
etc., wi

Noti
this ye
we mu
still es
work o
dustry

The
of indu
not ful
and th
cost of
enterpr
duction
produc

also registered a high rate of growth. The average annual increase in the production of consumer goods in the course of the first two years of the new Five-Year Plan will be in excess of 13 per cent, compared with the 11 per cent envisaged in the directives for the Five-Year Plan.

The light and food industries are developing year by year, increasing the output of consumer goods and of foodstuffs. Output of the food industry rose more than 25 per cent in the course of the first two years of the fifth Five-Year Plan; the quality and range of products were improved and expanded.

In the current year the amount of consumer goods and foodstuffs available to the population is much greater than in 1950: wearing apparel—27 per cent; leather footwear—32 per cent; meat and fish products—31 per cent; butter, vegetable oil and other fats—31 per cent; sugar—58 per cent; confectionery—29 per cent. Output of household equipment and machines such as domestic refrigerators, etc., will also rise.

Noting the big success achieved this year by our socialist industry we must not forget that there are still essential shortcomings in the work of individual branches of industry and of individual enterprises.

The work of individual branches of industry is unsatisfactory; they do not fulfill the fixed production plans and the assignments for lowering cost of production. There are still enterprises that do not ensure production of complex and high-quality produce, violating state standards

and technical requirements.

The executives of those enterprises and branches of industry not fulfilling the state plans and whose products are of inferior quality should give thought to the matter that if they do not correct the situation they will have to step aside and give way to others more energetic and more qualified for the job.

Big successes were registered in the course of the first two years of the new Five-Year Plan in the sphere of agriculture. The crop area, and especially the area sown to wheat, the most important food crop, was extended. As is known, in the current year the total grain harvest amounted to 8,000 million poods* with a total wheat harvest 48 per cent greater than in 1940. Thus, the grain problem, always considered the most acute and gravest problem, has been solved successfully in our country firmly and finally. . . .

The technical base of agriculture has been still further reinforced by a considerable number of new tractors, motor-trucks and agricultural machines. This resulted in greater mechanization of the main agricultural work. In 1952 the machine and tractor stations performed with their tractor and machine park three-quarters of the main field work on the collective farms. Planting of cotton, sugar-beet and other industrial crops, is now almost completely mechanized. Over 70 per cent of the area sown to grain crops on the collective farms was harvested by combines. Mechanized harvesting of cotton and

* One pood equals 36.1 pounds—ed. P.A.

mechanized cotton ginning are extending year by year.

Agricultural workers in the steppe and forest-steppe regions of the European part of the U.S.S.R. are successfully fulfilling the Stalin plan for planting forest shelter belts. In the past two years alone the area planted to shelter belts amounted in these regions almost to 1.5 million hectares.**

The XIX Congress of our Party placed before agriculture new and grand tasks for ensuring still higher crop yields and developing animal husbandry.

Successful fulfillment of these tasks demands, first of all, that the existing shortcomings in the work of collective farms, state farms and machine and tractor stations be eliminated. It is essential to improve the quality and reduce the time required for field work, to make better use of tractors and agricultural machines, to strengthen the organizing role of the machine and tractor stations in the collective farms in the struggle for fulfillment of plans for raising crop yields and gross output of agriculture.

Collective farmers, both men and women, and the workers of agriculture have enthusiastically embarked on fulfillment of the second postwar Stalin Five-Year Plan. Consequently, there is no doubt that the assignments of the new Five-Year Plan for agriculture will be fulfilled.

Growth of industry and agriculture is accompanied by the growth of rail and water-borne transport in our

country. Rail freight carriage will increase this year 23 per cent compared with 1950, river-borne freight carriage—21 per cent, sea-borne freight carriage—22 per cent. Considerable work is underway to extend electrification of rail transport. The sea and river mercantile fleets will be reinforced with new ships.

1952 saw the commissioning of the V. I. Lenin Volga-Don Navigation Canal—a great construction of the Stalin epoch.

The main aim of socialist production is maximum satisfaction of the growing material and cultural requirements of the whole of society. The well-being and the cultural level of the Soviet people are rising steadily. The quantity of consumer goods supplied to the trade network is increasing. The total volume of retail state and cooperative trade increased in 1952 by 27 per cent compared with 1950.

The fifth postwar reduction of state prices for food and consumer goods was effected in April this year. This ensured a further rise in real wages and salaries for factory and office workers and reduced expenditure by peasants on manufactured goods.

For the purpose of further improving housing for the working people of our country house building is being extended year by year. In the course of 1951 and in the ten months of 1952 new housing with a total dwelling space of 43 million square meters was completed in towns and industrial settlements—the equivalent of more than 1 million two-room apartments. Six hundred

** One hectare equals 2.47 acres—*ed. P.A.*

and twenty thousand houses were built in rural districts.

In Moscow, the capital of our homeland, the volume of house building in 1952 will be almost twice that of the prewar 1940. The first group of high buildings—splendid monumental construction—has been erected.

An objective index of the constant improvement in the material well-being of the working people of our country is the growth of the national income in the U.S.S.R. In 1952 the national income will rise 25 per cent compared with 1950. The growth in the national income made possible a considerable rise in income for the population and simultaneously increased investments for capital construction in the national economy.

The current Five-Year Plan envisages approximately a twofold increase in capital investments in industry compared with the fourth Five-Year Plan. A large number of new factories, pits, ore-workings, power stations and railways will be built and many others reconstructed. The volume of state capital construction in 1952 is 26 per cent greater than that of 1950.

The grand Stalin construction on the Volga, Dnieper, Don and Amudarya occupies a special place. In 1952 the volume of capital work on these sites will rise twofold compared with 1951. The plan for construction of these projects is being successfully fulfilled.

In recent years the transition from mechanization of separate processes

to complex mechanization is being widely effected in the building industry, and fast methods and conveyor methods of construction have been widely introduced.

Introduction of advanced technique, improved organization of labor and the higher cultural and technical level of builders have resulted in the fact that labor productivity in the building industry will rise by 20 per cent in 1952 compared with 1950.

However, there are still serious shortcomings in the work of the building organizations. Chief among these are violation of the fixed schedule for commissioning new objects and failure to fulfill assignments for lowering cost of production. These shortcomings in construction must be resolutely combatted.

Big success has been achieved by the Soviet people in recent years in the sphere of science, culture and the arts. In addition to implementation of the universal seven-year schooling, secondary education, based on ten-year schooling, is being extended. This has made possible the setting of the task in the current five-year period to ensure transition, by the end of the five-year period to universal secondary schooling (ten years) in the capitals of the republics, in cities under republican authority and in regional, territorial and large industrial centers. It is necessary to prepare the conditions for the full implementation in the next five-year period of complete, universal secondary schooling in the other towns and in the rural areas.

Simultaneously, we must prepare all the conditions for transition to universal polytechnical schooling.

The enrollment in the higher educational establishments and technicums in 1952 was much greater than in previous years. The number of students in the higher educational establishments in the U.S.S.R. is one and a half times the number of students in all the European capitalist countries taken together. The number of young specialists graduated during the first two years of the fifth Five-Year Plan is 65 per cent more than in the first two years of the fourth Five-Year Plan. Thanks to the tireless concern displayed by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government the number of schools, technicums and higher educational establishments in our country is growing year by year.

Construction of the magnificent new building of the Moscow State University, undertaken on the initiative of Comrade Stalin, will be completed in the near future.

The Party and the Government display great concern for the health of the working people of the Soviet Union. Expenditure on public health will amount to 27.7 billion roubles in 1952. Hospitals, dispensaries, rest-homes and sanatoria are growing in numbers. Output of medicines and medical equipment has been considerably increased this year. As a result of the improved public health service and due to the rise in the well-being of the people the birth rate has increased in recent years, while illness and the mor-

tality rate in our country have fallen considerably.

The Soviet people have attained a high rate of progress in science and technique. Convincing proof of this is the successful designing and construction of hydro-technical projects unprecedented in scale and complexity, erection of high buildings, designing and production of complex machines and equipment. This progress is also determined by the fact that science is daily enriched with the experience of the leading workers in industry and agriculture.

At present there is not a single machine, apparatus, equipment or technological process that cannot be made by Soviet specialists and workers. In the course of recent years the research institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. have been considerably enlarged and new laboratories with splendid equipment built. Industry has supplied the Soviet scientists with measuring apparatus of high precision, with modern laboratory equipment.

All this is directed at deepening theoretical knowledge in the various branches of science, and, in particular, in the sphere of utilizing atomic energy for the well-being of mankind.

Tremendous changes have taken place in the past 35 years in the economy and culture of all the peoples of the multi-national Soviet Union. The Great October Socialist Revolution liberated the enslaved nationalities from political, national and economic oppression. The national regions, formerly backward

econ
veloc
Com
indu
publ
Or
natio
took
natio
Th
ensur
ture
U.S.S.
high
search
theat
acad
open
merop
oped
and
gents
Th
tional
Union
year p
friend
U.S.S.
home
Wh
of pea
people
Lenin
the S
streng
the so
every
Navy
state
ist in
Forces
most
milita

economically and culturally, have developed under the leadership of the Communist Party into prosperous, industrial-collective farm socialist republics.

On the basis of the old, bourgeois nations, there arose, developed and took shape new, advanced socialist nations.

The Lenin-Stalin national policy ensured the flowering of science, culture and art among the peoples of the U.S.S.R. The network of schools, higher educational establishments, research institutes, clubs, libraries and theaters is being expanded. National academies of science have been opened in the Union Republics. Numerous national cadres have developed in industry and agriculture, and cadres of the national intelligentsia trained.

The further advance of the national economy and culture of the Union Republics in the new five-year period will strengthen still more friendship among the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the might of our Soviet homeland.

While carrying out the program of peaceful socialist construction, our people never forget the counsel of Lenin and Stalin—the founders of the Soviet state—about the need to strengthen the defense-capacity of the socialist state, to strengthen in every way the Soviet Army and Navy and to keep them always in a state of readiness for action. Socialist industry supplies the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union with the most up-to-date armaments, and military technique.

But the strength of our army is determined not only by its first-class technical equipment. It is strong by virtue of its unexampled moral-political spirit, the patriotic consciousness of its men and officers, its indivisible bonds with the people who surround it with love and care. Every soldier of the Soviet Army and Navy is proud that he is called upon to defend his socialist state, to protect the peaceful labor of the Soviet people. Such an army, as historical experience has shown, is invincible!

The U.S. warmongers and their lackeys should not forget the strength of the Soviet Army which is ready to give a crushing rebuff to any aggressor attempting to violate the frontiers of our great homeland.

Comrades, great is our success in all fields of socialist construction. But the Soviet people, reared by the Party of Lenin-Stalin, are alien to feelings of self-complacency and conceit. They regard their achievements as a stage in the struggle for new successes.

The XIX Party Congress stressed the exceptional importance of further bold development of self-criticism and criticism of shortcomings in our work.

By carrying out this demand of the historic Congress of our Party, by eliminating, with all resoluteness, the shortcomings observed in the work on various sectors of Communist construction, the Soviet people will ensure fulfillment and overfulfillment of the grand program of the fifth Five-Year Plan!

FOREIGN POLICY OF SOVIET UNION AND CONSOLIDATION OF WORLD PEACE

By their selfless and heroic endeavor the Soviet people are paving the way to a bright future for the working people of the world.

The experience of the past thirty-five years has fully confirmed the well-known theses of Lenin and Stalin about the world-historic role and significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The great leaders pointed out time and again that the international significance of the October Revolution is not only manifest in the "broad" sense of its influence on all countries, but also in the "narrower" sense, in the sense of a repetition on an international scale of its basic features and laws of development.

The great Lenin said: "Our pathway is the correct one, since it is the path to which, sooner or later, all other countries will inevitably come." These prophetic words are now becoming reality.

As a result of the heroic victory of the Soviet people in World War II countries with a population of over 600 million broke away from capitalism and together with the Soviet Union established the mighty camp of democracy and Socialism.

In the countries of people's democracy 1952 is also a year of further progress in all spheres of national economy and culture.

Compared with 1951 the volume of industrial production this year will

increase: in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria 22-25 per cent; in Albania, by more than 80 per cent. Simultaneously, the gross output of large and medium industry will exceed the prewar level several times.

Electrification in the countries of people's democracy is being carried out at a rapid rate. Compared with 1950 production of electric energy rose this year in Poland and Czechoslovakia by 24-25 per cent; in Hungary and Rumania by 38 per cent; in Bulgaria by 77 per cent; in Albania more than threefold and in the German Democratic Republic by 22 per cent. The friendship and cooperation of these countries are also manifest, by the way, in the successful transmission of electric energy from Rumania to Bulgaria, from Poland to Czechoslovakia, and also in the mutual transmission of electric power between the German Democratic Republic and Poland.

The rapid economic progress in the countries of people's democracy is to a considerable degree determined by the great and fraternal aid rendered by the Soviet Union. In the European countries of people's democracy and in the Chinese People's Republic numerous new plants and power stations have already been built and commissioned from the designs of Soviet specialists and with equipment produced in the U.S.S.R.

Utilizing the aid of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies are successfully solving the task of developing and reorganizing agriculture. The state machine and tractor

stat
in a
racy
stru
ing
peop
coop
duce
The
acco
tries
id in
bein
Bi
tere
lic i
nese
of th
to th
and
—an
In
than
same
of in
and
high
In
of th
has l
entre
begin
Chin
suffic
needs
now
prod
The
ment
demo
the p
sued
lation

stations which have been opened in all countries of people's democracy are a vital lever of this reconstruction. More and more the working peasantry in the countries of people's democracy are attracted to cooperation, to the creation of producer cooperatives.

The general economic advance is accompanied in all European countries of people's democracy by a rapid improvement in the material well-being of the working people.

Big successes have also been registered by the Chinese People's Republic in the three years since the Chinese people, under the leadership of their Communist Party, put an end to the domination of the imperialist and their hirelings—the Kuomintang—and took power into their hands.

Industrial production in 1951 more than doubled as against 1949. At the same time output in various branches of industry by the end of 1951 reached and for some items exceeded the highest prewar level.

In agriculture the fruitful results of the great agrarian reform which has been completed in most of the entire territory of China are already beginning to be seen. At present the Chinese People's Republic produces sufficient grain and cotton to meet the needs of its own population and is now able even to export agricultural produce.

The results of economic development in all the countries of people's democracy are convincing proof that the policy of economic blockade pursued by the U.S. imperialists in relation to the countries of the camp

of democracy and Socialism has suffered complete fiasco. This policy boomeranged on those pursuing it. As for the countries in the camp of democracy and Socialism, they, in reply to the blockade policy, joined forces, organized friendly economic relations and mutual aid and created their own world market counterposed to the world capitalist market.

The most important economic result of the Second World War, points out Comrade Stalin, is the disintegration of the single all-embracing world market, and consequently, the further deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system.

In the report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party to the XIX Congress, Comrade Malenkov gave a profound Marxist analysis of the entire present-day international situation, citing convincing facts and figures showing the growth of the forces of the camp of democracy and Socialism on the one hand, and, on the other, the aggravation of the general crisis of world capitalism. Two trends of development characterize at present the general picture of the world economic situation.

"The first trend is represented by the steady advance of the peace economy of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, an economy which is free from crises and aims at securing the maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of society. . . .

"The second trend is represented by the economy of capitalism, the productive forces of which are stagnant. This is an economy caught in

the vise of the steadily deepening general crisis of capitalism and of constantly recurring economic crises; this is the trend of militarization of the economy and one-sided development of branches of industry producing for war, of rivalry between countries and enslavement of some countries by others."

The antagonisms between the United States and Britain, between the United States and France and other European capitalist countries are becoming increasingly acute. A naked struggle is in progress between American and British monopolists for oil resources, rubber, non-ferrous metals, sulphur and for markets. The struggle is sharpening between Western Germany and France owing to the rivalry of the capitalists in these countries in the so-called European coal and steel association; conflict is sharpening between them over the Saar region.

Seeking a way out of the general crisis of capitalism, which, after the conclusion of the Second World War, has become more acute, the U.S. imperialists have taken the path of preparing a new world war. Their aim is: to establish their domination over the world. However, the frantic arms drive, conducted under U.S. pressure by the imperialist camp, daily intensifies the difficulties and contradictions rending this camp and leads inevitably to economic crisis.

Of late, production in the capitalist countries has been marking time in the same place. Taking the first quarter of 1951 as 100, the quarterly index

of production in the U.S.A. changed as follows: 1951: 1st quarter, 100; 2nd quarter, 103; 3rd quarter, 101; 4th quarter, 101; 1952: 1st quarter, 100; 2nd quarter, 97.

These data show that, having reached peak in the second quarter of 1951, the index of industrial production began to decline. In the 1st quarter of the current year it remained on the level of the 1st quarter of last year and later further deteriorated. This testifies to a tendency towards decline in the general level of industrial production despite the fact that the arms drive is in full swing. The reason is clear. Civilian industry is being curtailed to such a considerable degree that even the rapid increase of arms production cannot make good the reduction. Hence, the outcome of the one-sided development of the American economy is already telling in sharp fashion.

