

OCTOBER 1974

# political affairs

**Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis**

**FRONT-RANKERS IN THE  
CLASS STRUGGLE (I)**

Henry Winston

**NEW DANGERS AND NEW POSSIBILITIES  
FOR THE AUTO WORKERS**

Thomas Dennis

---

**THE ECONOMICS BEHIND ABEL'S  
MISLEADERSHIP**

James West

---

**A COMMUNIST CAMPAIGN IN SAN JOSE**

Bettina Aptheker and Jack Kurzweil

**THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE STRUGGLE  
FOR DETENTE**

John Pittman

**25 YEARS OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC  
REPUBLIC**

Margrit Pittman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Henry Winston*

Front-Rankers in the Class Struggle (I) 1

*Thomas Dennis*

New Dangers and New Possibilities for  
the Auto Workers 13

*James West*

The Economics Behind Abel's Misleadership 24

*Bettina Aptheker and Jack Kurzweil*

A Communist Campaign in San José 35

*John Pittman*

The United Nations and the Struggle for Detente 44

*Margrit Pittman*

25 Years of the German Democratic Republic 55

COMMUNICATIONS

*Joseph Norrick*

On Dealing with the "Ultra-Left" 63

---

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$7.50 a year; \$3.75 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$8.50 a year. Single copies 75 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N.Y.

HENRY WINSTON

## Front-Rankers in the Class Struggle (I)

The style in attacks on Marxism-Leninism in the name of "revolution" changes, it sometimes seems, almost as frequently as traffic lights. And these "revolutionary" assaults—which always have as their core a challenge to the Marxist-Leninist concept of the leading role of the industrial working class—receive more than a mere passive welcome from monopoly. Monopoly subsidizes, promotes and publicizes them through their centers of education and mass media.

Some individuals, for example, such as Professor Herbert Marcuse in the 1960s, become widely known for their contributions to a "new" and "more revolutionary" ideology. However, these "latest models" in revolution have a pronounced tendency toward obsolescence, and Marcuse's concept, for example, has already been forced into semi-retirement.

In Marcuse's view, the working class was hopelessly reactionary and contentedly integrated into the system—the upholders, not the gravediggers, of capitalism. As an accompaniment to Marcuse's ideological dismissal of the working class, other "theoreticians" dismissed it numerically—claiming it was being automated out of existence. Fortunately, according to Marcuse, a truly revolutionary force had arrived to replace the working class: the students. It was because of the influence of such anti-Marxist views that the New Left aged rapidly and passed from the scene.

Among the reasons for a relatively rapid refutation of theories on the irrelevance of the working class was the surfacing of new facts—i.e., far from causing its decline, technology was expanding the size of the working class! At the same time, it became impossible to advance the concept of students as the revolutionary replacement for the working class, in the face of the incontrovertible evidence that the student movement could not sustain activity without a relationship to working-class struggle.

This disproving of Marcusean views has not, of course, diminished attacks on the Marxist-Leninist concept of the role of the industrial working class. Far from it. Such challenges are now being advanced by other "theoreticians" in somewhat modified form.

Among those attempting to fill the small gap left by the Marcuseans is Arthur Kinoy. Kinoy, a lawyer, lacks Marcuse's academic mystique and his constituents, and is unlikely to reach the prominence of Mar-

cuse in the pseudo-radical field. Nevertheless, Kinoy's view can serve as a point of reference for concepts held in certain areas on the Left.

At this historic moment the struggle for detente and peaceful co-existence opens up the possibility for a break with monopoly's politics and economics—hot and cold war, racism, anti-Communism, anti-Sovietism—that led from McCarthyism to Watergate. For this is a time when the working classes and the oppressed peoples in the U.S. and everywhere in the capitalist world, together with the socialist and "third world" countries, are on the move launching an offensive against imperialism.

These radicals who deny the role of the working class as central to the struggle for an alternative to monopoly at home, who reject the policies of detente and peaceful coexistence advanced by the socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union—which are central to a people's offensive in the U.S., Western Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America—operate against Marxism and the people in the name of "Marxism" and the "people." In distorting the role of the socialist camp, and in opposing unity in the struggle for detente, these radicals ironically parallel bourgeois liberals and ultra-Rightists in both monopolist parties who are opponents of detente.

In their writings and speeches, these radicals—among them Arthur Kinoy—claim they are overcoming "distortions" of Marxism-Leninism. Yet their positions on foreign and domestic policy reflect bourgeois, anti-Marxist ideology, capitulation to monopoly's ideological offensive, aimed at blocking emergence of the working class as an independent political force, the center of unity for a multi-racial, multi-strata, anti-monopoly movement.

In a lengthy mimeographed document, Kinoy calls for "developing an independent force powerful enough to lead and organize the struggle for power." In order to develop this "independent force" and advance "the struggle for power," one must—it would seem apparent—consider the great potential inherent in the struggle for detente in breaking the grip of monopoly's anti-Communist, anti-Soviet and racist neo-colonialist policies. Kinoy, however, reverses this logic and accepts the politics of anti-Communism, anti-Sovietism and racism as the *starting point* for building this "independent force."

### *Kinoy's "Image" of the Soviet Union*

Kinoy falsely concludes that the Communist Party long ago gave up "the struggle for power" and instead relied on the "image" of socialism in the Soviet Union as "the catalyst" that would in itself bring socialism to the U.S. and the world. He writes:

*. . . a new ingredient was added to the thinking of the left in the '30s and '40s which was, later, to have the most traumatic effect upon an entire generation of activists and organizers throughout the world. The catalyst which somehow would bring about "some day" the enormous change—the leap to a new society—would be the impact upon working people in the capitalist world of the image of the socialist society being built in the Soviet Union. (Mimeographed document, p. 12. Emphasis in the original.)*

Imperialism's propaganda "image" of the Soviet Union—as a "threat" that must be "contained" has proved a costly one to the people of this country and the world. It is this false "image" by imperialism that has provided the justification for hot and cold war, poverty, repression, and mounting armaments and inflation. Yet Kinoy not only overlooks the incalculable burden this "image" has placed on the people; he himself becomes a reflector of it, when he claims that the "image" of the Soviet Union allegedly projected by the CPUSA has weakened the "struggle for power" in the U.S.

In Kinoy's incredible reversal of history, it is the "image" of the Soviet Union, not U.S. imperialism—which took over the Hitlerian banner of racism and anti-Communism as central to its global strategy—that had a "most traumatic effect" on the unity of labor and the people's movement.

Unlike Kinoy, we Communists refuse to lend monopoly our assistance in its anti-Soviet perversions of reality. On the contrary, we are proud of our constant struggle to project a true image of the Soviet Union, recognizing it as an indispensable element in the working class's historic struggle for power. However, along with our feeling of pride, we are self-critical that we have not conducted our offensive against imperialism's "image" of the Soviet Union on a much broader scale. Far from surrendering to the Right and "Left" opportunism of those who would have us believe the key to organizing a mass "revolutionary" movement is acceptance of imperialism's anti-Sovietism, our aim is to vastly increase the scale of our attack against imperialist ideology—at the center of which is anti-Sovietism.

In the face of the most virulent ruling-class assaults, the Communist Party has always exposed the link between monopoly's anti-Communist, anti-Soviet propaganda "image" and its racist aggressions, nationally and internationally. Today, this exposure is as vital to the struggle against imperialism's racist, anti-labor and neo-colonialist policies as it was to the fight against the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo fascist axis. History reveals that the Soviet Union, the only socialist state at

that time, played the decisive role in saving the world from the racist, genocidal consequences of anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism.

Instead of allowing themselves to be influenced by the propaganda of the imperialists they oppose, many radicals would find it valuable to ponder the reasons for imperialism's prodigious, though futile, efforts to efface the great moral, political, social and economic image of the Soviet Union—the land where imperialism, national oppression and class exploitation were first abolished, under the leadership of the working class and its Leninist vanguard, the Communist Party. This was the land which succeeded in welding unity of democrats and anti-fascists all over the world and brought victory over German, Japanese and Italian fascist expansion in Europe, Asia and Africa—less than 30 years after world imperialism's attempt to strangle this first socialist state—and opened up a new page in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. This was the land that played the decisive role in forcing U.S. imperialism to retreat after 20 years of hot-and-cold-war attempts to achieve the global domination the Axis powers failed to accomplish. What an "image"!

Of course, no class or liberation movement anywhere in the world can make headway without depending first of all on its own resources. At the same time, it must be recognized that advances anywhere against imperialism are inextricably linked to the role of the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, which accelerates the struggle against international monopoly in the imperialist countries and in the countries struggling for liberation from imperialism. Further, no gains can be made anywhere in the struggle against class and national and racial oppression if the people's movements are "traumatized" by anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism.

Rejecting monopoly's anti-Soviet "image" and its "traumatic effect" on the anti-monopoly struggle does not imply reliance on a Soviet "catalyst" as the substitute for mass struggle against one's own ruling class. On the contrary, rejection of such an "image" strengthens the consciousness of the working class, and is a vital ingredient in the struggle to put the working class on the high road toward independent action—enabling it to become the "catalyst," the decisive component, in the formation of a wide anti-monopoly struggle, the only basis for a winning strategy against monopoly.

In the opening lines of the *Communist Manifesto*, written in 1848 when the modern working class was emerging, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels noted that Communist influence on the working class was already a "specter" "haunting" the exploiters and oppres-

sors. At a time when the ruling-class alliances of the world—from Czarist Russia to North America—were doing all in their power to maintain the survivals of serfdom and chattel slavery, Marx and Engels proclaimed that the workers of the world “disdained” to hide their common aims of expropriating the expropriators and establishing rule of the working class.

Surely today, when the “specter” that “haunted” the rulers of the 19th century has become the most decisive force on earth, the CPUSA can do no less than “disdain” to hide its common aims with the Communist and workers’ parties of the world, in the forefront of which are the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Leninist parties of the socialist countries. Today ties of solidarity, which the CPUSA proudly proclaims, unite the parties where the working class is in power—from Moscow to Hanoi and Pyongyang, from Berlin to Havana—and the Communist and workers’ parties in the capitalist countries with the workers and peoples of the world in the struggle for class and national liberation. These are three currents of a single revolutionary process.

Kinoy’s mind-bending anti-Soviet distortion of history is brought to us at a moment when U.S. imperialism is in deepest crisis. At a time when the rank and file of labor and the masses of exploited and oppressed—from Vietnam to Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, Lisbon, Paris, Rome and New York—are moving into a new level of struggle against the “traumatic effect” of imperialism’s anti-Communist, anti-Soviet, racist strategy, monopoly must find new ways to carry on its ideological assaults. This is why there are attacks against Marxism-Leninism in the name of “Marxism-Leninism,” just as there are attacks against racial equality—in the infamous DeFunis case, for example—in the name of “equality.”

The views of radicals such as Kinoy are part of the new stage in the ideological thrust against the Marxist-Leninist policies of detente and peaceful coexistence of the world Communist and workers’ parties. In the caricatures prolifically sketched by these radicals, the long struggle for peaceful coexistence—initiated by Lenin at the founding of the first socialist state—is replaced by a scene in which the Communists urge the masses to rely on the “image” of the Soviet Union, the “catalyst” making it unnecessary for them to wage the class struggle in their own countries. Thus, these radicals who warn the Left against a Moscow that “exports revolution”—instead of joining the struggle to prevent U.S. imperialism from exporting *counterrevolution*—accommodate their views to the “image” of anti-Soviet class collaboration put forth by the Meanys and Lovestones



on the Right, and the Trotskyites and Maoists on the "Left."

*"Placing One's Reliance On The Ruling Class"*

As part of his caricature of the struggle for detente, Kinoy not only alleges that the CPUSA urges the masses to substitute an exported "catalyst" for class struggle, but that it also calls upon the people to place their "reliance upon the liberal wing of the ruling class." He says:

The beauty of this metaphysics [Kinoy's "catalyst" theory] was that it justified the immediate strategy of placing one's reliance upon the liberal wing of the ruling class in one's own country because this would encourage an alliance with the Soviets which, in turn, would in some way prove to the people of the capitalist world (through its own image) the vast superiority of socialism, the new society, over capitalism, the old society. This obviated the necessity for the *primary* thrust towards a transfer in state power, a revolutionary change, to come from *within* the capitalist country itself. Subtly and quietly, it shifted the role of the Left *away from* its original and historic responsibility for developing an independent force powerful enough to lead and organize the struggle for power to the task of becoming organizers for the liberal wing of the ruling class. (*Ibid.*, p. 13. Emphasis in the original.)

Although Kinoy speaks of "developing an independent force powerful enough to lead and organize the struggle for power," he does not tell us what *kind* of "force"—or strategy—is needed "to lead and organize the struggle." Nor does he tell us what "force" the struggle should be aimed *against*. And while he talks of "the necessity for the *primary* thrust toward a transfer in state power," he neglects to identify the "force" to which he believes state power should be transferred.

Kinoy proposes "a transfer in state power"—which, in the scientific sense, would mean a revolutionary shift from capitalist to working-class rule—as an immediate task at a moment when the immediate task is to advance independent working-class action around the burning issues of the day. The future promise of a "transfer in state power" can be realized only from the struggles of the present, and the "primary thrust" of the masses is already in motion against the escalating monopoly-imposed burden of armaments, inflation, poverty and unemployment, felt by all the people and weighing especially on the Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano, Asian and Native American



minorities.