Having taken the road of the arms drive the European capitalist countries are also curtailing civilian production, thus evoking stagnation in industry.

The war economy is devouring vast resources. The U.S. budget has, in recent years, become a typically war budget. Thus, 74 per cent of the budget expenditure for 1952-53 is used for direct military expenditure, which exceeds more than threefold military expenditure prior to the war in Korea.

In 1949-50 the military expenditure of the West European countries, members of the Atlantic bloc, constituted 6.2 billion dollars. At the demand of U.S. ruling circles this

sum reaches almost 16 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1952-53.

The arms drive leads to unprecedented enrichment of the billionaires and millionaires. In the seven postwar years the profits of the U.S. monopolists have amounted to almost 220 billion dollars. Simultaneously, taxes are soaring on an unprecedented scale. As reported in the press, Truman, during his presidency, collected more taxes than the previous 31 presidents taken together.

In all countries of the aggressive camp the arms drive has intensified the already pronounced inflation. The channels of currency circulation are overflowing with bank notes. The purchasing power of money is steadily falling. Prices of consumer goods are steadily soaring. The standard of living is falling rapidly. The conditions of the toiling masses are deteriorating day by day. In the U.S., Japan, Britain, Italy, Belgium and Western Germany the numbers of fully and part-time unemployed have reached 32 million. The wave of strikes and political demonstrations is mounting.

Bourgeois economists no longer argue whether a new economic crisis will or will not take place but about just how soon it will break out. It is characteristic that all manner of institutes engaged in a study of the economic situation are frankly warning the business world of the need to "prepare" for the inevitable and imminent crisis.

Meanwhile, seeking to deflect the attention of the toiling masses from

their arduous lot, the huge propaganda machine of the U.S. billionaires is artificially whipping up war hysteria, accustoming the people to the idea of the need to use the atom bomb, daily inculcating fear not only among adults but also among children, arranging in particular sham air-raid alarms.

The results are plain. Many Americans have lost their peace of mind. They keep on looking at the sky and some think they see some strange objects resembling huge "flying plates," "flying saucers," "flying pans" and "flaming balls of green." U.S. newspapers and magazines widely publicize the narrations of all kinds of "eye-witnesses" who allege they have seen these strange objects and assert that they are either mysterious Russian shells or at any rate—flying apparatus sent out from some other planet to observe life in America! One cannot help but recall the Russian saying that "Fear distorts the imagination."

In his historic speech at the XIX Congress of the Party, Comrade Stalin said that in the capitalist countries the principle of equality of people and nations has been trampled underfoot; it has been replaced by the principle of full rights for the exploiting minority and no rights for the exploited majority of citizens. The rights of the individual now are recognized only in the case of those who have capital, while all other citizens are regarded as human raw material fit only for exploitation. U.S. ruling circles have openly taken the pathway of fascization.

They are following in Hitler's footsteps. They have implanted a system of terror in the country, seeking to suppress all progressive forces; they have virtually outlawed the Communist Party and with the aid of hired gangs break up the meetings and rallies of democratic organizations. Propaganda and preparations for a new imperialist war and for world domination have developed on an unprecedented scale.

Having taken the course of a new world war, the U.S. ruling circles are establishing in Europe, Asia and in the Near and Middle East a network of military bases and maintain their armed forces in these areas. They are persistently frustrating peaceful international cooperation. The American imperialists are banking mainly on the revival of German militarism, striving, for this reason, to perpetuate the dismemberment of Germany and are converting Western Germany into their military base. With this end in view they seek to obtain ratification of the Bonn agreement and the Paris treaty on the so-called European defense community. In Asia they are feverishly restoring Japanese militarism. For this purpose the U.S. forced on Japan a separate treaty which is a war treaty and is also calculated on converting Japan into a U.S. military base.

Two and a half years ago the U.S. imperialists unleashed sanguinary war against the heroic Korean people.

The U.S. has become the world pillar of reaction and fascism, the cen-

ter of the world conspiracy of the aggressors against peace and the security of nations.

Small wonder that the ordinary people everywhere have such hatred for the American soldiery, who, with their gendarme heel, trample on the rights and freedoms of the peoples.

But the American warmongers cannot turn back the wheels of history. The liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialism is developing apace in all countries.

Nowadays even the most brazen advocates of world domination for American capital, such as Dulles, alarmed at the growing liberation struggles of the peoples, have been forced publicly to acknowledge the growing anti-American sentiment in the European and Asian countries.

The aggressive Atlantic war bloc, knocked together by the U.S. imperialists, is being rent more and more by internal contradictions between the U.S. and Britain, and also between the U.S., France and other capitalist countries in Europe. The ruling circles in the European capitalist countries, under pressure of the popular masses and economic difficulties, have been forced more and more often to express discontent with the American policy of naked *diktat*.

The *New York Times* wrote recently that the West European governments are utterly fed up with the feeling of dependence on the U.S.A. The newspaper further admits that continuation of American economic "aid" will not improve but worsen the situation in Europe.

Every
Britain
count
nation
States
deavor
from
the pa
ment.
The
shook
centers
also at
It unde
perialis
penden
As a
colonial
everyw
role in
histori
ple.
Strik
the att
suppres
ment o
ferred b
the K
baric b
of the
planes
U.S.-B
break
people
fratern
volunt
of Kin
people
uphol
freedo
The
Ameri
want v

Everything points to the fact that Britain, France and other capitalist countries will not tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly, that they will endeavor sooner or later to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.

The October Socialist Revolution shook imperialism not only at the centers of its domination, it struck also at its rear lines, at its periphery. It undermined the domination of imperialism in the colonies and dependent countries.

As a result of World War II the colonial system of imperialism is everywhere disintegrating. A vital role in this was also played by the historic victory of the Chinese people.

Striking testimony to the failure of the attempts of the imperialists to suppress the national-liberation movement of the peoples is the defeat suffered by the U.S. in the war against the Korean people. Despite the barbaric bombings of Korean towns, use of the bacteriological weapon, jet planes and modern armaments, the U.S.-British troops are powerless to break the resistance of the Korean people. The Korean people, with the fraternal aid of the Chinese people's volunteers and under the guidance of Kim Ir Sen—leader of the Korean people—are valiantly and steadfastly upholding their independence and freedom.

The peoples brand with shame the American aggressors. They do not want war. They stand for peace and

are intensifying their rebuff to the warmongers.

It would be difficult to overrate the significance of such a powerful demonstration of the forces of the people in the struggle for peace as the recent Peace Congress of the Peoples of Asia and the Pacific. The messengers of 37 countries with a population of 1,600 million people firmly declared that in the future the machinations of the warmongers will be even more resolutely rebuffed. The forces of the peace partisans are growing. Friendship among the peoples of all countries is growing stronger. In the rear of the imperialist warmongers there resounds more frequently and more loudly the cry of the ordinary people: "We shall never go to war against the peoples of the land of Socialism."

The inviolable friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the countries of people's democracy is becoming stronger in the struggle for peace.

The great friendship between the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union, friendship which guarantees durable peace in the Far East and throughout the world, is growing and gaining strength.

Our great homeland is an indestructible bastion of peace. The Soviet people do not want war. The whole world knows this. All the activity of our state takes place under the slogan of the Stalin policy of peaceful creative labor, under the slogan of friendship among nations. The interests of the Soviet Union, points out Comrade Stalin, are inseparable

arable from the cause of world peace.

The peaceful Stalin foreign policy of the Soviet Government proceeds from the assumption that peaceful co-existence and co-operation of capitalism and Communism are quite possible. What is needed is a mutual desire to cooperate, a readiness to fulfill exactly obligations taken and to observe the principle of equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.

At the regular session of the General Assembly of the U.N. which opened in October the delegates of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies, as has always been the case, are consistently exposing the dictatorial aggressive policy of the U.S. rulers. The Soviet representatives are again upholding the concrete program of genuine strengthening of peace and international security.

However, only hopeless fools can think that the peace policy of the Soviet Government is due to the weakness of our state. The Soviet people do not belong to the timid, they do not fear war. The indestructible strength of the Soviet state was confirmed more than once, both during the years of intervention by the capitalist states against the young Soviet Republic and in the years of the Second World War. Now, when the Soviet Union is no longer alone, when it marches at the head of the camp of democracy and Socialism, its forces and its might have grown immeasurably.

Alexei Maximovich Gorky, the great Russian writer, wrote that

should the capitalists in fear of the inevitable future, lose their heads altogether and move their hordes against our country, then "it will be necessary to greet them with such a blow, by word and deed, at their addled pates as will become the last blow at the skull of capitalism and send it into the grave which has been quite timely dug for it by history." Such actually will be the case should the aggressors dare fall upon our country.

* * *

Comrades, the immortal Lenin pointed out that Communism was now growing everywhere. No efforts on the part of the bourgeois governments, no fascist methods of terror against the advanced people of our days can halt the spread of the ideas of Communism among the broad toiling masses of the world. There is no force capable of turning back the wheel of history, of holding up the process of the social forward movement, to Communism.

The new successes registered in the past year in developing the socialist economy and culture in the Soviet Union, the successes of the People's Democracies marching along the pathway toward Socialism, the further consolidation of the camp of peace and Socialism graphically confirm the great truth and the all-conquering strength of the Lenin-Stalin teaching.

In our forward movement along the path toward Communism the leading and organizing force is the Communist Party of the Soviet Un-

ion, t
minded
the r
the ba
Lenini

In h
of the

"Aft

1917 a
measur

talist a
sentativ

admirin
our Pa

gade' o
workin

way th
success

facilitat
groaning

ism. I
"that o

especial
ond W

Union,
Japanes

peoples
the me

Summ
years,

victory
was not

a few
ever, o

in a st
and su

culties
It is

power i
existed

ion, the militant union of like-minded Communists, working for the re-making of human society on the basis of the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

In his speech at the XIX Congress of the Party Comrade Stalin said:

"After our Party took power in 1917 and after the Party took real measures to do away with the capitalist and landlord oppression, representatives of the fraternal Parties, admiring the valor and success of our Party, named it the 'Shock-brigade' of the world revolutionary and working-class movement. In this way they expressed the hope that the successes of the 'Shock-brigade' would facilitate the position of the peoples groaning under the yoke of capitalism. I think," said Comrade Stalin, "that our Party justified these hopes, especially in the period of the Second World War when the Soviet Union, by smashing German and Japanese fascist tyranny, delivered the peoples of Europe and Asia from the menace of fascist slavery."

Summing up the results of the past years, we see that the path to the victory of Socialism in our country was not an easy one. There were not a few difficulties in our way. However, our Party always kept itself in a state of militant preparedness and successfully overcame all difficulties and obstacles.

It is now clear to all that Soviet power in our country would not have existed even 35 days, to say nothing

of 35 years, had it not been for the heroic Party of Lenin-Stalin, which is closely linked with the people and enjoys their boundless confidence.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party the Soviet people made their state powerful and invincible. Therein lies the great historic service rendered by Comrade Stalin, the leader of the Party and of the people. For more than a quarter of a century, since the death of the great Lenin, Comrade Stalin has confidently led our Party and the Soviet people along the untrodden pathways of building the new Communist life. Hence the boundless confidence of the working masses of our country and of the world in the wise Stalin leadership, the strength of their faith in the policy of the Communist Party, in Stalin's genius. Hence the great love of the Soviet people and of working people throughout the world for Comrade Stalin.

Long live the Great October Socialist Revolution which ushered in a new epoch in the life of humanity!

Long live the mighty Soviet Union—the indestructible bulwark of peace, democracy and Socialism.

Long live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party of Lenin-Stalin!

Long life to our dear teacher and leader, the great Stalin!

Under the banner of Lenin-Stalin forward to Communism!

The Ford Local Union Election

By John Swift

WHEN THE International Executive Board of the United Auto Workers dictatorially abrogated the rights of the Ford Rouge Local 600, removed its leadership, and imposed an Administrator over its affairs, workers everywhere were concerned. They wanted to know: Would Walter Reuther be able to get away with it? When, finally, after months of struggle, the Ford workers did re-win the right to a local union election, the big questions were: Would the Ford workers uphold Reuther's actions? Would they permit themselves to be swept into renouncing their own progressive program and their democratically elected leadership?

The Ford Local Union election held in September provided the answer to these questions. It is this which gives this election its *special* significance.

Strangely enough, the result of this test of strength in the Ford Local went unnoticed in the national press. We say "strangely," because it cannot be said that the monopoly controlled newspaper syndicates and chains were indifferent to the outcome of the struggle in Local 600, or unaware of its existence.

On the contrary, when Reuther rode roughshod over the rights of the Ford workers in March, this made front page news throughout the nation. It was even translated into a score of tongues and beamed to the four corners of the earth by the Voice of Wall Street, improperly and cynically called the "Voice of America."

If the results of the Ford election were played down in the Detroit press and entirely omitted from the corporation-controlled press of the nation, this was due to the fact that the news was not to the liking of the millionaire publishers. These are the gentlemen who so zealously guard our much vaunted and yet hard-to-be-found "freedom of the press," and who so ardently and tenderly, and, may we add, so class-consciously, determine what news is and what is not "fit to print."

In other words, when Reuther opened his "anti-Communist" crusade, this was considered as News with a capital "N." But when the Ford workers rejected this Red-baiting and indicated that they loved Reuther's policies in September even less than in March, this was no news whatsoever!

Just as it was important for Com-

munis
ists to
the R
in Mar
stand
rebuff
careful
every
by the
be ma
labor
moven
of labo
That
al unio
buff at
ers is
can all
to squ
change
the res
i. A
cal, th
ther,
whelm
the un
worker
of the
challen
Alre
election
forces
made c
various
which
and A
proved
to the
result i
ther's f
boastful
cautious

munist and progressive trade unionists to understand the reasons for the Reuther seizure and its success in March, so is it important to understand the reasons for the Reuther rebuff of September. For only by carefully analyzing and studying every setback and every gain made by the workers can real headway be made in breaking the hold of the labor bureaucrats over the labor movement and advancing the cause of labor unity.

That Reuther and his International union leadership did receive a rebuff at the hands of the Ford workers is an incontrovertible fact. Nor can all of Reuther's eel-like attempts to squirm out of his predicament change this fact. Let us summarize the results of the election:

1. All four top officers of the local, the very ones removed by Reuther, were re-elected with overwhelming pluralities. So strong was the unity displayed by the Ford workers that the coalition leadership of the local was not even seriously challenged.

Already prior to the local union election, the true relationship of forces in the local union had been made evident by the results of the various unit (building) elections which had taken place during July and August. These conclusively proved that any head-on challenge to the local union leadership would result in humiliating defeat for Reuther's followers. Thus, a brash and boastful Reuther became a coy and cautious Reuther. What he could

not win by strength he hoped to gain by stealth. He decided to permit Carl Stellato, the local union president, to run unopposed.

In this way Reuther hoped to accomplish two ends: First, to cushion the impact of his own defeat, and second, to try to split the local leadership by separating Stellato from the rest. This did not work. The four top officers ran on one common Unity Slate. They openly appealed to the workers to vote down the actions of the International in sending Administrators into the local, and to support the whole progressive program of the united local leadership.

Significantly, even though the other top officers were opposed, the Right-wing pro-Reuther caucus did not dare to challenge them openly. Of great importance was the re-election of William Hood as recording secretary. Hood, the most outstanding Negro leader of the local, and National President of the Negro Labor Council, was opposed in the election by three candidates, all of them white. It was hoped to corral the votes of backward white workers against a Negro in top office, thereby forcing a run-off election. But there was no run-off. Hood received nearly twice as many votes as all the three of his opponents combined! The vote was 12,567 for Hood as against 6,500 votes for his three opponents.

Important also was the re-election of Pat Rice as vice-president. It was Pat Rice, co-Chairman of the Progressive (Left-wing) Caucus who,

together with William Hood, had been made the special target of attack by the House Un-American Committee during its visit to Detroit last March. Rice received 14,509 votes; his opponent 4,648.

2. In addition to the four top officers, the entire Unity Slate was elected. Not a single opponent of this slate even came close to being elected!

3. In the unit (building) elections that preceded the local union election, the Unity forces around the local union leadership swept the field and emerged stronger than before the election.

The tabulation of the results of the building elections was made public on August 26th in a statement issued by Dave Moore, co-chairman of Progressive Caucus. This compilation showed:

In twelve Buildings with a membership of 41,013 or 85 percent of the total Rouge membership, the workers voted into office Building Chairmen united in the Unity Coalition, opposed to the Administrators, supporting the program of Local 600. . . .

In five buildings with a membership for 4,486 or 9 percent of the total Rouge membership, the workers voted into office Building Chairmen who are in the Reuther Right-wing camp. In none of these Units did the Reuther Right-wing slate identify itself as supporters of Reuther, nor take a position in support of the Administrators over Local 600.