To ignore the fact that the primary task is to strengthen the mounting thrust toward a great anti-monopoly movement, with the working class as the leading force, is to step aside from the needs and struggles of the people. To do this would amount not only to "becoming organizers for the liberal wing of the ruling class," but to giving support to its most racist, reactionary sectors. A "Left"-sounding call for a "primary thrust toward a transfer in state power" cannot camouflage the fact that what Kinoy has proposed is a strategy for demobilizing—not organizing—the struggle against monopoly capital, the class in power.

In labeling the struggle for peaceful coexistence as an "alliance" between the Soviet Union and the United States, Kinoy can only be interpreted as echoing an amalgam of forces ranging from the Maoists and Trotskyites to the Right social democrats, the liberal bourgeoisie and the ultra-Right.

The struggle for detente, for peaceful coexistence, does not represent an "alliance"—but a new, a higher stage of the international class struggle between the two social systems. One wonders just how Kinoy's opposition to the struggle to break state monopoly capitalism's grip on U.S. global operations helps bring about a "revolutionary change, to come from *within* the capitalist country itself."

The essence of Leninism is the recognition of the indivisibility of all aspects of policy. The revolutionary process within the U.S. can be moved forward only by a strategy that recognizes the inseparability of the fight for democratic advance "*within* the capitalist country itself," and the struggle to end U.S. imperialism's counterrevolutionary role *throughout the world*. This is the objective of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence. When Kinoy's "primary thrust" is to distort the meaning of peaceful coexistence, it is he—not the Communists—who has "subtly and quietly" shifted "the role of the Left *away from* its original and historic responsibility for developing an independent force powerful enough to lead and organize the struggle for power."

When Kinoy portrays the Communist Party's advocacy of peaceful coexistence as "urging reliance on the liberal wing of the ruling class," he—from a "Left" stance—joins the "liberal wing of the ruling class" and the ultra-Right senators—the Jacksons, Goldwaters and Wallaces—in using the "traumatic" strategy of anti-Sovietism against the hard-won steps toward detente. Whatever his intent, Kinoy's treatment of the central contradiction today between the world system of socialism, headed by the Soviet Union, and world imperialism, with the U.S. at its center, fits into monopoly's strategy to divert the work-

ing class and the oppressed of the U.S. from a struggle to influence affairs of state.

As early as 1895, Lenin challenged the Kinoy's of his day, who did not grasp the role of the working class and the revolutionary meaning of proletarian internationalism. He wrote:

... the class-consciousness of the workers means the workers' understanding that to achieve their aims they have to work to influence affairs of state, just as the landlords and the capitalists did, and are continuing to do now. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 2, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960, p. 113.)

### "Mutual Learning Process"

At a time when all but ultra-Right red-baiters have found that tagging the CPUSA with the "foreign agent" label is too crude a device to be effective, this now fossilized red herring has been dredged up from the "Left." To pursue his polemic—in which setbacks are divorced from monopoly's hot- and cold-war, racist and anti-Communist offensive at home and abroad—Kinoy depicts the CP as a "foreign agent" promoting a Soviet "catalyst."

Although the introduction of the word "catalyst" (interestingly enough, a synonym for "agent"! ) is a new semantic touch, it is not "subtle" enough to "shift" our attention away from the fact that Kinoy surrenders to monopoly's anti-Communist tactics when he writes:

The dynamics of the projection of this "catalyst" role of the *image* of the Soviet Union on the long-range responsibilities of the American Left to prepare for the "ultimate" struggle requires intensive and thoughtful study in terms of its effect upon the tactics and the psychology of the Left during the past thirty years. . . . Such an exploration is essential to development of the type of mutual learning process between the old and new Left which Staughton Lynd called for. . . . (Mimeographed document, p. 13.)

Oddly enough, an article by Lynd, "A Chapter from History: The United Labor Party, 1946-1952" (*Liberation*, December 1973) does indeed contribute to a "mutual learning process"—although hardly in a way intended by either Lynd or Kinoy. In this article, Lynd tells of the United Labor Party, a left grouplet in Ohio, which played an "avant-garde" anti-Communist role by orienting itself almost three decades ago on the same approach Kinoy calls for today.

Although Lynd seems to consider the Ohio grouplet a prototype for the Left today, his account reveals that the demise of such "Left"

groups in the '40s and '50s foreshadowed the fate of groups influenced by the policies Kinoy now projects as "new": "Only six years after its founding," relates Lynd, the ULP "dissolved itself into an amorphous movement known as the American Rally, less radical and less oriented toward workers, which in turn dissolved not long thereafter."

"What," asks Lynd, "went wrong? Certain answers," he states, "are obvious." For example:

The coming of the Cold War put the party on the defensive. It was difficult to make clear to voters the difference between the socialism which the ULP espoused and the communism which it ostentatiously disavowed. John Barbero, one of the steelworkers in Youngstown whose memories of the party so intrigued me, recalls that after 1950, "it just became impossible. We had an anti-war pamphlet on the Korean War that we wanted to distribute at the mill gates but [the atmosphere] was too hostile. It never got out. (*Ibid.*)

Citing another example of "what went wrong," Lynd writes:

The possibilities and frustrations of the ULP in its relation to the trade unions are illustrated by two events in 1950. The Akron CIO Council prevented the immediate cessation of rent control in that city by gathering 12,000 signatures to force a municipal referendum on the question. The success of the petition work was largely due to the efforts of Marie Wagner and Bob Brenneman, who as delegates to the CIO Council from their Goodyear local activated and organized the drive. But when the same Bob Brenneman ran relatively well as the ULP candidate in the Congressional election, Earl Jordan of the Goodyear local stated: "Why shouldn't he be thrown out? He refuses to follow national and local CIO policy every year. We threw the Commies out for refusing to follow CIO policy, didn't we?" (*Ibid.*)

Even this mini-history of this "premature" New Left group is a devastating indictment of the Kinoy version of history, all too clearly illustrating the "traumatic effect" of anti-Communist tactics on the struggle against reaction.

A ULP protesting its anti-Communism became paralyzed when it came to protesting in the interests of the people. The McCarthyite attacks against its members led not to a determination to fight back, but had the "traumatic effect" of dissolving the ULP "into an amorphous organization," which soon disappeared.

But, as is well known, the Communist Party—despite the "atmosphere"—took the struggle against the Korean War to "the mill gates"

and throughout the country. And far from "dissolving" because of McCarthyite attacks against it, the CP played a leading role in the fight to end McCarthyite repression against the people.

If Lynd and Kinoy would draw the not at all subtle lessons from this little fragment out of the past, they would indeed make a contribution "essential to the development" of a "mutual learning process"—one that would broaden Left unity against the monopolist enemy.