In two Buildings with a membership of 3,050 or 6 percent of the total Rouge membership, the workers voted into of-

fice, Building Chairmen who are Independents—neither adherents of the Reuther Right-wing nor participants in the Unity Coalition.

How does this compare with the relationship of forces in the Ford Rouge Plant before the election? Brother Moore, in behalf of the Progressive Caucus and in the same above-quoted statements, tells us:

Prior to the Administrators, the Reuther Right-wing controlled the Presidency of 5 Buildings with a membership of 11,878 workers. Now they succeeded in electing 5 Chairmen in Units with a membership of 4,486, representing a decline of over 7,000 workers. The Reuther Right-wing suffered its biggest losses in the Foundry with 6,070 workers and Rolling Mill with 2,295 workers. They retained the same number of Building Chairmen (5) by virtue of victories in the Glass Plant with 973 workers and in the newly established Unit, the Specialty Foundry with 700 workers.

Furthermore, before the recent elections two building units had elected Negro chairmen. This was increased to three Negro chairmen in this election. The contrast between the record of Local 600 in the promotion of Negro workers to top leadership and the continued shameful existence of a lily-white International Executive Board is more striking than ever.

4. Brother Moore also tells us: "Within the Unity Coalition, the Progressives (Left-wing) were victorious in 7 Buildings with a mem-

ship of
total F
Conse
Unit
5 Bui
16,794
Roug
5. T
Counc
body
of an
Unity
these
Caucu
the pr
As
above
that
Board
to adm
(After
did is
and is
ther!)
the R
it was
withd
I.E.B.
the re
ing se
local
out t
annou
ment—
—"Th
cently
that C
the u
Gener
in the
Nov
trying

ship of 24,219 or 49 per cent of the total Rouge membership. Center and Conservative Chairmen within the Unity Coalition were victorious in 5 Buildings with a membership of 16,794 or 35 per cent of the total Rouge membership."

5. The newly elected General Council, the highest policy making body of the local, also is composed of an overwhelming majority of Unity Coalition supporters. Among these the percentage of Progressive Caucus supporters is larger than in the previous General Council.

As clear and irrefutable as are the above cited facts, it would appear that the International Executive Board is understandingly reluctant to admit having received a trouncing. (After all, what the Rouge workers did is entirely unfair to the I.E.B. and its Grand Lama, Walter Reuther!) In a statement issued after the Rouge election, and at a time it was compelled to announce the withdrawal of its Administrators, the I.E.B. claimed great achievements for the reign of its Administrators. Having sent the Administrators into the local under the pretext of "cleaning out the Communists," the I.E.B. announces as its greatest achievement—and this with a straight face—"The results of the elections recently concluded in Local 600 show that Communist Party influence in the units, the local union, and the General Council is at its lowest level in the history of the local union."

Now, now, Walter, whom are you trying to kid? If your "house clean-

ing" was so successful why does the IEB statement subtly warn the Ford Local to watch its step? Why does it declare that "our next Convention must devise new and more effective machinery to deal with the problem of any Communists within our ranks?" To borrow a phrase of yours, Walter, whose slip is it that is showing?

Not all of Reuther's followers have so keen a sense of humor and so developed an Achesonian ability to misread failure as success. Some of them can recognize a smack in the nose when they run into one. The official publication of the Michigan Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, *The Wage Earner*, has been wearing sackcloth and ashes over the Right-wing defeat in Local 600. Its September issue carries on the front page the mournful headline, "End of UAW-Reuther Era Seen in Events at 600." The body of the story continues in the same doubtful notes by stating: "Control of the local by anti-Reuther forces (read: pro-unity forces—J.S.) can be interpreted by other UAW locals throughout the country as a serious blow to Mr. Reuther since 600 is in his own city and the much vaunted 'biggest' local."

It continues: "It is all the more significant because the election was delayed since June when Administrators were placed over the controversial local by International officers who charged it was dominated by Communists and C.P. followers."

The A.C.T.U. is worried lest the

progressive victory at the Rouge will make it more difficult for the Ford Corporation to get away with increased speed-up and exploitation, and its heart bleeds for both Ford and Reuther at the same time. "An anti-Reuther slate of officers, and domination of committees and units by Progressive forces," laments *The Wage Earner*, "will undoubtedly affect collective bargaining with the Ford Motor Co." "Why?" one may ask, and *The Wage Earner* replies: "Dissatisfaction over the handling of routine grievances . . . and charges of speed-up can have drastic effects on production, and labor-management relations during the coming year. And none of these will reflect to the credit, deservedly or not, of Mr. Reuther."

Does *The Wage Earner* wish to imply that acquiescence to speed up and grievances on the part of the union would reflect to the credit of Reuther? With whom? The workers or the corporation?

So much for who won the election at the Rouge.

* * *

What were the factors that made the progressive victory at the Ford Rouge possible?

The first factor was the mass indignation of the workers at the usurpation of their democratic union rights by the imposition of Administrators. This opposition to the Reuther seizure was so widespread that it crosses all caucus lines. It included

large numbers of workers who on other questions normally support Reuther's policies. This is why even those candidates who supported Reuther's dictatorial actions, in the main, did not dare publicly to proclaim this support, but remained silent on the matter of the Administrators.

Correctly understanding this, the progressives refused to fall into the trap of making "Communism" the issue. Instead they made the issue what it really was, that of union democracy. For the first period after the Administrators took over the local the simple slogan which united nearly all Ford workers was the demand for a prompt local union election.

This hostility to International interference in the internal affairs of U.A.W. locals is quite widespread throughout the union and confirms the view that the Reuther machine has far from succeeded in cowering the rank and file of this great union.

The second factor was the growing dissatisfaction of the workers with their economic position under the five-year-do-nothing contract. Many workers realized that the Reuther seizure, made on the pretext of fighting so-called Communist influence, was meant to stifle the snowballing rank-and-file pressure for a do-something policy, for a reopening of the contract. This movement for a reopening of contract was not only strong among the Ford workers, but was one of the key issues of difference between the Flint General Motors' workers and the Inter-

nationa
Walt
tested
issue. A
things
gle, Re
own p
tract. C
agility
Reuther
out on
that he
contract
able. F
have ch
He now
present
1) add
living i
increase
tor from
pension
rise in
As i
mands
change
importa
tant vic
the U.A.
and "a
are con
ers hav
characte
ments."
The I
gle and
tributed
This do
on Reu
does op
cessions
putting

national leadership.

Walter Reuther, himself, has attested since to the vitality of this issue. As soon as he saw which way things were going in the Ford struggle, Reuther proceeded to modify his own position on the five-year contract. Giving another example of his agility in double-jointed gymnastics, Reuther has turned himself inside out on this issue. He now pleads that he never thought the five-year contract was sacrosanct and untouchable. He now argues that conditions have changed since it was written. He now favors "adjustments" in the present G.M. and Ford contracts to: 1) add the main part of the cost of living increases to the base pay; 2) increase the annual improvement factor from 4 to 5 cents, and 3) increase pension payments in line with the rise in the cost of living.

As inadequate as are these demands for "adjustment," Reuther's change of face on this issue is of great importance and constitutes an important victory for the rank and file of the U.A.W. For once "adjustments" and "amendments" to the contract are considered permissible, the workers have the means to influence the character and scope of these "adjustments."

The Ford workers, by their struggle and by their unity, have contributed greatly to this development. This does not yet mean victory, even on Reuther's limited demands, but it does open the door to winning concessions and improvements and to putting an end to the obnoxious sys-

tem of long term do-nothing contracts.

The third important factor in the progressive victory is that the Unity Coalition remained united despite varied and frequently sharp differences in its ranks and despite all efforts of Reuther and his machine to break this unity. The Left-wing forces learned something from their previous errors. They did not hesitate to take issue with Stellato and other more conservative elements in the united front coalition. This was done within the framework of over-all unity and in order to strengthen this unity. In many ways, this correct struggle for unity was the decisive factor in the victory, for without this, the popular sentiment against the seizure and for improved economic conditions would have been dissipated instead of harnessed in constructive channels.

The only hope Reuther had of winning was by splitting the coalition and by trying to break the more conservative forces away from the more progressive and Left-wing forces. That is why he tried to make Communism the main issue and centered his attack on the leaders of the Progressive Caucus, while treating Stellato as a stooge. As *The Wage Earner* admits, the leaders of the Right-wing caucus were speculating on a rift within the Unity Coalition. They hoped to provoke the Progressive Caucus into putting forward its own full slate for local union officers as against Stellato.

"Were a complete Progressive slate

to be tossed in," writes *The Wage Earner*, in September, "the Right-wing planned to stay in the race hoping that in a three-way vote they might win." When these hopes of a split turned to ashes, the Right-wing jig was up, at least for the time being. Failing to split the united front, the Right-wing caucus itself began to split up. This is so because of its heterogeneous and unprincipled character. This same tendency will occur everywhere that correct united front policies are pursued by progressives.

The fourth important factor in the victory was the ability of the progressives to exercise self-control and to keep from being provoked into wild factionalism which would be tantamount to an unprincipled cat and dog fight in the eyes of the workers.

In the main it can be said that the progressives stuck to the issues. They saw the Ford Corporation as the main enemy, and took up the grievances of the workers such as speed up, the demand for a 28½ cent wage increase for the skilled workers, etc.

If this is so, a great deal of credit is due the Left-wing militants. When the local union officers became somewhat paralyzed by the brazen seizure of the local by Reuther, the Left-wing progressives did not wait for them to snap out of it. They went directly to the workers themselves. They issued leaflets clarifying the issues. They organized struggles over grievances. In most buildings they began movements for Unit Membership Meet-

ings, so that the rank and file could air its shop grievances and its opposition to the Administrators. They helped organize the resistance to the growing arrogance and speed-up squeeze of the company. Stoppages over such questions as wash-up time and speed-up took place in the Tool and Die, Plastic, and Gear and Axle Units. The mounting struggle against economic grievances also produced mounting pressure upon the local union officers for a convening of the General Council of the local *despite* the Administrator's taboo. More than two-thirds of the members of the General Council signed a petition asking for such a meeting and Stelato finally set a date after which the "gloves will be off." Also, over a hundred elected Negro leaders in the local met under the leadership of William Hood to undertake a united fight in behalf of Negro leadership in the Union. At the same time the Progressive Caucus held well attended and enthusiastic meetings in a number of buildings.

It was this splendid initiative, it was these united-front struggles and activities *from below*, which also forced a change of tactics on the part of Reuther's Administrators. They saw that they were unable to provoke the Unity Coalition into wild counter charges, and that their own campaign was missing fire, in fact, back-firing. Therefore, they abruptly changed their tactics in the middle of the fight and began to compete with the progressives over the handling of grievances.

The
sue o
minis
scurr
tion
wing
the f
that
ing a
litera
use o
irresp
simpl
tion b
up in
It w
must
told
ousne
boom
Th
came
an "a
that
votes
vario
trator
and
declin
came
sion
else
It
A.C.
wing
his S
doubt
had
finish
in the
decid
part o

This change occurred after one issue of *Ford Facts*, edited by the Administrators, made an especially scurrilous attack on the Unity Coalition and particularly on the Left-wing. In a screaming headline across the front page, *Ford Facts* charged that the progressives had been forging a union printing label on their literature in order to conceal their use of non-union scab printing. So irresponsible was this charge, so simple and complete was its refutation by the progressives, that it blew up in the face of its perpetrators. It was at this point that Reuther must have called in his boys and told them to check their over-zealousness because their tactics were boomeranging.

The next issues of *Ford Facts* became very "objective" and took on an "above the struggle" tone. From that point on, and especially as the votes began to come in from the various unit elections, the Administrators grew more and more civil and restrained. Red-baiting visibly declined, and Reuther's policy became one of avoiding head-on collision in order to save face and what else he could from the mess.

It is this which led some of the A.C.T.U. leaders of the Ford Right-wing caucus to accuse Reuther and his Social-Democratic followers of double-crossing them. Apparently he had promised them a fight to the finish with no holds barred. Instead, in the middle of the scrap, Reuther decided that discretion was the better part of valor. But on his part he could

reply to his A.C.T.U. cronies in the Rouge and with some justice, that they had misled him. They had exaggerated their strength and underestimated the strength of the Unity Coalition and the intelligence of the Ford workers.

The change of tactics on the part of the Administrators, plus Reuther's decision not to have a candidate in opposition to Stellato, has led to considerable speculation as to whether a deal had not been consummated between Reuther and Stellato. After all, the unprincipled Reuther has shown great versatility in the art of bribing and buying off the opposition, thereby destroying ever more effectively new, promising and militant young leaders.

On our part we refuse to engage in the time-wasting pastime of mind reading, soul searching or crystal ball gazing. We do not know what Brother Stellato has in mind. All we can do is to stick to the facts. These are, that even though Stellato ran unopposed, he ran as part of, in fact, the leader of, the Unity Coalition.

This coalition, in its appeal to the workers for votes, made no bones about where it stood on the issue of the Administrators. A four-page platform issued just before the local elections declares that "the placing of Administrators over the membership of Local 600 will forever be a blot upon the history of the International union." It comes out strongly for the rights of the five building unit leaders who had been barred

from the right to hold office by the International on the charge of membership in or "subservience" to the Communist Party. In italic bold face type it declared: "We will fight to restore these members to full membership privileges within our Union..." Nor did the Unity Coalition headed by Stellato backtrack on any of its program. In the main it stuck by its guns.

From all this it cannot be shown that there was connivance between Stellato and Reuther. Nor would such back door deals prove very wise for the prestige and influence of Stellato as a leader of the union. He has proven that, when a leader really has the rank and file solidly behind him, not even a machine as strong as Reuther's can topple him.

Reuther's challenge to the Ford Local and his subsequent defeat at the hands of the Ford workers has strengthened the position of the Ford Local leadership, in fact, made it stronger than ever before. The only way this greater strength can be dissipated and weakened is if the leaders of the coalition violate the trust placed in them by the workers and become tempted by the siren call of soft jobs in plush covered swivel chairs.

* * *

In its successful fight to regain its rights under the U.A.W. Constitution, the Ford Local also has won an important battle in its campaign for a better and more progressive union. But only a battle. That is why the

Ford progressives dare not rest on their laurels. They must not exaggerate their victory, nor read into it license for cockiness or factionalism. The workers in the Rouge supported them because they expect militant advanced leadership. They will continue to support them only so long as they get this kind of leadership.

The prestige of the Ford Local has been enhanced throughout the U.A.W. Other local unions will be watching Local 600 to see how it uses this victory. In this connection the progressives constantly must bear in mind that even the victory scored in their local union is jeopardized. At best it can be only a partial victory so long as the unity they have built in Local 600 finds no expression throughout the U.A.W. Certainly the united strength of the workers in Local 600, pillar that it is, is insufficient by itself to win the many progressive demands contained within the Local 600 unity program.

This was borne out once again at the recent conference of the Ford National Council which met to draft the united demands of the Ford workers throughout the country. Here, on many questions, Local 600 was in a minority. Yet without the support of the other Ford locals throughout the country, it will be more difficult for Local 600 to win its fight against the Ford corporation in the Rouge.

It must be said, however, that following this conference, Local 600's leaders did not creep into their tent and sulk. The *Ford Facts* of October 4th carries a footnote to its story

on the
Local
pletel
the s
cal 60
comp

Bra
ship
specte
600 w
with
them!

Eve
of the
dictate
office-
render
600 al
arena
demo
in the
that i
U.A.W
strings
demo

The
of act
strong
find i
policy
the er
the fir
Witho
slogane
Work
Labor

Dur
strugg
union

on this conference which states that Local 600 delegates "are not completely satisfied with the decisions of the majority of the Ford Locals." At the same time, it goes on to say, "Local 600 will continue its fight for the complete 600 program."

Bravo! This is responsible leadership which will be greeted and respected in the entire U.A.W. If Local 600 wants other local unions to march with it, it, too, must march with them!

Even the fight to restore the rights of the five union leaders who were dictatorially barred from holding office—a fight which must not be surrendered—cannot be won by Local 600 alone. It can be won only in the arena of the larger fight for a more democratic U.A.W. This is evident in the announcement of the I.E.B. that it intends to ask the coming U.A.W. Convention for even more stringent infringements upon the democratic rights of members.

Therefore, the struggle for unity of action, while it must grow even stronger within the Ford Local, must find its expression in a consistent policy of the outstretched hand to the entire labor movement and, in the first place, to the whole U.A.W. Without this, Local 600's inspiring slogan, "*The Salvation of America's Workers Lies Within the Unity of Labor*," becomes mere rhetoric.

* * *

During the course of the six-month struggle which ended with the local union election in September, the pro-

gressives in the Ford Local had a number of golden opportunities to give practical life and meaning to their slogan for labor unity. These opportunities, or would it not be better to say, responsibilities, frequently were neither seen nor seized. Had they been, Local 600 would have participated in the Michigan State Convention of the C.I.O. It did not.