*"Which Sector of Society is Most Advanced?"*

It is only logical that radicals who deny the decisive role of the working class in power—the socialist community of nations—in the world revolutionary process will also deny the decisive role of the working class in the capitalist countries. Kinoy, for instance, reflects the "latest" in bourgeois theories of the "post-industrial society," which assert that the Marxist concept of the workers in industry as the leading force for social change has been made outmoded by the revolution in science and technology, when he states:

... it is essential that we not be paralyzed by sterile and dogmatic formulations from the experiences of past years which would lead to futile debates as to whether the working class is necessarily the "only leading" revolutionary force at every level of the struggle to come. What must be understood is that the bankruptcy of the capitalist system which has so infected and poisoned *every* aspect of society has created a situation in which *many* groups of oppressed people now have, together with the workers, an objective and real stake in the taking of power. This means that an academic discussion as to which sector of society is *most* advanced, as to which group of the oppressed peoples is the "leading" group, is not particularly helpful at best, and can be enervating and divisive at worst. ("A Party of the People," *Liberation*, December 1973.)

Despite a slight nod in the direction of the working class, Kinoy here reveals that he goes even "beyond" Marcuse in negating the role of the working class. Of course, "many groups" are oppressed "together with the workers," and of course Marxism has *always* recognized that many non-working-class strata "have together with the workers, an objective and real stake in the taking of power."

But when Kinoy precedes the above statement with the word *now*, he is implying that this is a *new* phenomenon. By injecting the word "now," he attempts to offer a rationale for shifting the "leading revolutionary force" away from a *class* to "groups" or "people." But no amount of juggling can provide a scientific basis for dispensing with

the working class as the motive force for change.

Many radicals who share other key aspects of Kinoy's ideology have found his crude substitution of "group" or "people" for *class* hard to take, and have sought more sophisticated "alternatives" to the Marxist-Leninist concept of the role of the working class. Such radicals, including some in the New American Movement (NAM), prefer to revise Marx, Engels, and Lenin via Daniel Bell or Roger Garaudy, for example, rather than Kinoy or even Marcuse.

Those who look to Bell for "alternatives" are informed that "simplified Marxian categories no longer hold. The most important [such category] clearly is that of the leading role of the working class." (Daniel Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*, Basic Books, New York, 1973.) To back up his theory of the obsolescence of Marxist concepts of the working class, Bell cites a "remarkable" study by Radovan Richta—a "leading" theoretician of the 1968 counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia—and a research team from the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences as follows:

An entirely new phenomenon, demonstrating the disparity between the scientific and technological revolution and industrialization is the turn to a *relative* decline in the amount of labor absorbed by industry and associated activities—accompanied by a strong shift from the traditional branches to the progressive within industry. This tendency clearly refutes the standpoint giving absolute validity to the industrialization process and the structure of "the industrial society" . . . (Quoted in *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*, pp. 107-108.)

Richta then goes on to predict:

In general, we can assume that in the course of the scientific and technological revolution the volume of "services" will grow to the point of occupying 40-60 per cent of national labor in coming decades, with a still bigger share in the long term. The civilization to which we are advancing might accordingly quite well be called "post-industrial civilization". . . . (*Ibid.*, p. 108.)

But, according to Richta

The most striking effect is, however, induced by the growing numbers of *technical and professional* personnel in all sectors of the economy outside immediate production. In the fifties and sixties, this group outpaced all others in the United States in its rate of growth, which was twice that for clerical workers (the category

that held the lead in the forties) and seven times more than the overall rate for workers. (*Ibid.*)

Here we see that those in the United States who would revise Marxism in the name of "Marxism" have immediate ideological predecessors in Czechoslovakia. In the '60s in Czechoslovakia, as in the United States today, changes in the structure of the working class accompanying the technological revolution became the "theoretical" justification for proclaiming the obsolescence of the leading role of the working class, and especially that of its front-rank detachment, the industrial proletariat.

(The concluding portion of this article will be published in the November *Political Affairs*. It will analyze the relationship between the intellectuals and the working class and the special role of industrial workers in the class struggle—*Ed.*)

---

*(Continued from Page 62)*

World War II, among them the sovereignty of the socialist German state." (*Twenty-five Years of the German Democratic Republic: A Quarter-Century of Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*. Theses of the National Council of the National Front of the GDR, p. 32.)

The effort to roll back socialism has failed and the strength of the peace camp found its new qualitative expression in the emergence of the European Security Conference, which holds the promise of securing all of Europe as a zone of peace. This Conference is a new arena of struggle in which the imperialists continue to fight for positions consistent with their class interests. The nature of imperialism has not changed, but it is weakened. The struggles are now on a new plane. The development of the GDR is a clear example of this.

# New Dangers and New Possibilities for the Auto Workers

The 24th Constitutional Convention of the United Automobile Workers union took place in the midst of the most vicious onslaught on the working conditions and living standards of the auto workers and their families in the entire history of this union. The Big Three, along with the rest of monopoly capital, is on a profit orgy that features increasing inhuman speedup in the plants and unending price increases at the checkout counter.

The auto corporations are serving notice on the car buyers and the auto workers that 1975 is going to give them another profit bonanza, if they have their way. The biggest new model price increases in the history of the industry are promised. If the \$500 rise announced by GM becomes the pattern, that will mean that close to \$1000 has been added to the sticker price during the last year. These increases are on the volume leaders. The increases on the standard and luxury models are even higher. It is an effort on the part of the auto monopolists to make the same kind of profits on each compact and subcompact that they have made on the luxury cars.

These increases, along with higher prices on the "options" and the galloping inflation and skyrocketing interest rates, will have the effect of further shrinking the new car market. Therefore, the rosy predictions of a 10-million car year seem unwarranted.

The auto makers have announced, at the same time, a drive to "cut production costs," to increase productivity. The big switch to the smaller cars has already meant big savings in production costs. The drive for further cuts means cheapening the product more. It also means that the already man-killing speedup will be intensified even more. Speedup along with a higher percentage of smaller cars will mean less jobs. The outlook is for continued high levels of unemployment.

Before the returning delegates could get their bags unpacked, work stoppages were breaking out in different parts of the country affecting each of the Big Three. All these stoppages were around intolerable working conditions, long-neglected grievances, unsettled local agreements, speedup. The workers are fighting back.



### *A Crisis of Class Collaborationism*

Neither the keynote address of the president of the union, Leonard Woodcock, nor the resolutions brought to the floor by the Convention Resolutions Committee reflected any of the problems being faced at the point of production. Starting with the keynote and reflected throught the entire Convention the leadership was on the defensive. Two-thirds of Woodcock's speech was devoted to defending the "remarkable achievements of our collective bargaining of 1973 and 1974."

The convention resolutions and overall content reflected a drift to the Right so far as the union posture on a number of key national and international issues is concerned. They also showed the inability or failure of social democracy and class collaboration to deal with the deep-seated problems that the workers and their families face in the shop and in the community.

Faced with the onslaught of monopoly, all that the leaders of the union came up with was either silence or retreat on the major problems facing the members of the union. On no major question did they have an offensive strategy to defend the welfare of the membership against monopoly.