If we are to believe the statement of the Administrators as it appeared on the front page of *Ford Facts* during their regime, the reason for this absence was a decision of the General Council of the Local, before the administrators took over, to stay away from this convention. It is difficult to square this action with the slogan for labor unity.

How at least one other local union in the U.A.W. felt about this action of Local 600 was expressed in an article in the Buick Local 599 section of the *Flint Weekly News*. The writer summarizes what occurred at the State C.I.O. Convention and states that one of the reasons why the Schoiles-Hopkins machine was not successfully challenged at the convention was that "Local 600, the largest in the C.I.O. in Michigan, sent no delegates." The writer adds, "Whether it was a boycott of the convention or not we will never know but it is a matter of record that Local 600, almost consistently votes pro-Unionism which is sometimes anti-machine." But in order to vote "pro-Unionism," it at least had to be present!

It is time for progressives generally to learn that the boycott is the least suitable of all tactics for breaking isolation and building unity in the labor movement. It should be a challenge and duty to progressives to take advantage of *every* opportunity no matter how small, to discuss problems with the delegates of other local unions, to air differences with them, and to join hands with them whenever this is possible. Pet theories, which say that attendance at Right-wing dominated union gatherings is a waste of time and that all the delegates at these conferences are hand-picked stooges, are false and dangerous doctrines. They are only "Left-sounding" clap-trap for running away from a possible fight. One may, like Greta Garbo, "want to be alone," but not in the name of labor unity!

Another example of this general aloofness and lack of awareness of what is happening in the rest of the U.A.W. and the Detroit labor movement can be seen by what occurred at the height of the recent steel struggle. It should be noted, in passing, that during the steel struggle, more than at any other time in recent years, the trade union movement as a whole was swept by a shudder of fear of what the reactionaries had in store for it. When the new Smith Bill was introduced in Congress, even the most upholstered bureaucrats indicated signs of uneasiness.

It was at this time that militant unions such as the United Electrical Workers and the Fur Workers were

making pleas for unity behind the steel workers, and when John L. Lewis made his dramatic proposal and offer in support of the steel strikers.

In the midst of all this, the Briggs Local 212, in Detroit, held a special membership meeting and adopted one of the most advanced and strongly worded resolutions calling for united labor action. This resolution, as reported in the columns of the *Voice of 212*, declared that "unless this political reactionary sweep on the part of the enemies of labor is stopped in its tracks, unions in the United States will end up in a legal net of labor-curbing laws." It concluded by "urging the International U.A.W.-C.I.O. to take the initiative in calling upon the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods and Independent unions to plan a conference to evaluate the situation and take what action they believe the times call for to protect labor and free, democratic collective bargaining."

This resolution hit the nail on the head. It deserved the immediate and unconditional support of every honest worker and every U.A.W. local. The fact that it came from Local 212, led by Ken Morris, Social-Democratic side-kick of Reuther and sharp critic of the Ford Local leadership, did not lessen its importance. If anything, it heightened it. This was an opportunity for the Ford Local leadership to have said: "Brother Morris, we disagree on many things, but on this proposition you have our full support. We are glad to be able to

join
nati
for
fere
hav

T
say
disp
him
uni
thu
Sup
the
If i
blu
ris,
call
was
ber

T
eith
the
to l
of
uni
is a
cau
No
righ
labe
Loc
tho
nec
B
sho
not
gan
tan
tak
col
T
to

join with you in urging our International union to take the initiative for the calling of such a unity conference of all labor." That would have been true labor leadership.

There are those, of course, who say that Ken Morris engineered this display of militancy because he found himself hard pressed in his local union election and needed a chest-thumping, fighting line to get votes. Suppose this were true. Did it change the importance of the plea for unity? If it was meant as mere bluff and bluster on the part of Brother Morris, it was all the more necessary to call his hand. One thing is sure, it was not meant as such by the membership of Local 212.

The Ford Local leadership was either unaware of, or indifferent to, the Local 212 resolution. We prefer to believe the former. But a policy of closer contact with other local unions would change this lapse. This is all the more imperative now, because the Republican victory in the November election endangers every right and gain won by organized labor in the past two decades. What Local 212 called for last summer is a thousand times more urgent and necessary today.

Because criticism, like charity, should begin at home, let us also note that the Communists of Michigan paid no attention to this important resolution. They did not even take the trouble of reporting it in the columns of the *Daily Worker*.

The last example we would like to cite of this same tendency is the

failure of the progressives in the Ford Local, and in Michigan generally, to take a positive and active position towards the statewide referendum on reapportionment. This referendum, initiated by the Michigan C.I.O., received the backing also of the Michigan A. F. of L. It was put on the ballot by the C.I.O. going out and getting 270,000 signatures on petitions. The referendum itself aims at ending a situation in the state in which the rural and small town areas are given majority representation in the State Legislature, although they constitute a minority of the population of the state.

The fight for such referendums is a positive, progressive fight. It arises precisely in those places where the labor movement begins to become more politically conscious and realizes that the election laws of the state are weighted against the working class. The progressives in Michigan did not pitch in behind this fight. They took a say-nothing, do-nothing attitude.

Here was an opportunity for progressives to work together with the whole labor movement. This was an opportunity to do some real education of the workers on the class structure of government. It also was an opportunity to discuss independent political action. The workers could be shown that, in a state like Michigan, where they and their families are a majority, the labor movement could, if united, step forward into the leadership of a party of its own.

The "go-it-alone" tendencies on

the part of the Ford Local can and should be overcome in the immediate struggle ahead to win a maximum of improvements during the contract reopening struggle. *Ford Facts* is correct when it warns: "Past experience shows that corporations only give in under pressure. . . . How many changes are made and how good these changes are, depends on the united pressure exerted by the membership."

The Ford Local should be an example in rallying its own membership to exert this united pressure and in working to bring about the united pressure of the whole union. It must be remembered that the difference between progressive and reactionary trade union policies is not merely a difference in programmatic demands, but in the approach to how these demands are won. The labor bureaucrat relies on negotiations; the progressive labor leader on the united and militant action of the rank and file. It is this which makes the difference in what demands can or cannot be realized.

* * *

In critically evaluating the election in Local 600, it is necessary to point out that the peace issue, which stood forth plainly and visibly in the 1951 local election, was either soft-pedaled or entirely lost sight of in the recent election. There are a number of reasons for this. In the first place, the issue of union democracy predominated. This issue itself was closely tied to that of war or peace. For Reuther's seizure of the Ford

Local occurred within the context of the war drive and war hysteria. It can be argued, therefore, and with merit, that when the workers upheld their local leadership against the un-American witch-hunt committee and against the Red-baiting attack of Reuther, they also were taking a position against the war hysteria and for peace.

This does not, however, explain why the peace issue as such was played down. The reason is to be found elsewhere. In 1951, the big issue before the Ford workers was that of mounting unemployment. They realized that this was one of the bitter consequences of the change from peace-time to armament production. In the summer of 1952, the issue of unemployment was not as acute. The slack in civilian production was being taken in by increasing war production orders. Under these circumstances the question of war or peace did not appear to have the same urgency, in terms of bread and butter for the workers.

But the progressives, if they are really to be progressives, cannot permit temporary shifts in employment status to determine what in their opinion constitutes the key to the best welfare of the workers, both today and tomorrow. The failure to treat the peace issue was a mistake. Continued failure in this direction on the part of the progressive coalition can only undermine the very foundation of their victory.

All the weathervanes point toward a rapidly approaching economic gale.

Produ
and i
crisis.
tion,
peace
need.
Local
ally,
for pe
relativ
work
crease
impos
work
the c
hour
gram
Roug
craft
when
prog
cently
Unio
same
trade
Comm
all th
termi
the F
Do
ing i
for t
bring
to se
broad
other
cation
a pro
tive p
dema
porat
tive

Production for war is not halting, and cannot halt, this approaching crisis. Not increasing war production, but increasing production for peace is what the workers want and need. This means that what the Ford Local, and the auto workers generally, need, is an economic program for peace. When the present period of relative high employment ends, the workers will want more than increased unemployment insurance as important as that is. They will want work, and work without war. While the demand of the local for a six hour day is one plank of such a program, it does not answer how the Rouge and the rest of the auto-aircraft industry can avoid shutdown when a crash comes. An economic program for peace such as that recently drawn up by the Mine Mill Union is part of the answer. At the same time, such problems as that of trade with China and with other Communist-led countries may make all the difference in the world in determining whether the workers in the Rouge have jobs or not.

Doing a little more advance thinking in terms of what is shaping up for the American workers also will bring the progressives in Local 600 to see the need for beginning to broaden their program in respect to other questions, such as housing, education, etc. In the last analysis, only a progressive and advanced legislative program *added* to the economic demands directed at the Ford Corporation, and together with a positive peace program, can help meet

the vexing problems of the period ahead.

Already taxes are eating away a large chunk of the workers' paycheck. A progressive union, therefore, must do something about this if it is to safeguard the economic position of its workers. And tomorrow, with mass unemployment, only immense government expenditures for housing, slum clearance, schools, hospitals and other domestic projects, plus increased world trade, can even approach the problem of providing jobs and limited security.

Therefore, a progressive union today also must be a union with an advanced program for social legislation, with a positive peace program for increased trade, and with an *active* program of political action to achieve these objectives. Furthermore, a program for peace, a program based on welfare and not warfare, is a program which must be fought for by labor in a *new* way. The results of the November elections, the great danger of increased domestic reaction, prove that labor's policy of tailing after the Democratic Party's reactionary politicians and policies has led it into a blind alley. To get out of this there must be true *independent* political action on the part of labor, both within and upon the Democratic Party, as well as in the direction of a new party of the common people led by labor.

In raising these questions, it may appear to some that we are advocating a narrowing down of the broad unity which has characterized the

progressive coalition in Local 600. This is not so. We favor the maximum of unity. But such maximum unity does not exclude, but includes, the need for raising new questions, for forward movement to keep abreast of new, ever changing and ever more challenging problems. To stand still is to move backward. To fail to think ahead is to lag behind.

We realize that the task of broadening and deepening the progressive program of the Unity Coalition at the Rouge will take time and perseverance. At this stage the most important thing is that the Communist workers, and the Left-wing generally, begin to understand the need for winning the workers, *from below*, for more advanced positions. Only if this is done, only if the level of understanding of the workers is raised, can changes and additions be made to the unity program without endangering existing unity, while in fact, at the same time cementing that unity. Unless the Communists, through their Party organization, play such a vanguard role, they cannot serve best the unity of the Ford workers. We are convinced that the Communist workers at the Rouge, who worked so well to make the progressive victory of their local union possible, will now learn again from their new experiences and strengthen further the Party organization and its influence among the workers.

It is in the spirit of these remarks that we also wish to criticize what

may appear to some to be a mere trivial editorial matter, but which may be much more than that. We refer to the recent insertion of the innocent word "Christian" before the word peace in the Local 600 program. Now, who can be opposed to a "Christian peace," one may ask. But when we stop to think that our country today is engaged in a war on the Korean peninsula, and that the people of Korea, China and Asia are not "Christians," a call for a "Christian peace" could be interpreted to mean a white-imperialist peace dictated to the "non-Christian" colored peoples of Asia.

We do not say this is what was meant. We only say this formulation could lead to such an unfortunate conclusion. What is wanted in Korea is not a Christian peace or a Mohammedan peace, but just plain *peace* based on an immediate cessation of all hostilities and the ironing out of all pending issues by the Security Council of the United Nations.

* * *

In conclusion, what is the main lesson which Communists and trade union progressives can learn from the Local 600 experiences? It is this: That it is possible to establish and consolidate progressive-led coalitions within Right-wing led unions despite all attempts of the reactionary officialdom to dislodge or destroy them.

There are no unions in which progressives cannot work and get results in the direction of building the unity

of the
union
work
stain
sion
sciow
mili
not
same
great
ing
most
orga
If C
not
spite
work
In
work
into
setba
victor
are n
fate.
whic
to be
Su
yet b
part.
take
of eff
little
lessor
incom
feats
accid
tions
taken
ucts
work
be se
same

of the workers and in making these unions *better* class instruments of the workers in the defense of their living standards and rights. This conclusion must be blazoned into the consciousness of every Communist and militant trade unionist. This does not mean that the results can be the same everywhere. It does not deny great difficulties and even humiliating ones. But the trade union is the most elementary and most basic mass organization of the working class. If Communists and progressives cannot learn to work in these, yes, despite the labor fakers, where can they work?

In order to make headway in this work, it is necessary to probe deeply into the reasons for every progressive setback and every advance, for every victory and every defeat. For these are not fortuitous products of a cruel fate. They are the products of causes which must be understood if they are to be controlled.

Such digging and probing has not yet become a *style of work* on our part. Too frequently great struggles take place requiring a great exertion of effort and yet when they are over, little attention is given to learn the lessons of the struggle. Thus, often, incorrect conclusions are drawn. Defeats are written off as either fluke accidents or as due to objective conditions beyond control. Victories are taken in their stride as natural products of correct policies and good work. But how superficial this is can be seen in the reluctance to apply the same yardstick to setbacks and de-

feats. These are never, or hardly ever, treated as natural products of incorrect policies and bad work. And if and when they are, they are usually kept as state-secrets for the select, and rarely brought out publicly, and self-critically, so that all advanced workers can learn from them.

As Marxists, as historical-materialists, we know that objective conditions are primary, and that to fly in their face is the utmost folly. We also know that not infrequently objective conditions are the prime factor in the defeat of progressive forces. But even where this is so, the question still arises: Was the real objective picture, and not a fanciful one, taken into account at the outset of the struggle. Were the goals set in harmony with what was practical of attainment? If they were not, for sometimes this can only be gauged accurately by putting it to the test, were they taken into account from then on?

It is impossible to pursue correct policy where there is no correct general appraisal of what can and what can not be attained under concrete given, objective conditions.

Thus, frequently, where objective conditions seem to rise up to smite progressives down, like some strange force from the nether-world, it is because they have not taken into account the totality of the objective events. They have not understood the probable course of development and its tempo and, therefore, have been unable to utilize the objective conditions, but instead, become their

blind victims. Like sailors who do not know how to trim their sails to the prevailing winds, the very winds which can bring them closer to port, shipwreck them. And because the class struggle under capitalism never ceases, regardless of what the objective conditions may be, whether that of ebb or flow, there are winds which can be made use of, which can move the working class ship forward, even if an inch at a time.

This dangerous tendency to blame objective conditions for setbacks which are avoidable, was what made us so concerned over the position initially taken by some Michigan Communist leaders that the Reuther seizure represented the victory of fascism itself, no less. For this was an "easy" way of writing off the defeat without setting a fighting, realistic perspective for victory. And we are glad to note that the holders of this view soon threw it aside, learned the lessons of previous errors, and helped make the victory of the progressive forces at the Rouge possible.

Events have confirmed the realistic nature of the estimation in the July *Political Affairs* which said that given correct leadership and a learning of the real lessons of the defeat, there could be confidence "in the courage and good judgment of the Ford workers."

Confidence in the workers, their basic integrity and their readiness to defend their rights as they see them, is more important today than ever, precisely because of the Republican victory and the new position

of the Tafts and McCarthys in American life. But this confidence in the workers can only grow out of understanding them, their conditions of life and struggle, what they are ready to fight for and what they are not, and why.

Any confidence which is not so grounded is only a petty-bourgeois romantic idealization of the workers. It arises from an idealistic and not materialist point of view. Because it is based on wishful thinking and not fact, it soon turns into its opposite, into a complete loss of confidence in the working class and even a contempt for it. In our own ranks there are examples of both this abstract confidence and this arrogant contempt.

The Left-wing and progressive militants in the Ford Local did not have an abstract confidence in the Ford workers, nor did they exaggerate their level of understanding. That is why they refused to allow Reuther to get away with making "Communism" the issue. They knew that while the workers were not ready to defend Communism as such, they were ready to defend their own rights to elect their own local leadership, to determine their own policies and to work for a united local without Red-baiting or witch-hunts.

These experiences have general validity. The November elections showed that a large percentage of the American people are taken in by anti-Communism. But it is still true that the American people do not want war or fascism. In this we must have

the u
It
reacti
ens t
labor
jectiv
to rai
labor
labor,

in
ence
out
ndi-
they
they

the utmost confidence.

It is likewise true that the very reactionary sweep which now threatens the most elementary rights of labor and the people is also an objective factor which can be utilized to raise high the banner of united labor action and militant defense of labor, democratic and civil rights.

If this "opportunity" is seen, then the reactionary Republican victory of November can also be transformed in time into a greater labor and people's unity and a setback for the forces of reaction, fascism and war. Toward this end, the experiences of the workers of the Ford Local may prove useful.

ssive
not
the
gger-
ding.
allow
king
new
not
such,
own
lead-
poli-
local
ants.
neral
tions
ge of
in by
t true
want
have

On the 1952 Steel Strike

By Joseph M. Holden

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF the 1952 steel strike goes far beyond the immediate gains won by the union. This was no ordinary strike.

To grasp its significance, to assess its strengths and weaknesses, it is necessary to see the strike in the focus of U.S. imperialism's drive to dominate the world in general, and of the "national emergency" proclaimed by President Truman two years ago in particular.

THE "NATIONAL EMERGENCY" HOAX

The National Committee of the Communist Party declared at that time that the "national emergency" proclamation, while having no basis in fact, since no foreign power threatened our shores, signified a stepped-up drive to war by the ruling class; that its counter-part at home would be increased attacks upon the labor movement, an attempt to fasten the no-strike shackles upon labor, a drive to whip up a false "national unity" in which the interests of labor, the Negro people and broad masses would be subordinated and sacrificed to Wall Street's war and profit drive.

The longest industry-wide strike in the union's history, when seen in the context of these aims of the "national emergency," stands out as

an important set-back to the war-makers and a very significant victory for the steelworkers, all organized labor and all peace-loving peoples.

The steelworkers did not believe in the phony "national emergency" and certainly did not see the unpopular Korean war as a reason for not striking. This was made dramatically clear by the steelworkers themselves at the most crucial point of the strike. A few weeks after the strike began, Philip Murray emerged from a White House conference to announce a scheme whereby the union would get together with certain companies to plan 15 to 20 percent of capacity production in some plants for "national defense."

Had the steelworkers gone along with this scheme, it would indeed have meant that they were taken in by the mirage of "national emergency," and it undoubtedly would have resulted in a broken strike and weakened union. But the rank-and-file did not go along with Truman and Murray on this suicidal scheme. They rejected it with a unanimity and denunciation which shocked the capitalist press into silence. Even Murray then saw fit to remain silent.

"Strike-breaking!", was the roaring reply of the rank-and-file when the scheme was presented to them. When staff representatives tried to ram it down their throats with cries of

"nat
rean
com
Kor
Dire
nour
wou
was
Mor
ousl
ally
Th
"nat
whic
whic
to v
man
text
the v
Mur
post
emer
steelv
and
steelm
ment
to hi
ton i
It
mora
emer,
not c
also i
about
in th
tries,
the st
aims
stratic
quick
It w
the h
betwe

"national emergency" and the Korean war, they were greeted with the common retort, "To hell with Korea!" Within a week, District Director Germano of Chicago announced that no steel "for defense" would be produced. Not a single ton was produced in any struck plant. Moreover, the effort to remove previously produced steel was only partially successful.

The steelworkers began to see the "national emergency" as a weapon which served the bosses well but which was used to block every effort to win the steelworkers' just demands. Truman used it as the pretext to seize the mills, which got the workers nothing but delay and Murray used it to justify four strike postponements. And while "national emergency" was thus used to rob steelworkers of their right to strike and speedy victory, they saw the steel corporations use the government's *claim* of "national emergency" to hijack the country for a \$5.60 a ton increase in steel prices.

It is little wonder then that the moral authority of the false "national emergency" declined tremendously, not only in steelworkers' eyes, but also in the eyes of millions of workers about to enter contract negotiations in the coal, rubber, packing industries, etc. The very continuation of the strike became a threat to the war aims of Wall Street and its Administration. It was necessary to move quickly to bring it to an end.

It was this realization which led to the hasty White House conference between Truman, Fairless, and Mur-

ray that brought a sudden end to the strike.

Evidently mindful of the great damage done to the prestige and authority of the phony "national emergency" and to the hopes for a war-making unity, Fairless proposed that "management and labor" undertake an "arm-in-arm harmony tour" of U.S. Steel plants this fall. The now deceased Murray readily agreed.

Neither this projected tour of class collaboration, nor any other "lovely-boss" gimmick that may be dreamed up, will serve to wipe out the significance of the 1952 steel strike as a blow to the anti-labor aims of the war-making profiteers and a victory for organized labor and the peace camp. Especially so, since the tour, if it takes place at all, will coincide with new company drives for speed-up and break-down of working conditions, against which new strikes had already broken out the day after the return to work!

WHAT THE BOSSES GAINED

Nonetheless, the ruling class did accomplish a number of its objectives, due in the first place to the fact that the trade-union leadership is still tied to Wall Street's apron strings.

First of all, while the steel workers made important gains (the 21¢ package, six paid holidays, reduction in North-South differential, 3 weeks vacation after 15 years, increased shift differential), these gains are far be-

low the actual bargaining position of the steelworkers, based on their actual strength. The ruling class succeeded, through the WSB and with Murray's collaboration, in sharply curtailing the gains that should have and could have been won.

The strength of the steelworkers is such that it could have prevented the price increase and won close to all the original 22 demands, thereby bringing about an actual rise in living standards and a vast improvement in working conditions. The strength of the steelworkers is such that it could have compelled the inclusion of the vital FEP clause in the contracts, and a flat across-the-board wage increase in place of the discriminatory classification-increase, and thereby have won a new status for the Negro members of the union by abolishing jim-crow departments and exclusion from skilled jobs. Had the policies proposed by the Left, and particularly the Communist Party as developed by William Z. Foster in his articles in the *Daily Worker*, been followed, this great strength of the steelworkers would have been given that necessary direction and leadership which would have won such a truly great victory in the shortest possible time.

Secondly, the ruling class and the Administration achieved considerable success in re-invigorating the two-party system during the strike and in sowing additional confusion on the question of the war and peace.

The steelworkers did not see the "fight" between Truman's seizure and the companies' demand for Taft-

Hartley injunction as being simply a division of labor between them for the purpose of preventing effective strike action and curtailing the union demands. Instead, this "tug-of-war" was viewed, thanks to the interpretation put upon it by the union leaders, as a struggle between Administration efforts "to find a way to help the strikers" and corporation efforts "to use the government machinery against the strikers." And while illusions that Truman would grant the WSB proposals on the heels of seizure were soon shattered, the attitude of the mass of steelworkers was expressed in belief that "bad as Truman is, the Republicans are worse," and "at least he's trying to find a way to help us."

Thus, the whole legal rigmarole and court fight around seizure, together with the other Administration and company maneuvers, served to keep the attention of the steelworkers and the labor movement riveted within the two-party structure, and thereby to strengthen the illusion that a solution to labor's problems can be found within the two-party system in general, and in the "lesser evil," the Democrats, in particular.

Thirdly, the ruling class succeeded in re-invigorating the workers' illusions of the reformist trade-union leadership with its policy of supporting the war drive.

It is true that the Murray leadership found it necessary to resort to unprecedented measures due to the rise in the fighting spirit, militancy and union consciousness of the rank and file. Such unusual measures

were
Janu
enla
Poli
mac
tion
to a
moo
mor
stre
file
But
lead
mar
had
it w
and
cont
pres
in t
dur
F
in p
tive
for
at t
F
thre
saw
wea
con
hou
of
tim
V
des
the
a r
bill
Th
con
195
tra

were the special convention early in January to discuss the wage fight, the enlarged meetings of the Wage Policy Committee, the relaxing of machine-control at the 6th Constitutional Convention in May sufficient to allow the rank and file's fighting mood to express itself. All this, and more, constitute a tribute to the strength and power of the rank and file which compelled these moves. But it is also true that the Murray leadership showed itself able to maneuver in this situation, that it had learned from past mistakes, that it was able to ride out the situation and, in most instances, keep it under control. As a result, much of the prestige which that leadership lost in the last two strikes was recouped during this strike.

Fourthly, the ruling class succeeded in part in advancing toward its objective of developing new conditions for making more and more profits at the expense of the workers.

Faced with overproduction and the threat of cut-backs, the steel barons saw in the strike an opportunity to weaken or destroy the union, worsen conditions, open the way to mad-house speed-up, and rid themselves of huge steel surpluses at the same time.

While they did not weaken or destroy the union, they did secure the introduction of the Smith Bill — a more far-reaching union-busting bill than any previously introduced. They succeeded in extending the contract an additional year to June, 1954, insuring themselves the contractual conditions for the drive

against job conditions, a drive they are already embarked upon. And they succeeded in eliminating a surplus estimated at some 20 million tons, almost equal to the annual output of Great Britain!

At the same time, the companies served notice that whether or not the management clause would be changed, they were going to enforce their own working conditions. At Jones & Laughlin in Cleveland, at Inland in East Chicago, at U.S. Steel's South Works and at Republic in Chicago, in Youngstown, at Buffalo and elsewhere, returning strikers found management arbitrarily cutting work crews and imposing new production schedules aimed at unheard-of speed-up. There can be no doubt that the insatiable steel corporations are embarking on an all-out assault on job conditions to squeeze even more fabulous profits out of the men and women who make steel.

The immediate strike action undertaken by the steelworkers in reply to this sneak-attack proves beyond any doubt that the steelworkers, far from exhausted by the 63-day strike, are more militant and more determined than ever to resist the new onslaughts of the steel monopolists. The struggles in steel, far from over, will become more intense.

WEAKNESSES IN THE STRIKE

It remains to be answered: why were the steelworkers unable to win all their demands and in short order? Why was the ruling class able to accomplish some of its objectives?

As William Z. Foster has proved, and as we have seen, the primary responsibility for this situation rests upon the Right-wing and reformist leaders of labor who support the war-making policies of the ruling class, who rely heavily on the Administration for support, who are tied to the two-party system and who fear any mass action and initiative of the rank and file.

It is quite clear that without the leaders of the most decisive unions (with the sole exception of John L. Lewis) taking a position and actively working for united labor action and solidarity in support of the steel strike, a nation-wide solidarity movement was out of the question at this time. And such a movement was one of the chief factors needed for a sweeping and speedy victory.

One of the unique and outstanding features of the steel struggle was the magnificent solidarity strike of the North country ore miners. By their strike action, the ore miners not only strengthened and shortened the strike of the basic steel workers, they also took into their own hands the solution of one of their oldest grievances, forcing an ore settlement simultaneously with steel, and reducing the wage differential between them. This is a splendid example of solidarity paying off in gains for the workers engaged in the solidarity action.

In general, however, it must be recognized that the Right-opportunist policies of the trade-union leaders are not without influence among the rank and file. What must be seen

most clearly is *how* this influence expresses itself and in what way the rank and file understands it. For while the Right-opportunist policies of the leadership must be *exposed* and *fought*, the rank and file must be won away from such influences. This rudimentary difference is not always understood.

Let us take, for example, the question of mass picketing. The membership saw no need for mass picketing for reasons quite different from those which moved the union leaders to discourage mass picketing.

The leaders did not want mass picketing because they placed their faith in the Administration and did not want to embarrass it. Moreover, they lack faith in the membership and simultaneously fear it would "get out of hand," and endanger their control.

The strikers, however, were supremely confident that there would be no scabs; and that if there should be, there would be immediate mass picketing. (This was substantiated by the one attempt at mass scabherding, at the Timken plants in Canton, Ohio, where instantaneous picket lines of upwards of 1500 strikers defeated this strike-breaking effort).

The strikers, with high union consciousness, had confidence in their own solid ranks and in their fellow-workers. But they did not see the danger of possible scab-running, did not understand the extent of the anti-labor aims of the ruling class, and their class vigilance was blunted by the expectation that "Washington

would pull something out of the hat." Hence, they did not see the significance of their own mass picketing and activity as a positive, independent policy for demonstrating their own strength, rallying the active support and sympathy of the whole labor movement, thereby bringing the strike to a speedy and more fruitful victory.

In such circumstances, what must be the role of the Left, and above all of the Communists?

Clearly, to explain again and again the class, anti-labor aims of Big Business and the Administration, the war and profit aims, the growing danger of an all-out attack on the labor movement, and the consequent need to develop an all-round, mass rank and file strike policy. What was especially needed was to explain again and again the *reasons* for such a policy, to develop clarity in place of confusion.

It must be said that, aside from *The Worker* and *Daily Worker*, most especially William Z. Foster's splendid articles, this was inadequately done.

Large quantities of material (no less than 500,000 pieces overall) were issued by the Party and by the Labor Youth League in the course of the strike (especially in Chicago-Gary, and to a lesser extent in Ohio, Buffalo, Eastern Pennsylvania) testifying to the vitality and initiative of the Party organizations and of the LYL. While this material played a very important role and was highly valued by the strikers, it must also be said that too much of it merely called

for more militant, fighting measures, and too little developed a clear-cut, independent rank and file policy distinct from the class collaborationist Murray policies.

Thus, the net effect was for the Left, and the Party, to appear to be only for more militancy as the means of attaining the self-same Murray policies. Much of the material of the Left repeatedly, and correctly, urged the strikers not to rely on Truman but rather to rely on their own economic power, to conduct mass picketing, etc. What was generally lacking in such calls was, 1—the *reasons* there should be no reliance on Truman, why the strikers should rely on their own strength and an adequate spelling out of how to do this; and, 2—a concrete answer to all the doubts and confusions which prevented them from seeing the necessity for such independent, mass rank and file policies.

NEED FOR INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION

For example, workers have learned from much experience that government power in present-day life plays a big role in labor struggles. Recalling the Roosevelt era, many retain illusions in what the Democratic administration will do for them. Recognizing the value of political action, they do not yet see *their own role* as most decisive in political action.

Simply to repeat, as a slogan, "Don't rely on Truman, rely on your own economic might!", does not answer what is in the minds of steel-

workers. More, such answers descend to economism when stated baldly and with no development. To show the need for mass picketing is one thing. To reduce everything to this and other purely economic activities of the workers is to lead them back from a position toward which they are groping. With all their illusions, the workers have learned the big role politics plays in their lives. Taft-Hartley, high taxes, high prices, etc., have re-inforced that lesson. Workers, especially workers on strike, must therefore be shown the need for a policy which not only realizes their economic might, but also realizes the tremendous political power they can become, provided they move along independent lines based on their class needs and interests.

The strike provided numerous instances which afforded the opportunity for the Left to demonstrate the need for an independent *political* as well as economic policy by labor. Despite many splendid supporting activities of the Party and the Left, the Left overall did not emerge in the thinking of masses of steelworkers with a distinct policy differentiated from that of the top union leaders. The basic reason for this will be found in continued Right-opportunist influences in the thinking of much of the Left and in our Party—underestimation of the strength of the working class and overestimation of the strength of the ruling class.

For example, there was the tendency to underestimate the duration of the strike and the speculation around how long it would last. This

was expressed, among other ways, in the failure to issue certain leaflets "because the strike might be over by the time we got them out"; in the failure to move sooner to rally support to the strike and to organize strike relief, in the expectation that the strike would be a very short one.

Here the thinking was that matters were almost exclusively in the hands of the Administration and the corporations, who "could not permit a long strike"; that the workers were "too much under the influence of 'national emergency' and could not prevent a top-deal which would make short shrift of the strike and leave them 'peanuts'". Clearly, this was a Right-opportunist estimate.

Another example was the too-ready accommodations of many Left forces to the inadequate WSB proposals, the consequent surrender of the fight for the original 22 demands, and the failure to popularize the Left program for the steelworkers.

THE NEGRO STEEL WORKERS

The strike was marked by a failure to develop a real fight on the FEP contract clause. The reason for this failure is the Right-opportunist lack of faith in the white workers and in their readiness to fight for equal rights. As in all previous strikes since 1937, the Negro steelworkers played a militant role far beyond their numbers in the union. This is something which many white workers, including Communists, have, unfortunately, come to take for granted.

Yet the steelworkers would be well

advised not to take this for granted. For, while the Negro workers took an active part in the strike in numbers far out of proportion to their membership, the settlement gave the Negro workers, as a whole, less of a wage increase than that won for the white workers as a whole. This is the third steel wage settlement based on the infamous classification increase, in which the lowest paid got the least increase and the highest paid got the biggest increase. The Negro workers are found primarily in job classifications 1 through 5, the lowest paid. Hence, the gap between lowest and highest paid, and consequently, between the Negro workers as a whole and the white workers as a whole, has been greatly increased.

Thus, the white workers as a whole were the beneficiaries of bigger wage increases, thanks, among other reasons, to the very great and particularly militant role played by the Negro steelworkers.

Is it not clear that Negro steelworkers will not forever go on accepting such a situation? Is it not clear that continued failure of white workers to show how highly they value that unity and militancy of Negro workers, which are so indispensable to strike victory, can alienate the Negro workers? Is it not clear that continued failure to reciprocate by fighting for FEP contract clauses, against jim-crow departments and against Negro exclusion from skilled jobs, as well as against the present iniquitous classification-increase system—that such continued failure can alienate the Negro workers, jeopardize

the unity of white and Negro workers and with it all the hard-won gains and the strength of the union?

Is it not clear further that if this situation were well understood by the white workers, they would see the danger to themselves and their union, and would see the absolute necessity to fight for winning a new, equal status of the Negro steelworkers, both in the industry and in the union?