The following examples should suffice to make the point. After stating that "as workers and citizens we are confronted with the most critical constitutional crisis since the Civil War," the resolution on "Political Action-U.S." offers as its main action proposal that "we must devote our energies to the most fundamental of all political tasks—registration and get-out-the-vote." The resolution urges each local and CAP Council (Community Action Program) to organize better, work harder, master the latest campaign skills and raise more money.

There is nothing about labor candidates, Black representation, electing women, or the need for independence in any form. There is not even presented an independent program that the UAW and labor as a whole should work for in the 1974 elections. At least three other resolutions from the Convention Resolutions Committee besides the one on political action dealt in one way or another with the question of the 1974 elections. None of them took up in any way the question of independence. This may seem incredible in this period of Watergate politics.

There were resolutions from local unions calling for an advisory legislative assembly and for conferences of labor and others to take initiatives leading to a labor party. There were resolutions that

called on the union to have nothing to do with any candidate of either old party and to start "our own party." All these resolutions were clearly ignored, because there was no reflection of any of them in the resolution presented to the floor.

The resolution on civil rights dealt mainly with the contractual recognition of the FEP Committees as official union bodies, with the right to participate in the grievance procedure. The affirmative action program for the local unions was confined to civil rights in "the work place." There was the usual pledge to continue to work "to fulfill the promises of democracy, to realize full equality and to win unconditional freedom in all areas of life." It is an important fact and a serious danger signal that there were only two or three resolutions from local unions on this question.

The resolutions that dealt with foreign trade and international labor solidarity contained the usual red-baiting clauses that have occurred in previous resolutions on these matters. The Ukrainian fascists were permitted to have a table and to circulate petitions to "free the oppressed Ukrainians" all during the convention.

The only reference to detente in the resolutions was to what is called "human detente," using a quote from Sakharov to make the point. Even the keynote made only passing reference to relaxation of tensions. There were no resolutions on detente from local unions.

The Convention did not deal with any of the economic questions or the problems the members face in the plants. Most of the resolutions sent in dealt with problems in the shops. There were at least 15 resolutions from local unions on the question of a wage reopener. There were several resolutions calling for more vigorous action in relation to health and safety in the work place. Most called for immediate strike action when life or limb is endangered or when the company fails to correct the hazard. The efforts of the delegates to bring these matters to the floor on the last day of the Convention were shut off by a very close vote for adjournment that the chair declared passed.

The question that produced the most debate was the proposal for a Constitutional change that put the next convention off for three years instead of two. The effect of this change was to extend the term of office for all the officers and executive board members from two years to three.

Some of the dissatisfaction with the international executive board (IEB) and the failure to deal with the conditions in the shops surfaced around this question. The vote was so close it had to be taken twice. There was actually a majority of the delegates voting against

the three-year term. The uproar that followed the declaration that the motion passed was so great that no further business could be conducted that day.

The three-year term of office was extended to all elected local union officials, shop stewards and committeemen. The three-year term was even made retroactive for those who were elected prior to the Convention on approval of a majority of the members at a membership meeting.

This package is a setback for union democracy. It makes it harder for the rank and file to get rid of unsatisfactory local leadership. They have to wait three years instead of two. It is particularly bad because the removal of stewards and committeemen, the key people in the grievance procedure, is much more difficult. The rank and file will have to resort to the recall to keep from being saddled with a lousy steward or committeeman.

A side effect of postponing the convention is that the delegates that were elected to this convention will be the delegates to the Economic Convention to be held in 1976. When these delegates ran that was not the case. Had the convention date not been changed there would have been a new set of delegates to serve at both the 25th Convention and the Economic Convention. At least, the workers would have known at the time they voted that they were electing people who would fashion their collective bargaining demands for the next contract. This time the question of the future contract was not even an issue in the elections.

The other bad feature of the three-year term is that the leader of the bargaining team, Leonard Woodcock, and at least one of the regional directors, will be lame-duck bargainers. They won't have to be concerned about the effect of what they do on the future of the union. Such a situation places heavier responsibilities on any rank-and-file movement that develops over the next three years to be more united around a common program than ever before. That rank-and-file movement will have to be spread throught the UAW and be strongly based in the Midwest, especially Michigan and Ohio.

The issue that was expected to be the hottest before the convention was the right of the skilled trades to have veto rights over the national agreements. In an effort by UNC to get wider support for this proposition, they proposed that the right of veto be extended to "production, clerical and technical, engineering, etc.," clearly an effort to spread craft union concepts in the union. Resolutions submitted calling for this change in the Constitution did not reach the convention floor.

Article 19, Section 3 of the Constitution gives the IEB the right to approve or reject any agreement that applies solely to a local union or even only to a given group. It gives each separate group the right to vote separately on matters that relate exclusively to that particular group. The section does not give any individual group the right to veto the whole agreement simply because they do not agree with the part that applies exclusively to them.

What was actually voted on was a 40-point policy statement given to each delegate and read in its entirety. It says, in effect, that the skilled trades members have the right to formulate demands and to vote separately on the final agreement reached on those matters that relate exclusively to them. It says also that the IEB retains the right to approve or reject the result of that vote. In short, there is no change in this section of the Constitution.

It was clear, before the vote, that the majority of the delegates were not in favor of giving the skilled trades veto power over the contract. The production workers were against it because of local experiences. The Black workers saw racism in the proposal. The skilled trades workers have alienated themselves from wide sections of the production workers, many of whom are Black, by their demanding and getting special consideration at the expense of the production workers and because of their demonstrated racism in the shop and the community.

The composition of the union has changed over the last ten years. The skilled workers used to be the most advanced, best organized and the most progressive section of the union. That is no longer true. The cancer of racism has helped change that.

With the influx of young workers, especially young Black workers, the production workers are now the most militant, progressive, politically advanced section of the union. They constitute the section of the union that holds in its hands the hope for change to class-struggle trade unionism. The problem is that they are not well organized and do not have a national perspective.

### *Rank-and-File Caucuses at the Convention*

There were three rank-and-file caucuses in evidence at the Convention. The one that was most active and most visible was UNC (United National Caucus). It was the largest, with some 33 delegates in its orbit. It has been around the longest, and at the Convention was the best organized and got out the most material.

The second caucus was the Brotherhood Caucus. It is strictly a locally-based caucus out of the GM plant in Fremont, California.

Its only action was a picket line in front of the convention hall on the second day of the Convention. From the signs one would conclude that there is strong Leftist influence in it.

The third caucus was the Auto Workers Action Caucus (AWAC), a new caucus at the Convention for the first time. We shall have more to say about it below.

UNC was instrumental in getting a number of good resolutions passed in several local unions—resolutions on political independence leading to a labor party, nationalization of all energy sources, a wage reopener, organizing the unemployed, etc. However the good that they represented was overshadowed and discounted by their continuous attacks on the leadership and the union. The delegates were turned off by this.