That white workers can be won to wage such a fight is proved by the strike of the Timken Roller Bearing workers in Canton. There, the skilled steelworkers, overwhelmingly white, took a stand for a flat, across-the-board increase in opposition to the discriminatory classification-increase. Their outspoken reasons include their conviction that the lowest paid, primarily Negro workers, need the increase most. This position became the official policy of the local in the strike, and unquestionably was a decisive factor in the overpowering unity and militancy of the strikers who turned back scabs and company thugs day after day with thousands-strong picket lines. Another example was provided by the similar stand taken by the Homestead, Pennsylvania, strikers.

It is only a Right-opportunist lack of faith in the white workers and capitulation to white chauvinism which prevent the Left from fully bringing this most vital fight to the white workers.

There is no contradiction whatsoever between the fight against Right opportunism as the main dan-

ger, and the fight against sectarian methods of work. In fact, the fight against sectarian methods of work can be successful only when conducted in the context of the struggle against the main Right-opportunist danger.

The fight against Right-opportunism is the fight for a correct estimate of the actual situation, the actual strength of the working class and its allies, and of the ruling class. It is the fight against dependence on, and orientation to, the ruling class, and for reliance on the working class. Only such a fight makes possible the development of methods and tactics which are neither "Left" sectarian nor Right opportunist. Only such a fight can result in successful struggle against the Right-opportunism which permeates the labor movement.

WHAT LIES AHEAD FOR THE STEEL WORKERS?

1. Immediately, the steelworkers are confronted with the fact that the fight is not over. Even before the contracts had been formally signed, new strikes erupted against vicious company attacks to reduce work-crews, violate seniority and greatly increase the speed-up. As if by pre-arrangement, all the big companies have singled out a number of plants where the new drive on working conditions has been launched. While the companies are moving into battle in accord with a unified plan, the union is reduced to separate, guerilla-type actions, local by local.

There is urgent need, irrespective of the outcome of various local

strikes in the meantime, for a concerted union-wide policy and strategy to meet the new-on-the-job offensive of the companies. An emergency conference of all locals, union-wide, as well as company-wide, and the establishment of permanent company-wide union councils are urgently needed.

The Left should immediately project a forthright program to meet this situation, to include, among other things: no cutting of work-crews; against speed-up in all its forms; posting of job-promotion charts based on automatic seniority progression, plant-wide, thereby opening up skilled, higher-paid jobs to workers in unskilled and semi-skilled departments, which includes the bulk of the Negro workers; inclusion of FEP clause in supplementary local contracts pending its inclusion in the master contracts, etc.

Learning from the just-concluded nation-wide strike, solidarity and support to local strikes now in progress must be fully developed.

2. The unfolding of a program of political action based on the needs of the workers and the lessons of the strike stands as a major task.

One of the big achievements of the steel strike was the revival of the fight to repeal the infamous Taft-Hartley law as a big issue in the election campaign. The constant threat of Taft-Hartley which hung over the steel strikers, the incessant ruling-class demand for T-H injunction, brought home sharply the stark fact that labor cannot live with Taft-Hartley.

The utmost development of mass political and legislative action in all steel locals, aimed at T-H repeal, defeat of the Smith Bill, repeal of the Smith and McCarran Acts, for a Federal FEPC, for price and rent controls, for tax reductions based on reduction of arms expenditure, etc., is now required. The building up of mass Political Committees, based on such a program and aimed at developing the participation and initiative of the vast rank and file, must be encouraged everywhere. The idea of advancing steelworkers, and workers generally, for political office, city, state and national, must be popularized everywhere. It is along such lines that the first steps towards an independent political policy by the working class can be taken and the whole labor movement further strengthened.

3. Early next year, the steelworkers face the election of International officers, District directors, and Wage Policy Committee members.

These elections could be the occasion of electing a Negro steelworker to a top international office and advancing the fight for Negro representation at all levels of union leadership. The defeat of "shot-gun" Donovan's white supremacist leadership by a unity slate of Negro and white rank and filers in Cleveland's Republic Local 1157 is indicative of what can be done.

The development of broad coalition policies expressing the will of the rank and file can result in electing many more militant fighters to posts of higher leadership in the union.

4. The Left has new opportunities and new tasks as a result of the developing situation in the steel industry.

Immediately, there is need for bringing the fundamental lessons of the strike to the widest numbers of steelworkers, especially in the decisive plants. The more than half-million pieces of reading matter issued during the negotiations and the strike should be matched and surpassed in the post-strike period. Recalling that the union's original demands were for the most part identical with much of the economic program for the steel workers which our Party has advocated for many years, we should compare what the steelworkers won with the Party's steel program, as a yardstick for measuring what still remains to be won, as well as a basis for discussing what it will take to win it.

At the same time, there is need to re-examine the program in steel in the light of experience and the new situation. The program must be brought up to date, developed beyond economic matters alone, to include political action, the fight for peace, and a more complete development of the Negro question in the steel industry. Especially must it be placed within the perspective of the longer-range aims of the steelworkers and the working class as a whole.

The Party was strengthened organizationally during the strike. The advances made provide a good base for further strengthening and building of the Party, and for wider distribution of shop papers, our press and literature.

A Form of Socialist Democracy: People's Democratic Power*

By Leo Figueres

WE SHOULD LIKE in this article to dwell particularly on the development of people's democracy as a new and concrete form of the dictatorship of the proletariat—a subject which is of considerable practical and theoretical interest to Communists and to all democrats.

DECISIVE ROLE OF THE VICTORY OF U.S.S.R.

We know that the Great October Socialist Revolution opened the era of revolutions through which countries break away from the imperialist system. And the stronger the first Socialist country—base and forum of the international proletariat—has become, the more rapid has been this breakaway process, thus confirming the analysis made by Stalin more than twenty-five years ago: "the very process of the breaking away of a number of new countries from imperialism will be more rapid and more thorough, the more thoroughly Socialism fortifies itself in the first victorious country. . . ."¹

The historic victories won by the

* This article, here presented for the information of our readers, is translated from *Cahiers du Communisme*, Sept., 1952 (Condensed text)—Ed.

¹ Joseph Stalin, *Leninism* (International Publishers, n.d.) I, pp. 135-36.

Soviet Union in the Second World War, the strengthening of the land of Socialism, and the considerable weakening of world imperialism which resulted from that war, played the decisive role in freeing a whole series of European nations from capitalist and imperialist domination. The repercussions were as great in Asia, where the struggle for liberation of the peoples of China, Korea, Viet-Nam, and other colonial and semi-colonial countries was quickened and intensified.

The fact that it was the Soviet Army, educated in the spirit of friendship with other peoples and the deepest proletarian internationalism, and not another army, that entered Warsaw, Bucharest, Budapest, Prague, and Sofia as liberator was decisive in enabling the peoples of these countries to choose freely their path of further development. For, contrary to the vile slanders of the agents of imperialism, it was not the Soviet forces that imposed the rule of people's democracy; it was the peoples involved who freely chose it, after having forced it on the reactionary elements in their own country, in the course of a bitter struggle. What is true is that the mere pres-

ence of the Soviet Army heightened the confidence of these peoples, of the working-class and democratic forces, and that it prevented the success of numerous plots organized by the American, English, and French imperialists in an attempt to thwart the realization of the peoples' aspirations.

In contrast to the unhappy Greek people, on whom the bloody monarcho-fascist regime was imposed by the armed intervention of the Anglo-American "liberators," in contrast to the peoples of France, Italy, and other countries whose hopes were trampled underfoot as a result of the alliance between native reactionary forces and outside imperialist forces, the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania were able to take the path of complete renovation of their national and social life.

The Soviet Army completely fulfilled the role which Comrade Stalin had defined in the midst of the war against Hitlerism: "Our aid consists in assisting these peoples in their liberation struggle against Hitler tyranny and then setting them free to rule on their own land as they desire."²

STRUGGLE OF THE MASSES FOR PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY—THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

It is quite clear that though the

victory of the Soviet Army was the decisive factor in the people's democratic revolution in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, this revolution would not have been able to develop and triumph, had not the broad masses of the people in each of these lands, above all the working class, resolved to transform completely the living conditions in their country, had not the workers and other toilers led by the Communists fought tirelessly to this end.

Refuting the myth spread by the imperialists concerning alleged "Soviet interference," Comrade Mathias Rakosi, general secretary of the Hungarian Workers Party, declared at a recent conference: ". . . Without the heroic liberation struggle of the Soviet Union, without its continuous and generous support, the Hungarian People's Democracy—and we may add: the other countries of people's democracy as well—could not have been established. But it also could not have been established had not the Hungarian Communist Party, thanks to its self-sacrificing work, thanks to its example, thanks to its persistent and effective defense of the workers' interests, and thanks finally to its successful struggle against reaction, won over the great majority of the working class, the bulk of the peasantry, the most important sections of the toiling population. Anyone who does not understand that does not understand the role of our Party—or the role of Communist parties in general—which was in fact a decisive role. Thus, intention-

² Joseph Stalin, *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union* (a compilation of speeches and Orders of the Day), (International Publishers, N. Y., 1945) p. 33.

ally or unintentionally, he finally lands with those who attribute the creation of the people's democracies exclusively to 'Soviet interference'.³

Thus, people's democracy did not result from military victory alone. The latter merged with the mass struggle in each of these countries, a struggle which had been going on for decades, under the leadership of the Communists.

In all these countries, the Communist parties—parties of a new type—led the fight of the working class and the people, despite conditions of fascist terror. Except for Czechoslovakia, where until the Munich agreement of 1938 they were able to function legally, the Communists in the other countries worked for years under conditions of dangerous illegality. In Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria they led big strikes and struggles of the working peasants. They were active in powerful legal organizations and often led them. From 1935 on, they took the initiative in forming popular fronts which, in certain countries such as Romania, won successes at elections. Under conditions of the Hitlerite occupation, when the basic strategic task was to contribute to the defeat of the fascist invaders, they worked heroically against the anti-Soviet war. They took the leadership of the patriotic resistance movement, formed partisan units, and succeeded in creating and

developing powerful united national fronts of liberation, whose program served as a basis for the creation of people's democratic governments. Recall, for example, how in Bulgaria the popular pressure was strong enough to prevent the pro-Hitler government of that country from sending troops to wage war against the Soviet Union.

Of course, the people's democratic revolution was not completed when the country was liberated from the Hitler occupation and when those sections of the bourgeoisie and feudal landlords who had collaborated with the fascist invaders were eliminated. It extends over a long period and has specific features in each country.

In a recent report Comrade Vylko Tchervenkov, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, has analyzed the development of the people's democratic revolution in that country as follows:

On September 9, 1944, the rule of big capital, of the capitalist bourgeoisie, was overthrown by means of a popular armed uprising led by the Communist Party of Bulgaria and which relied on the Soviet Army, then victoriously entering Bulgaria. Power passed into the hands of the "overwhelming majority of the people, the working masses of town and countryside, with the active and leading role of the working class and its Communist vanguard. The uprising of September 9, which triumphed with the decisive aid of the heroic Soviet Army, paved the way for building

³ Mathias Rakosi, *The Path of Our People's Democracy*, Conference of February 29, 1952, republished in the Information Bulletin of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers Party, Special Edition, Budapest, 1952.

of so
Dim
TH
the
migh
strug
ner
powe
the p
whor
whil
tion
The
did
over
and
stage
in t
bour
the p
In
dem
a slo
in a
far
for
wer
Febr
risin
that
nists
N
gene
ple's
thes
the
ing
ation
Sovi
the
the
4 T
of the
Peace

of socialism in our country" (Georgi Dimitrov).

The working class, in alliance with the toiling peasantry, relying on the mighty political army, united in the struggle against fascism under the banner of the Fatherland Front, came to power and formed a government with the participation of its allies—some of whom were true allies, others waverers, while still others concealed their intention of resorting to subversive activity. The working class and its vanguard did not, at once, on September 9, take over the key positions in the State and in the economy: this was done in stages, in the course of the revolution, in the struggle against the capitalist bourgeoisie and their agents, against the pressure of the U.S. imperialists.⁴

In the other countries the people's democratic revolution developed at a slower pace than in Bulgaria and in a somewhat different manner. As far as Czechoslovakia is concerned, for example, the reactionary forces were not decisively defeated until February 1948, when the mass uprising of the workers foiled the plot that aimed at removing the Communists from the government.

Nevertheless, one may note several general traits common to the people's democratic revolution in all these countries: first of all, it was the result of the struggle of the working population in the favorable situation created by the victory of the Soviet Army; secondly, it combined the tasks of national liberation from the foreign fascist oppressors with

those of the social liberation of the workers and toiling peasants from their domestic exploiters; and finally, in each case, from the beginning of the revolution, the working class, guided by the Marxist-Leninist party, was the leading force.

This is emphasized by Comrade Chervenkov, in his above-quoted report, in the following terms:

During the three years which followed the uprising, the people's power fulfilled above all democratic, anti-imperialist tasks. Most of the means of production in industry still remained in the hands of the capitalist bourgeoisie. But even in these conditions the basis of people's democratic power as the power of the working class allied with the toiling peasantry was laid by the September 9 uprising, which opened the road to socialism in our country.

The fact that the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, played a leading role in the Fatherland Front, that they were a decisive force in this front and among the people, was of vital importance in the fate of the Fatherland Front. Power was actually in the hands of the local committees of the Fatherland Front, and in them the Communists played the main role.

These characteristics illustrate the fundamental difference between bourgeois democracy and people's democracy from the very outset.

FROM THE BEGINNING, PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY WAS A REVOLUTIONARY NEGATION OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

In the very first period of the people's democratic revolution the

⁴Chervenkov: Report to the Third Congress of the Fatherland Front, published in *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, June 13, 1952.

working class enjoyed hegemony, and the working-class party played the decisive role in state power, whatever the form of the latter and the number of Communist ministers in the government. . . .

The leading role played at the very outset of the people's democratic revolution by the working class and its party is therefore a fact of incalculable importance; it marks a decisive qualitative difference between this type of revolution and the classic bourgeois revolutions in the countries of Western Europe. And it is because they have not properly understood this fact that various theoreticians and political leaders in a number of countries have given wrong definitions of people's democracy.

Some saw in people's democracy a social and political system whose principles were qualitatively different from those hitherto laid down by Marxism-Leninism. Others considered it a compromise, a sort of "middle way" between capitalism and Socialism. Still others defined it as a special path toward Socialism, which did away with the need for dictatorship of the proletariat. Hence, the use of such unclear formulas as "democracy of a new type," "democracy of a special type," etc.

These confused definitions and formulas resulted finally in blurring the class character of the state in a people's democracy and the leading role of the working class; they did not emphasize that from its initial steps people's democracy demonstrat-

ed that it was the contrary of bourgeois democracy, its revolutionary negation.

The enemies of the people tried to exploit this confusion by developing in the lands of people's democracy hostile tendencies—above all, bourgeois nationalist tendencies. The infamous fascist clique of Tito raised the banner of Yugoslavia's special path to socialism. The trials of Rajk in Hungary and Kostov in Bulgaria showed that there too the enemies of the Soviet Union and of the party hid their dirty work behind the defense of the alleged "special nature" of people's democracy in those countries. In Poland the Rightist nationalist deviation led by Gomulka developed the theory of people's democracy as a "third way" and a road of peaceful advance toward Socialism.

With the help of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of the U.S.S.R. and of Comrade Stalin personally the mistakes were quickly corrected, and clear and precise definitions of the nature and class content of people's democracy in the countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe were formulated.

Analyzing, in December 1948, the nature of people's democracy, the late Georgi Dimitrov described its four basic features in his report to the 5th Congress of the Workers (Communist) Party of Bulgaria:

a) The people's democratic State represents the rule of the toiling people—of the overwhelming majority of the

people
worki

b)

a State

tioned

count

c)

built i

the So

ism.

d)

belong

periali

At

in his

ent C

Work

people

lution

people

head."

out th

form

exister

tures;

tion a

the ca

form

ening

cialist

Thu

mocra

ship

Social

fined.

It w

think

peared

Hitler

the co

torshi

this c

people, under the leadership of the working class. . . .

b) The people's democratic State is a State in the transitional period, destined to ensure the development of the country along the road to Socialism. . . .

c) The people's democratic State is built in cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union, the land of Socialism. . . .

d) The people's democratic State belongs to the democratic, anti-imperialist camp.

At the same time Comrade Bierut, in his report given at the Constituent Congress of the United Polish Workers Party, stressed that "the people's democratic state is the revolutionary power of the masses of the people, with the working class at its head." Later in his report he pointed out that "people's democracy is not a form of synthesis or of permanent co-existence of two different social structures; but it is the form of elimination and progressive liquidation of the capitalist elements, as well as the form of development and strengthening of the bases of the future Socialist economy."

Thus, the nature of people's democracy as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a form of Socialist democracy, was clearly defined.