UNC appeared as a disruptive anti-union force. The delegates were looking for leadership in dealing with the shop problems that are of such deep concern to them. UNC was not giving this. UNC got little mileage out of its efforts and seemed to lose influence as the days went by, even though much of their material spoke to some of the frustrations of the membership and the delegates.

After several years of campaigning against the leadership, the UNC still remains an "opposition caucus." It is destined to be only an "opposition" because of its constant centering of its attacks on the union leadership and not the company. Such a position attracts only a limited number of adherents. New forces will come and go—never enough to win, but enough to be "the opposition." Since the UNC leaders rarely take up or do anything about the burning issues that face the workers on production, they appear no different than the "do-nothing leadership" they are attacking. They are in the posture of "the loyal opposition" whether they intend to be or not. Experience shows that the end result to which this leads is membership support of the leadership.

When the company is the focal point of the attack and struggle, the class-collaboration stance of the leadership is exposed. Only in such a struggle can the forces be gathered that will become strong enough to defeat even the entrenched leadership. It is from such struggle that a new quality of leadership will be forged, and new leaders will emerge.

Until some significant inroads are made in the fight against racism among the skilled workers, there will be severe limitations on UNC's ability to change. Racism is class collaboration. Class-struggle trade unionism and racism are more incompatible than ever before. The problem that faces any rank-and-file movement is the recognition

of the priority of the fight against racism so as to be able to weld the unity of skilled and production workers necessary for victory over the company and over class-partnership unionism and leaders at all levels.

AWAC is a new caucus that was organized only a few months before the Convention. It is an attempt to fill the void in the union created by the absence of any caucus that brings together and represents the interests of the rank-and-file production workers. It is an effort to build a rank-and-file organization based in the shop that struggles on the specific issues directed toward the challenge to management prerogatives. The movement works for unity between production and skilled workers around a common program of struggle. It would include those local leaders that are willing to support the program and principles of AWAC. It is a movement aimed at coordinating the efforts of the various caucuses around the country to realize the following general four-point program:

1. *Bring the Union Back to the Shop.* A steward for every foreman. Let the union deputize additional stewards to equal the number of bosses on the job. An "innocent until proven guilty" provision in every contract. No restrictions on the right to strike on health and safety. Let workers decide the line speed.

2. *Strengthen the Power of the Union.* Eliminate "crisis" and secret bargaining. End the "one at a time" strategy.

3. *Take the Burden off the Backs of the Workers.* A 30-hour week with 40 hours pay. End compulsory overtime and overtime during layoffs. End racism on the job and in the union.

4. *Democracy in the Union.* Referendum election of all those connected with enforcing the contract. A permanent production workers' council.

At the convention AWAC distributed only one piece of literature, calling for reopening the contract on wages. The leaflet was well received. However, AWAC was not strong enough or well known enough at this convention to bring about a united front with the other groups, or to galvanize the clear sentiment for such a reopener.

*Labor Today*, featuring the full program of AWAC, was distributed to 2,500 delegates. Now there are forces all over the union that have a knowledge of both *Labor Today* and AWAC. The task of all progressives now is to spread the organization of local caucuses basing themselves on the AWAC program. It is to work to build AWAC so that by the time the next convention rolls around there can be a powerful rank-and-file voice on the floor, a voice possibly strong enough to bring some rank-and-file leaders

onto the IEB and successfully challenge class collaborationism.

### *Present Tasks of the Party*

There is a constant struggle against the company in the shops throughout the industry. The fightback against the corporate drive for ever greater productivity goes on with increasing intensity. It can be seen in the constant flareups of both authorized and "un-authorized" strikes that are breaking out all over in spite of efforts of the leadership to "keep the lid on" or to "put the lid back on."

What stands out is that many of these eruptions are spontaneous. They are not organized. Therefore they usually fall far short of their goal or end in defeat. They are unable to prevent class-collaboration sellouts and deals because of their spontaneous character.

Grass-roots spontaneity, no matter how militant, seething with anger or rebellious the demands, does not serve as an effective opposition to the class collaboration of the leadership or to the onslaught of the company. Reliance on spontaneity erodes the struggle against the company, the fight for better working conditions, for union democracy, for a better and stronger union.

The Party's emphasis on developing an organized rank-and-file movement in every local and every department possible is crucial to the future of the class struggle. Only through organization of the rank and file will the present misleaders be kicked out and the direction of the trade union movement changed. It is well to note here that the rank-and-file movement will have to continue even after control of the union is won in order to *keep* the union on the path of class-struggle trade unionism. The greater the organized participation of the membership in all phases of union life the stronger the union.

Over the past few months there have been work stoppages led by certain forces on the Left, by some who call themselves revolutionaries. Though the purpose of these actions is to bring pressure on the company to correct some of the severe problems in the plant, what becomes clear is that the anti-leadership thrust which is the main line of these forces becomes anti-union once the struggle against the company begins. This is true whether that is the intent of the "anti-leadership" leaders or not.

How this works is evident in the pattern of several such actions in Michigan. Working conditions in the plant get to be intolerable. The local union leadership has done nothing about it after many efforts to get them to do so. The workers have little or no confidence



that they will do anything. The workers are willing to walk out and do walk out without the approval of the rest of the local or plant membership.

The plants are picketed and sometimes shut down. The workers usually sympathize with and support the demands of those who are out even though they did not have a chance to vote on the matter. They do not cross the picket-line, at first. Demands are made on the company by the strikers, the settlement of which the workers consider necessary before they go back to work.

The strikers are in defiance of the leadership, which at this point makes the main issue that the strike is not "authorized," that union procedure was not followed. The strike "leaders" take the position that the company must reach an agreement with them, because they are the leaders of the rank and file. The company "refuses to negotiate until everyone is back at work." The union leadership urges the workers to go back to work and let them negotiate.

The workers refuse and the company tries to get a back-to-work movement going. Usually at about this time the company fires some 50 to 100 strikers. It picks those it considers the most militant and the leaders among rank and file. They usually include a goodly number of workers who just happen to be caught up in the action, to be used as pawns later.

At the further urging of the union leadership, the promise of a strike vote and the sanctioning of the vote by the IEB, the strikers go back to work. The strike vote in the local is held quickly and the workers usually vote overwhelmingly for a strike. The IEB authorizes the strike. Now everything is nice and legal. The company seems to be backed into a corner where it must at last deal with the grievances that caused the workers to go out in the first place.

But, alas, that is not the case. The workers are back in the shop. But the leaders and the most militant rank-and-filers have been fired and are out of the plant. They are still militant, directing their fire at the "sellout" leadership and calling on the workers to follow them. Now the main issue on the bargaining table is getting those who have been fired back to work. The advantage is now on the side of the company.

The company says that if certain grievances are dropped, it will put so many workers back on the job. This suits the class-collaborationist union leaders just fine. They can emerge as heroes by getting 90 per cent of those who have been fired back to work—without back pay, of course, and without settling any of the key grievances that would hurt the company.