It would be wrong, however, to think that people's democracy appeared immediately—as soon as the Hitlerite troops were driven out of the country—as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To clarify this question fully, we must con-

sider people's democratic power from the point of view of the course and continuous development of this state form.

TWO STAGES IN DEVELOPMENT OF PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

Closely examining the process of development of people's democracy in each of the countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, we may distinguish two stages.

The first stage was more or less long, depending on national conditions; but in general it is possible to place it between the liberation of the country and the early months of 1948.

It would be senseless to deny that there are considerable differences between these two stages. Thus, for example, in the first period the monarchy was still maintained in Bulgaria and Rumania; Benes was chief of state in Czechoslovakia; and a reactionary was at the head of the Hungarian government.

In this period the people's democratic revolution carried through tasks of the bourgeois revolution—such as, for example, agrarian reform, which led to the elimination of the class of wealthy landowners and the strengthening of the alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry.

Nevertheless, we must point out that even in this first stage, owing to the hegemony of the working class in the revolution and the decisive role of its Party in the government,

reforms of a Socialist character were made which went far beyond the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution.

All the leaders of the Communist and Workers parties in the people's democracies stress the two stages in the development of people's democracy, as well as the realization of Socialist tasks in the first stage.

Thus, at the conference alluded to above, Comrade Rakosi declared:

People's democracy contains two stages of development: the first stage, in the course of which the accomplishment of the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution predominates, and the second stage, in the course of which the decisive element is the dictatorship of the proletariat, the building of Socialism. Yet this comparison may give the impression that the two stages are clearly distinguishable from each other, whereas in our country, as in the other people's democracies, the two stages are intertwined. Accordingly, we have equally stressed that, from the moment of our liberation, the first stage already contained many elements of the dictatorship of the proletariat: for example, the leading role of the Communists, their participation in the government, the nationalization of the mines, the taking over of the armed forces, the smashing of the old state apparatus and the first efforts to form a new state apparatus manned by proletarian elements, etc. That we had to draw special attention to the fact that "we had crossed the Rubicon" shows likewise that this development occurred prudently, gradually, without marked clashes, that it took place without any destruction or bloodshed. This rela-

tively peaceful development of people's democracy constitutes a considerable power of attraction for the peoples and classes struggling for their liberation.

State power in the first stage of people's democracy may, to some extent, be likened to the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry as Lenin defined it in his work *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*; but only to some extent, for it is obvious that the situation in 1945, in view of the power of the U.S.S.R. and the victory of its army, was totally different from that which existed prior to the first Russian Revolution of 1905. Nevertheless, it was by grasping the essence of this idea of Lenin: "the hegemony of the working class in the bourgeois revolution—the working class *being allied* with the peasantry—must be transformed into the hegemony of the working class in the socialist revolution . . . and the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry must prepare the ground for the Socialist dictatorship of the proletariat,"⁸ that the Communist and Workers parties in the countries of people's democracy were able to solve all the anti-fascist, anti-feudal, and anti-imperialist problems posed in the first stage and then pass to a higher stage, that of Socialist construction—using people's democratic power, a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as their instrument.

But because concrete historical con-

⁸In this connection, see the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B)*, chapter 3, section 3.

ditions and, in the first place, the power of the U.S.S.R., enabled the people's democracies to pass from one stage to the other without a civil war like the one which occurred in Russia in 1917 and the years following, we must not conclude that this happened without struggle, in a completely peaceful manner. On the contrary, the period which runs from the liberation of the countries to the first six months of 1948 is marked by a bitter struggle in each country, in the course of which every working class party had to fight hard to win the majority of the working class and wrest the major portion of the other toilers from the influence of the reactionaries.

In Poland the struggle, in the first years, even assumed a sharply military character. It is not generally known that more than 20,000 members of the Polish Workers Party were killed in the course of battles occurring between 1945 and 1947 against gangs of fascist bandits who were supported by Polish reactionaries and the Anglo-American imperialists.

Reaction was not really crushed in Poland until the general elections of January 1947, which gave an absolute majority to the bloc formed under the leadership of the Polish Workers Party, and in which Mikolajczyk's party was overwhelmingly defeated.

In the other countries there were no military engagements as bloody as those in Poland, but the struggle was no less sharp and fierce.

In Bulgaria the monarchy remained until September, 1946. Although conditions in that country were initially quite favorable, nevertheless the agents of imperialism — Petkov's Agrarian Party and the organization of Right-wing Social Democrats— had to be unmasked, isolated from the masses, and eliminated.

In Rumania the Republic was not proclaimed until the end of 1947, and the first two governments that succeeded the regime of the Hitlerite Antonescu were openly led by reactionaries. We may recall how Radescu did not hesitate to order soldiers to fire on a people's demonstration. The Rumanian Communist Party led a long and persistent struggle to win the majority of the people to the cause of people's democracy. Comrade Gheorghiu Dej, General Secretary of the Rumanian Workers Party, pointed out at the first conference of the Information Bureau of Communist and Workers parties that it was mass action which forced through the revolutionary measures of the first period:

As an answer to Radescu's refusal to replace Antonescu's mayors and prefects, we issued the slogan that the masses should proceed to install new mayors and prefects, named by the people. . . . When the agrarian reform was sabotaged, the Communist Party and the Plowman's Front called upon the landless and poor peasants themselves to break up the estates of the big landlords. Following this advice, the bulk of the peasantry put into effect

our program in the field of agrarian reform. . . .⁶

The same thing happened in Hungary, where the reactionaries were quite strongly entrenched. Rakosi has clearly explained how the Communists helped the masses learn from their own experience, how they exposed in succession the reactionary and pro-imperialist policies of the Party of Small Landholders, the Social-Democrats, and the Catholic hierarchy, how little by little they won the confidence of the majority of the working class and the toiling peasantry. How many know that after the elections of November, 1945, Hungarian reaction had grown so strong that it was taking back from the poor peasants the land given them by the agrarian reform? That the toilers of the countryside had to be organized in a struggle to guarantee the results of that reform? That a demonstration of 400,000 workers had to be organized in Budapest to force the leadership of the Party of Small Landholders to expel twenty-one of its openly fascist members?

The fight waged in Czechoslovakia between 1945 and February 1948 is better known. To open the road to Socialism, to a genuine people's democracy, to the working class and its allies led by the Communist Party had to struggle every inch of the way in the government and in the country against the reactionaries supported by foreign imperialism. Just remember that most of the key min-

istries of the national economy were in the hands of reactionaries, who used them to sabotage the life of the country. The Communist Party had to have real leadership of the working class and the people to smash the attempted *coup d'état*, to liquidate the worst reactionaries, to strengthen the positions of the working class in the state, and to open the road to socialist construction.

Thus, the winning over by the Communists of the decisive majority of the working class and the basic strata of the toiling peasantry, and the isolation and liquidation of the reactionary elements—after three and four years of patient and persistent struggles—were conditions for the transition from the first to the second stage in the development of people's democracy, the stage in which it completely takes over the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the phase of Socialist revolution.

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY AS A NON-SOVIET FORM OF DICTA- TORSHIP OF THE PROLE- TARIAT

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the road from capitalism to socialism passes of necessity by way of the socialist revolution, by means of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . .

But while they have shown that state power in the transitional period between capitalism and communism cannot be anything but the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin and

⁶ For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy, Dec. 15, 1947.

Stalin
variet
pow
tasks
ing th
In
olutio
from
certai
abund
essen
The
An
—“A
peria
phasi
cialis
natio
same
speci
racy
letari
at wh
tion
life.”

TH
inco
dicta
tory
com
the c
victo
arise
pow
It
in c
Sovi
exist

7 L
8 L
liber

Stalin have always spoken of the variety of forms which working-class power can take, with the essence and tasks of this power obviously remaining the same.

In his famous work *State and Revolution*, Lenin wrote: "The transition from capitalism to Communism will certainly bring a great variety and abundance of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be only one: *The dictatorship of the proletariat.*"⁷

And in his article written in 1916 — "A Caricature of Marxism and 'Imperialist Economism'" — Lenin emphasized: "All nations will reach Socialism; this is inevitable. But not all nations will reach Socialism in the same way; each will introduce a special feature in the form of democracy it adopts, in the form of the proletarian dictatorship, and in the rate at which it carries out the reconstruction of the various phases of social life."⁸

The Paris Commune was still an incomplete form of the proletarian dictatorship. Since October 1917 history has revealed its highest, most complete form: Soviet power. From the conditions created by the historic victory over the fascist states has arisen a new, non-Soviet form: the power of people's democracy. . . .

It will be noted, for example, that in contrast to what happened in the Soviet Union from 1918 on, there still exist several political parties in most

of the people's democracies. These parties express the interests of the non-proletarian elements, but they fully recognize the guiding role of the party of the working class.

Hence, whatever differences in form there may be, the essence of power, its nature and its tasks remain the same, especially if one compares the people's democracies in their present stage with the Soviet State in the first period of its development. . . .

As Soviet power was and still is for the U.S.S.R., so people's democratic power constitutes the most powerful instrument of Socialist transformation in the people's democracies. The great successes achieved by these countries in the field of industrialization, in organizing an agriculture based on modern techniques, and in building a culture which is national in form and Socialist in content, would not have been achieved without a power created on the ruins of the old state machinery in the course of several years of the people's democratic revolution.

The special feature of people's democratic power is that, having arisen from the victory won over the fascist countries by the heroic Soviet Army, it was able to consolidate itself and develop under relatively calm conditions, without great internal upheavals and sheltered against foreign intervention. This it owes to the existence of the first socialist state, to the existence of an unshakable dem-

⁷ Lenin: *State and Revolution*, ch. 2.

⁸ Lenin, *Collected Works* (International Publishers, 1942), IX, pp. 256-57.

ocratic and anti-imperialist camp led by the Soviet Union.

The originality of the march toward socialism by these countries by means of people's democracy lies also in the fact that they benefit continuously from the disinterested help of the Soviet Union in every field, that they are able to profit from the rich experience of the U.S.S.R. in building socialism. They are not isolated, as was the young Soviet Power in 1917. This enables them to build up their economy at an extremely rapid pace.

Basically, therefore, it is in the historical conditions prevailing at the formation and development of people's democracy that one finds its special features.

People's democratic power is a continuous creation which will improve still further until it reaches the higher level of Socialist democracy, such as has long existed in the Soviet Union. The constitutions of the people's democracies which, like the Stalinist Constitution, reflect what the working people have already won and obtained, show the progress achieved by people's democracy at the various stages.

The preamble of the proposed new Polish Constitution states clearly: "The basis of the existing people's power in Poland is the alliance between the working class and the working peasantry. In this alliance the leading role belongs to the working class as the vanguard class in society, relying on the revolutionary conquests of the Polish and the international working class movement,

on the historic experience of the victorious Socialist construction in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—the first state of workers and peasants."

Likewise in Article 2 of the proposed new Constitution of the Rumanian People's Republic we read: "The basis of people's power in the Rumanian People's Republic is the alliance of the working class and the toiling peasantry, an alliance in which the leading role belongs to the working class."

This means that the working class is at the head of the State; it means dictatorship of the proletariat; it means Socialist democracy and drawing the vast majority of the city and rural population into the actual management of public affairs—in contrast to what is happening in the bourgeois countries, where in actuality power is in the hands of a tiny minority of capitalists.

That is the profound significance of people's democratic power at the present stage of its development.

A FEW CONCLUSIONS

The working class and people of France may draw several valuable lessons from a study of the conditions in which people's democracy was born, developed, and has been definitely consolidated.

First of all, we find confirmation of the tremendous and decisive role played in the present period of history by the mighty land of the Soviets, the country of Lenin and Stalin,

whose
Second
ples
to cho
we fou
in fro
yoke.

At
weake
reacti
ism to
march
every
crush
the V
march
1920,
of all
world
again
to the
world
Social
all so
not b
demo
conso
all fig
comp
the c
forces
preve

whose efforts and sacrifices in the Second World War enabled the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe to choose freely their path; nor must we forget that these were also decisive in freeing France from the fascist yoke.

At the same time, the considerable weakening in the possibilities of the reactionary forces of world imperialism to halt the progress and forward march of the peoples is visible to everyone. The Paris Commune was crushed at the end of two months by the Versailles with the aid of Bismarck. Soviet Power, from 1918 to 1920, had to fight against a coalition of all the capitalist countries in the world, which waged a terrible war against it. Today, thanks above all to the power of the U.S.S.R. and the world camp of democracy, peace, and Socialism, the imperialists—despite all sorts of plots and threats—have not been able to prevent the people's democracies from developing and consolidating themselves. This gives all fighters for the cause of the people complete confidence in the future and the certainty that in our time the forces of the people will successfully prevent the warmongers from carry-

ing out their criminal designs.

Attentively and in a spirit of modesty we must study the tremendous task of winning over the masses accomplished by our brother-parties in the people's democracies, after the liberation of those countries. The struggle to win the masses was a long and arduous one. Had it not been victorious, the new power could never have been consolidated.

This experience demonstrates the truth of what Maurice Thorez has so often repeated: there is no progress without struggles, just as there is no large-scale project which can be carried out without the support of the majority of the working class and other toilers.

That is undoubtedly the greatest lesson we can learn today when, under different conditions, our central task consists of mobilizing the broad masses of our people to halt the warmongers, of uniting in a vast united front all Frenchmen and Frenchwomen—regardless of political opinions, religious faith, and social status—who wish to save our country from destruction and to impose a genuine policy of peace and national independence.

A "NEW" THEORY OF CAPITALISM

By Peter Colton

American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power, by J. K. Galbraith. Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston. 217 pages, \$3.00.

TREADING A PATH heavily strewn with the bleached bones of his ideological predecessors, once again a professor of economics sets out in quest of a "new" theory of capitalism.

This time, however, it is no ordinary book-bound scholar who undertakes the journey. J. K. Galbraith, now at Harvard University, was formerly price chief of the O.P.A., head of the Office of Economic Security Policy of the State Department, an editor of *Fortune*, and recently one of Governor Stevenson's speech-writers.

What prompts Professor Galbraith's quest is the paradoxical circumstances that for America "the five years following World War II were ones of high production and generous profits" and yet "there was deep uneasiness over the economy" (p. 2).

This uneasiness was "greatest among businessmen, who not only complained loudly about "statism" and "socialism," but privately shared the fear that "private capitalism is inherently unstable" (p. 5). Meanwhile, liberals, convinced too that this was the case, "had further causes for disquiet." Research had revealed the power of the monopolies and anti-trust laws had failed to curb them. "Thus, to his uneasiness over power for which he had no rationaliza-

tion, the liberal was forced to add a further component of despair" (p. 7).

This, then, is the "remarkable problem of our times. . . . We find ourselves in these strange days with an economy, which on grounds of sheer physical performance few are inclined to criticize . . . yet almost no one feels secure in the present" (p. 8).

The answer, concludes the professor, "can only be that there is something wrong with the current or accepted interpretations of American capitalism. . . . The trouble lies not with the world but with the ideas by which it is interpreted. It is the ideas which are the source of the insecurity—the insecurity of illusion" (pp. 8, 9).

Thus the "trouble" lies not with the world of capitalism but with the ideas which capitalists (and liberals) entertain about capitalism. And the aim of the professor's modest little volume is to dispose of the economic ideas which constitute the "trouble," replace them with his "new" theory of capitalism, and thus rescue businessmen from their "insecurity illusions" (and liberals from their despair)!

• • •

With this motive thus candidly stated, it is not surprising that Professor Galbraith comes up with one of the flimsiest "new" theories in the history of capitalist apologetics.

It is simple enough for him to dispose of the outmoded ideas whose continued

hold he finds to be the source of "insecurity." For these are the ideas of the classical political economy of Smith, Ricardo and Mill, and at some length the professor shows how developments in the 1930's shattered two basic requirements of the classical system. (Naturally, he makes no mention of the fact that Marx and Lenin settled these and many other questions long before).

The first requirement of the classical system is competition. But during the '30's studies of monopolies and semi-monopolies showed that there was "extensive concentration in American industry." And "an economy where the typical industry is shared by a few firms is awkwardly inconsistent with a theory of capitalism which requires that power to affect prices or wages or output or investment be impersonally governed by the reactions of the many" (p. 39).

The second requirement took the form of Say's Law of Markets which, asserting that capitalism provides an automatic balancing of supply and demand, "went far to preclude either a serious depression or a violent inflation" (p. 14). But the Great Economic Crisis of the '30's finished off Say's Law and left in its wake a "depression-psychosis" (while the spending implications of Keynesian theory added to business concern over government economic intervention).

It is the professor's contention, however, that none of the dire consequences of monopoly power came to pass which adherents of the classical ideas anticipated. Not only did a post-war depression fail to materialize, but, in particular, he finds, *monopoly power has been exercised with unexpected restraint and has turned out to be a veritable blessing in disguise with its*

stimulation of technical advances!

The author, therefore, concludes that the classical ideas, especially regarding competition and monopoly, must be replaced with a new interpretation of capitalism—and this he undertakes to provide through his concept of *countervailing power*.

His starting-point is the proposition that: "With the widespread disappearance of competition in its classical form and its replacement by the small group of firms if not in overt, at least, in conventional or tacit collusion, it was easy to suppose that since competition has disappeared, all effective restraint had disappeared."

But he finds:

"In fact new restraints on private power did appear to replace competition. They were nurtured by the same process of concentration which impaired or destroyed competition. But they appeared not on the same side of the market but on the opposite, not with competitors but with customers or suppliers. It will be convenient to have a name for this counterpart of competition and I shall call it *countervailing power*.

"To begin with a broad and somewhat too dogmatically stated proposition, private economic power is held in check by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it. The first begets the second. . . .

"The fact that a seller enjoys a measure of monopoly power and is reaping a measure of monopoly return as a result means there is an inducement to those firms from whom he buys or those to whom he sells to develop the power with which they can defend themselves against exploitation. It means also that there is a reward to them in the form of a share of the gains of their opponents' market power. In this way the existence of market power

creates an incentive to the organization of another position of power that neutralizes it" (pp. 118, 119).

Before turning to Professor Galbraith's theory of *countervailing power*, we may well spend a few moments on the "remarkable problem" to which his theory is addressed.

The professor's main initial premise is that the American capitalist system performed brilliantly in the five-year period following World War II. If, then, widespread feelings of insecurity nonetheless persisted, he concludes, these can have no *real* foundation in the operation of the capitalist system but must arise from wrong *ideas* about capitalism.

But this main premise is obvious nonsense! The Professor is indeed right about the "generous profits"; but had he presented the actual facts about the "sheer physical performance," the real reasons for the continued feelings of insecurity would have been all too clear.

What are the actual facts? (1) In the period of post-war "reconversion" *the index of industrial production dropped nearly 30 per cent* from the 1943 wartime peak of 239 (where 1935-9 equals 100) to 170 in 1946. And this, despite the huge backlog of civilian production and consumption needs, a large post-war export surplus, inventory building, a considerable increase in consumer credit, etc.

(2) Production showed a 10 per cent increase in 1947 to 187 (due to the above factors and especially to the drastic price-inflation of late 1946-7). But in 1948 production rose only 3 per cent — *even with a 33 1/3 per cent increase in Federal expenditures for goods and services, primarily for "national security."*

(3) *Production actually began to decline late in 1948 and, despite growing*

war expenditures, quickly fell 17 1/2 per cent from 195 (November 1948), to 161 (July, 1949). As a result, the year's production which was 192 in 1948 declined 8 per cent to 176 in 1949.

(4) Finally, the mid-'49 upturn, due to the credit-financed boom in housing and consumer durables together with the continued high level of government expenditures on war preparations (19 billion in 1949), raised production for the first half of 1950 to 189—*virtually the same as 1947*. And the economic picture in June 1950 showed *the American economy poised on the edge of a major decline — just at the moment when American intervention in Korea loosed a vast new flood of arms orders*. Thus, Professor Galbraith's base period of mid-'45 to mid-'50 was scarcely one of stability and security. Nor do the subsequent two years offer him any comfort. Despite the huge expansion in war expenditures following the Korean intervention (*from 18 billion, in annual rates, in the third quarter of 1950 to 45 billion in the fourth quarter of 1951*), *industrial production after moving up to 222 in the second half of 1951 has since remained stagnant or declined*.

Small wonder then that the feeling of insecurity mounts and that today virtually all economists are predicting a "recession" of varying degrees of severity setting in at various points in 1953!

But Professor Galbraith is more interested in presenting his "new" theory of capitalism than in analyzing the system's actual performance. For such an analysis would reveal that the "trouble" lies with capitalism, and not simply with capitalists' ideas about it. It would reveal that the widespread insecurity reflects the inherent instability of capitalism and not simply the persistence of

outn
this
the
lous
stave

A
theo
the p
can
idea
stabl
the
resto
in r
sor
in t
econ
brai
unab
merc
M
brai
day
with
crisi
ever
gene
omis
with
or a
onci
lif
talis
T
theo
to
som
mov
Cris
in
thro
gove
sent
Key
geoi

outmoded ideas. It would reveal that this inherent instability has now reached the point where even the present fabulous war expenditures can no longer stave off a major crisis.

• • •

An economist who can base a "new" theory of capitalism on the premise that the performance of the post-war American economy obviously disproves any idea that capitalism is inherently unstable, can likewise candidly admit that the purpose of his theory is simply to restore confidence in that system. Only in respect to his candor is the professor original. Otherwise he is squarely in the long tradition of the "vulgar" economists, as Marx called the Galbraiths of his day who, unwilling or unable to explain capitalism, sought merely to justify it.

More specifically, Professor Galbraith belongs in the ranks of the latter-day "vulgar" economists. Confronted with the undeniable facts of economic crisis and monopoly power—emerging ever more sharply in the period of the general crisis of capitalism—these economists replace the classical system, not with a real alternative, but with one or another "theory" which seeks to reconcile these facts with a continuing belief in the "inherent stability" of capitalism.

Thus, Keynes in the '30's devised a theory that admitted crises but sought to locate their cause (and cure) in something controllable, namely the movements of investment and savings. Crises occurred but were not inherent in the system and could be "offset" through proper policies of business and government without changing any essential feature of capitalism. Naturally, Keynes thus became a hero in the bourgeois world—all the more since his

theory later seemed to offer a "liberal" rationale for the war-spending policies of the recent years.

What Keynes attempted to do with respect to crises, Professor Galbraith now would do in regard to monopoly power. But his contribution is such a transparent—and in the end irrelevant—piece of apologetics that his value to the bourgeoisie is apt to be very limited.

For the sum and substance of the professor's theory of countervailing power is the notion that while monopolies (and semi-monopolies) exist, they are *no cause for concern because they generate their own restraints or offsets*; that is, "private economic power is held in check by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it" (p. 118). This proposition is so much in the vein of Dr. Pangloss' best of all possible worlds that the professor later confesses somewhat shamefacedly that "liberals will almost certainly detect here a nefarious whitewash of crypto-monopoly and bigness" (p. 173).

The only way he can give any semblance of justification to this comforting proposition is by deliberately lumping together under the label of "monopoly" trade unions as well as corporations, farm organizations as well as chain stores, etc. Thus, the steel trust "generates" as an offset the countervailing power of the "labor monopoly"; the consumer is "protected" by the countervailing power which the grocery-chain exercises against producer monopolies! (In this Alice-in-Wonderland economics, it appears that "in the ultimate sense, it was the power of the steel industry not the organizing abilities of John L. Lewis and Philip Murray that brought the United Steel Workers into being" (p. 121).

The concept of countervailing power

erves, therefore, to weaken and disrupt the anti-monopoly struggle by deliberately confounding inter-monopoly battles with people's basic fight against monopoly—and by imparting to the latter a kind of automatic, spontaneous character—with a “neutral” government hovering in the wings ready to “buttress weak bargaining.” More, it feeds reaction's anti-labor drive by making “labor monopolies” the outstanding example of countervailing power and a proper subject for government intervention if their bargaining position is deemed “unduly strong.”

Finally, to the transparency of the theory, the author himself adds the ultimate defect—irrelevancy. For it seems that there is a “major limitation on the operation of countervailing power . . . It does not function at all as a restraint when there is inflation”! (p. 133). But hasn't inflation become the rule, not the exception, in our war-based economy?

It is therefore not altogether surprising that in the summary, a scant dozen pages before he concludes, Professor Galbraith suddenly admits: “However, we are not left without troubles . . . As this book goes to press (in the summer of 1951) military expenditures are increasing rapidly . . . Accordingly inflation must be considered not a possibility but a probability . . . Where there is inflation, as noted, the self-regulatory mechanism based on countervailing power breaks down.”

In short, his theory on his own admission does not apply at all to the actual present-day American economy!

The truth of these matters is, of course, that business monopolies (and there are no others) have grown enormously in the United States over the decades and dominate our economic and political life. If they have not

reduced the laboring people to virtual serfdom and total misery it is only because of the active class struggle of the American working class, its unions, its allies, its advanced forces, including Communists. If the American trusts in their mad quest for maximum profits have not already plunged us into World War III it is only because of the active peace struggle of the world peace camp, headed by the Soviet Union, and embracing along with People's China and the Peoples' Democracies, vast sections of the peace-loving peoples of the colonial world, Western Europe and the Americas.

It is this conscious, organized struggle against the monopolies and their policies which Professor Galbraith tries to replace with his abstract, passive, classless concept of “countervailing power.”

Brushing aside the flimsy apologetics of the Galbraiths, the progressive labor forces must address themselves, as many are doing, to the real problems posed by monopoly and its program of war, inflation and crisis. Today, American labor sees increasingly that it is “war prosperity,” not security, which is the illusion. And it needed no demagogic reminder from candidate Eisenhower (*New York Times*, October 3) to realize that “the average family's income in 1951 was worth less to it than its 1945 income.”

But to the broad struggle now taking place against the disastrous effects of the war economy—the wage-freeze, high taxes, inflationary prices—must be added a concrete program to fight the threatening economic crisis. In particular, the Communists, rejecting the false dilemma of war or crisis, have the responsibility, in the light of their Socialist perspectives, of bringing such a program to the people and gaining mass support for it.

DEAR I
In
reader
I am s
take th
ment.

Wu
of Self
makes
estima
party
by the
the in
icism
sue, I
Doxey
Nation
In thi
himse
and in
clarifi
cept o

Wh
in pra
two a

DEAR
I a
tation
ticle
deepl
as a

Letters from Readers

New York

DEAR EDITOR:

In your August issue you invite reader contributions and comments. . . . I am sure many readers will be glad to take the opportunity offered for comment.

Wu Ch'iang's article, "On Problems of Self-Criticism," in the August issue makes the point that it is possible to estimate the revolutionary spirit of a party or an individual party member by the manner in which the party or the individual grasps and utilizes criticism and self-criticism. In the same issue, I read with the utmost interest Doxey A. Wilkerson's paper on "Race, Nation and the Concept 'Negro.'" In this article Mr. Wilkerson criticizes himself for an earlier incorrect concept, and in a most constructive manner fully clarifies the proper Marxist-Leninist concept of this important issue.

What a perfect illustration of theory in practice and how fortunate that these two articles appeared in the same issue!

A WOMAN ARTIST

Cleveland

DEAR COMRADE EDITOR:

I am taking advantage of your invitation for letters of comment. The article by Doxey Wilkerson interested me deeply from two points of view: one, as a contribution to the understanding

of the Negro question; two, as a contribution to the understanding of self-criticism. Wu Ch'iang says, in the same issue, that such criticism strengthens one's connections with the masses and I am sure Comrade Wilkerson will receive many letters and other evidences of people's deep gratitude for his splendid and clear expositions.

I found especially helpful the explanation that the *fact* of race distorted by the imperialist *idea* of racism plays a strong unifying role both in the development of the Negro nation in this country and in cementing the unity between all colored peoples against the imperialists in the interests of peace and democracy. . . .

But I should like to ask one further question if I may. Wu Ch'iang says in his article on self-criticism that "it is essential to examine the development of the error—to search out the roots of it." Now, Comrade Wilkerson says that the "correct struggle of Marxism-Leninism vs. the false and misleading 'race problem' conception of the Negro question . . . has been distorted by many progressives into a rejection of the concept of race altogether"; but he does not say how come the struggle was distorted. At the end he says the errors were corrected by the use of the Marxist-Leninist theory, and all through the article he gives fine and powerful quotations

from the classics on the subject of race and nation. But the distortion was made by a number of people, including Comrade Wilkerson, who were doing a great deal of study in the Marxist-Leninist theory. Was it that they pursued an incorrect method of study? Are our students perhaps inclined to Ivory Tower methods? Maybe one should "try out" new theories among the workers? I am sure they would have rejected this particular distortion. Of course the workers are not necessarily correct at all times, but in their arguments and the line they take in rejecting or accepting, the student can learn something as to the validity of his ideas. I do not think that distortions just have to happen because we live in a distorted bourgeois society. That seems to me to be begging the question. I would very much like to read some discussion on this matter.

With many thanks to *P.A.* and Comrade Wilkerson for a fine job which has been a great help to many of us.

KATEY P.

New York

TO THE EDITOR:

Katey P's letter correctly points to an important limitation of my recent article . . . namely, its failure to analyze the sources of the theoretical errors there corrected. This question was given considerable attention during the critical and self-critical discussions out of which my article grew; and only the space limitations of *POLITICAL AFFAIRS* account for its exclusion as published.

Both theoretical and political weaknesses contributed to the deviationist error, i.e., negation of the role of race and African heritage in the formation of the Negro nation—which I and

some of my associates brought to a "high" point of development a little over a year ago. Mere enumeration of the chief weaknesses must here suffice.

1. Inadequate mastery of existing Marxist-Leninist theory on the national question in general, and on the Negro question in particular.

2. An idealist, metaphysical approach to the question, rather than correct application of the scientific methodology of dialectical materialism.

3. Academic pre-occupation with abstract definitions, rather than primary concern for the urgent requirements of the current political struggle—reflecting, incidentally, a pattern of life too far removed from the concrete problems and day-to-day struggles of the working class and Negro masses.

Katey P's concluding suggestion is one which Marxist intellectuals would do well to heed. Let us, indeed, "try out" new theories among the workers!"

DOXEY A. WILKERSON

Los Angeles

COMRADE EDITOR:

In the August issue of *POLITICAL AFFAIRS* an article was written which should clear in the minds of white progressives, the term white chauvinism as applied in relation to Asians and other colored peoples. In the past I as a Japanese have come across white progressives who are vehement in their opposition to the usage of the term white chauvinism in relation to acts of chauvinism towards Japanese and who state that the term is only applicable to chauvinistic acts against Negroes. I feel that clarity on this question is essential to the whole fight against imperialism and the war in Korea.

Doxey Wilkerson, in the above-men-

tion
be
chau
natio
racia
Effe
nism
ing
weap
cour
the v
ing
white
again
again
such
India
Chin
other
of be
and
white
It
IPP
of th
killin
ever,
mass
chau
natio

REAL
word
welc

tioned article, points out that: "It should be emphasized that the concept 'white chauvinism' embodies both the idea of national superiority ('chauvinism') and racial prejudice ('white superiority'). Effective struggle against white chauvinism must rest upon a full understanding of the nature of this ideological weapon of imperialism—and also, of course, of its corrupting impact upon the working class. It is also worth noting that the imperialist ideology of white chauvinism is directed not alone against the Negro people, but also against other 'dark skinned' peoples—such as Puerto Ricans and Cubans, West Indians, Mexicans, Indians, Filipinos, Chinese, and Japanese. Thus, these and other 'colored' peoples are the objects of both racial *and* national oppression. and of the corresponding ideology of white chauvinism."

It was correctly pointed out at the IPP convention by Art Takei that one of the ideological bases for the war and killing in Korea was "racism." However, the correct scientific term for the mass genocide policy in Korea is white chauvinism (the embodiment of both national supremacy and white su-

premacy). It is evident to me that this white chauvinism permeates some individuals in the progressive movement by the type of, the level and degree of, struggle being conducted on the ideological front against this white chauvinism of the American imperialists. The American imperialists declared that they were going to level out 78 key cities in Korea. This policy of mass destruction should have been met by protests from every source possible, primarily the trade unions and church groups; nevertheless, for the historical record we find no such protest from these two major segments of the American people. The fact that this question was never raised in the immediate terms necessary shows that no adequate ideological battle was raised against this white chauvinism of the imperialists. This indicates that many white progressives have not waged a hard enough battle with themselves to rid their own thinking of white chauvinism and that they have narrowed their forms of struggle and not taken a flexible approach in the fight to end the war in Korea. . . .

A. S.

READERS ARE cordially invited to submit manuscripts, not exceeding 4,000 words, for publication in POLITICAL AFFAIRS. Letters of comment will also be welcomed; those submitted for publication should not exceed 400 words.

THE EDITOR.

Recent Books

- IN BATTLE FOR PEACE, by W. E. B. Du Bois
Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.00
- A LANTERN FOR JEREMY, by V. J. Jerome \$2.50
- IRON CITY, by Lloyd L. Brown Cloth \$3.00; Paper \$1.50
- WE CAN BE FRIENDS, by Carl Marzani
Cloth \$3.50; Paper \$1.00
- DAUGHTERS AND SONS,
by Kung Chueh and Yuan Ching \$3.50
- SPARTACUS, by Howard Fast Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF

Political Affairs, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1952.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Editor, V. J. Jerome, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Managing Editor, Herbert Aptheker, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 7th day of October, 1952.

(Seal)

MYRON J. BLUTTER

(My commission expires March 30, 1954)

Y
e,
A-

ss
;
rt
2

ed
g
es
er
f,
;

g
re

er
pc
in
es
he
of

d,
he
d

)