The grievances get lost in the shuffle or are traded off to get this or that worker back on the job. After this is all over and the dust has settled, conditions in the plant remain unchanged. The rank and file is beheaded. Those militants who are taken back have to agree to be on "good behavior" for the next six months a year. There is "labor peace" for a long time afterwards. The workers feel frustrated and helpless.

This is what happens when the center of attack is the union leadership instead of the company. More correct tactics in conducting such a struggle would be to make the company the main target while demanding that the union leadership take a fighting stand on the side of the workers. They will then be exposed or forced to act.

Organize the rank and file to go to the local union meeting and get the majority of the local or plant to vote for a strike. This takes more organizing and more work, but it mobilizes the forces needed for victory. Make it a condition that representatives selected by the rank and file sit in on the bargaining sessions as "consultants" and observers. This way the company is on the spot and so is the class-collaborationist leadership. The rank-and-file leaders and militant workers are still on the job where they can continue to give the leadership necessary for victory. This way the workers can be more fully organized to carry out supporting actions to help the bargaining. This way they are in a better position to change the leadership later, because the struggle will have produced new leaders with whom to replace the old.

That is why a rank-and-file movement dedicated to fighting the company, based on a program like that of AWAC, is needed to fill the vacuum. Replacement of class-collaborationist leaders will be the inevitable result of this kind of struggle, just as it was for the "Miners for Democracy." They fought a gangster leadership, the bloodthirsty mine operators and the power of the state, and they won.

All the conditions exist in the UAW for the blossoming of rank-and-file organizations throughout the union. The anger and ferment are there. The issues are almost too numerous to mention. What is lacking is class-conscious leadership. And this the Communists must supply.

The magnitude and intensity of the attack of monopoly on the living standards, working conditions and democratic rights of the workers and their families make it clear that much more is needed than a militant rank-and-file. What is needed, more than anything else, is a large and strong Communist Party.

Such a Party must have its main base of strength in the plants,

among the organized workers in basic industry. Therefore, the most important question facing every Communist is how to build Communist Party shop clubs in all plants. It is the Communist Party and the Communists in the plants that will give to the working class the class consciousness and socialist consciousness necessary to win the fight against monopoly capitalism and for the establishment of socialism.

Communists can become the recognized leaders in the fight for the workers' needs today and for socialism tomorrow. Communists must have an active concern for and a commitment to the health, welfare, economic and political interests of the workers on the line and in the community. Communists must have a hatred of the class enemy and a dedication to the trade union movement and to the working class. They must be concerned with how to beat the company in skirmishes of every kind every day.

Most of all there must be love and respect for the workers with whom one works. There is a contradiction between professing love for the class and contempt or disdain for one's fellow workers. Communists must have a feeling for and confidence in the strength of the workers in their own departments, their plants and their local unions as well as in relation to the class as a whole.

The primary Communist responsibility of every comrade is to fight for the mastery of the science of Marxism-Leninism and a dedication to the dissemination of the policies and ideas of this Party to the millions of working people and their families. Therefore the building of the circulation of the *Daily World* and the *People's World* takes top priority. Then comes the sale and distribution of Party literature. And next is getting out a Party shop paper. Getting two or three or more workers together to discuss what they read and to talk about their problems is a major step to winning them to the Party.

The credibility of Communists among the workers is won through struggle. Talk is cheap even in this inflationary period. Big talk about what should be done has to be backed up by militant leadership and action that is aimed at victory.

# The Economics Behind Abel's Misleadership

With the steel industry rooster strutting around like the cock-of-the-walk down Superprofit Lane, I.W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, has hatched a bunch of putrid eggs known as the "productivity clause" and the "Experimental Negotiating (no-strike) Agreement" (ENA). Now the chickens are coming home to roost.

The steel industry is on a price-gouging, profit-making binge unlike anything in history. Suddenly, Abel's former "sick" industry turns out to be very "healthy" indeed. The well of profits, far from drying up, is overflowing. Only the workers who make the industry run find their condition unhealthy and getting worse: ever-lower purchasing power, the most intense overwork (speedup), mounting injury and sickness rates, stepped-up company disciplinings and a rash of firings, not alone against militants, but against thousands of others, mostly younger workers, for infraction of arbitrarily-determined, rigidly-enforced work rules.

No sooner were price controls lifted than the steel companies played leap frog in a race to raise prices. Within a space of three months, *five steel price hikes* had been imposed on the country. *On August 5 of this year, the composite finished steel price was 31.7 per cent higher than it was one year ago!*

This was immediately reflected in higher automobile prices as well as other products made of steel, all attributable to higher steel prices. They guarantee that there is no relief in sight from the ever-rising cost of living.

Reported net profits of the steel corporations after taxes have taken off on a steep climb with rocket-like speed. U.S. Steel's net for the first half of this year were up 28.5 per cent over last year, including an 89 per cent increase racked up in the second quarter. Bethlehem's six-month net take jumped 13.4 per cent with a 20 per cent rise in the second quarter. Armco reported a six-month rise of 40 per cent and Wheeling-Pittsburg a jump of 30.6 per cent with an out-of-sight leap of 304.6 per cent in the second quarter. National Steel had a jump of 43 per cent in the first half of the year and a 59.9 per cent rise in the second quarter. Jones and Laughlin had a 159 per cent

upswing in the first quarter and Republic reported a 50 per cent jump in the second quarter. Second-quarter net profits after taxes for the industry as a whole were 80 per cent higher than last year!

And last year's profits, it will be remembered, were themselves in the record range, 66 per cent above 1972 for basic steel as a whole. This practically tied the paper industry, with 67 per cent, for first place in profit rise of all industries in the country.

The steel companies, of course, showed a big increase in their sales. But this was nowhere near the increase in profits. The explanation for this is two-fold. Tremendously increased output per production worker (productivity-speedup) is the basic cause; coupled with this are out-of-line price increases to add to the fabulous profits produced by steelworkers' labor.

Official figures on productivity show that in basic steel it rose by nearly 11 per cent last year above 1972, a fantastic figure by any measure. New technology and fuller utilization of capacity account for the *lesser* part of this increase. The chief source of this remarkable leap in productivity is overwork-speedup, doubling on jobs, crew cutting, disciplinary crack-downs and threats of discharge with little or no assurance of any real defense by the union hierarchy. This is especially true in the decisive areas of basic steel production.

The reality that emerges from these figures is, on the one side, a profit-bloated industry on a "get-away-with-as-much-as-you-can" price-gouging spree and, on the other side, a diminishing work force, whose real purchasing power fell by at least 5 per cent in the past year despite wage and cost-of-living increases, and which is increasingly overworked at the expense of its health and safety.

The old saying about the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer is an apt description of the situation in the steel industry. The imposition of ENA on the steelworkers was intended to disarm them, to leave them defenseless in the face of the all-out company attacks on their working and living standards, enabling the steel moguls to reap a profit bonanza now of two years' duration.

This situation is directly the result of I. W. Abel's eager and willing acceptance of the economic theories of the steel industry chiefs and their mostly cold-war economic advisors. Every time the industry pleaded poverty, Abel held out the tin cup to steelworkers to bail out the "sick" industry whose well was supposed to be drying up. And steelworkers have been paying through the nose ever since.

These economists in whom Abel placed his faith and the fate of the steelworkers had predicted prices would rise no more than 3.4 per cent in 1973. Abel set the union's economic goals on these fore-

casts. Actually, the average price rise for the year was closer to 6 per cent, with an 8.8 per cent rate rise registered in the last quarter—a tremendous jump that carried over into 1974.

The steel companies, themselves front runners in raising prices ever since the end of the Second World War, count on inflation to be a continuing process. They include it in all their calculations. And they use it. Especially do they use it to bring about wage cuts in an indirect way. They know full well that if they were to try openly and directly to cut wages they would meet with the stiffest resistance by the workers. So they don't mind "granting" a 5 or 6 per cent wage increase because they count on a steel price hike of from 25 to 30 per cent to bring about actually, if indirectly, a cut of 5 per cent or more—in *real* wages (purchasing power) for all workers, including steelworkers. So you end up with what looks like more money in the pay envelope but is able to buy less at the check-out counter.

#### *Abel's Unable Economics*

Abel further miscalculated, to say the least, when he "justified" the ENA no-strike sellout deal on the grounds that it would prevent hedge-buying by steel users anticipating a strike. He said it would overcome the boom and slack cycle and the layoffs that have followed some steel settlements. He tied this argument to his demogogy about the need to compete in productivity with steelworkers in foreign capitalist countries and the need to "buy American" to curb steel imports.

His arguments have been shot full of holes by the actual facts.

First, world-wide demand for steel was high at the very time that Abel was secretly hatching up the ENA sellout with the companies. It continues to remain high and will do so for at least another six years, according to bourgeois economists themselves. The demand was so strong that many steel users were willing to pay higher prices for imported steel even two years ago. At that time U.S.-made steel was in short supply and was still being produced more cheaply. Even today, with domestic steel still in short supply, the now still higher-priced foreign steel is keeping many U.S. steel users in production. (Because of devaluation of the dollar by some 30 to 40 per cent as against foreign currencies, U.S.-made steel has become more competitive in world markets, selling at lower than world prices despite the steep price increases since controls were lifted. As a result the export of steel from the U.S. has risen significantly.)

Failing to take into account the world-wide raw materials shortage (including steel) and ignoring the effects of the devaluation of the

dollar, the steel union leadership peddled the phoney company propaganda about the layoff effects of hedge buying, the "poor" competitive position of the domestic steel industry, etc., to justify the productivity (overwork-speedup) drive and the ENA.

Abel has completely tied the union's economic policies to the outlook of the steel industry. Thus, in the face of a world-wide shortage of steel which will last for many years, the industry chiefs drag their feet, refuse to take the steel out of their pants, refuse to embark on any bold plans for a rapid expansion of the steel capacity. Instead, they place as their main aim extracting the maximum profit out of the present capacity (with only a slight expansion). They use every kind of pretext to justify this: the high cost of anti-pollution equipment (on which they also drag their feet); not enough profits(!); not enough tax writeoffs; not enough protection from the government, and so on and on. Abel buys all this and joins the companies in demanding more production (speedup), holding down the size of wage increases, failing to fight health and safety violations and other grievances, accepting the consent degree which watered-down the Fairfield court order on plant-wide seniority, etc.

This has given the U.S. steel industry a temporary "competitive advantage" over its foreign capitalist rivals (see below). But it will be a short-lived advantage, for the West German and Japanese steel moguls, the chief rivals of the U.S. steel magnates, have embarked on extensive programs to expand their steel-making capacities at home and have joined in ventures to add 40 million tons of new steel-making capacity in such developing countries as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Iran, Libya, Brazil, Tunisia, Algeria, South Korea and Indonesia.

Much of this new capacity will use the direct reduction method, a relatively new method of making iron from iron-ore pellets without melting the ore. This is a comparatively low-cost means of expanding iron-making for steel. But the U.S. steel industry has always lagged in introducing new methods, preferring to use the old equipment to the breaking point before making a change. The industry owners prefer a situation of shortages, of tight steel supplies, which is conducive to their policy of always raising prices.

While there is a general, overall steel shortage, which will remain for some time, there are also artificially created shortages. Some of these occur when a company decides that a certain product-line is less profitable than another. Thus, Republic Steel in Cleveland shut down its bolt plant as "unprofitable" and stopped making a certain type of bolt needed for roofing timbers in coal mines. This resulted in a number of mines closing down in the very midst of the "energy



crisis." Thousands of coal miners and steelworkers lost their jobs. The Abel leadership never addressed itself to this "strike" (lockout) of Republic Steel against its own workers and the coal miners!

Other artificial shortages are created by "controlled inventories" in which big steel distributors, acting on orders from the steel-producing corporations, withhold steel from buyers to force higher "under the table" prices, to compel them to use and adapt other shapes, plates and forms which have piled up in inventory, or as punishment for having bought imported steel in the past. These phoned-up shortages, too, can lead to temporary layoffs, but Abel is unconcerned about this company practice.

Still another shortage developed at the height of the "energy crisis" when independent oil well drillers couldn't get tubular steel because U.S. steel producers were selling it abroad. But, of course, Abel's phoney "Buy American" patriotism wasn't intended for the corporations and their sacred right to make profits anywhere! Only workers are required to be "patriotic" by buying American and going into "one on one" competition with Japanese and West German steelworkers! Conversely, if the workers in those countries, which are importing ever larger amounts of U.S.-made steel, were to follow Abel's advice, how many U.S. steelworkers would be thrown out of work?

As for hedge-buying, it hasn't stopped. Under capitalism, there will always be some reason or excuse for it. Both the auto and construction industries are using less steel this year than last. Nonetheless they bought and stockpiled a great deal of steel in anticipation of price increases. Since the expectation that prices would go up is a big stimulus for hedge-buying and stockpiling, it would seem that Abel had a very good reason to take a strong stand against rising prices. But he has yet to raise his voice against higher prices, let alone lead the union membership in an effective fight for price rollbacks.

Steel is also being bought and stockpiled in anticipation of a coal strike. The coal miners, for sure, will not accept Abel's turn-tail-and-run no-strike formula in the illusion that this will prevent stockpiling. Coal miners, many times, have had to face mountainous coal stockpiles, as well as company thugs and state troopers, and have outfought and outlasted all of them to win. Long experience has taught them that the only way they can improve their condition is by united struggle, and not by smoking the opium-pipe of collaboration with the companies against their own best interests!

Abel's economic policies are all wrong because they are boss-serving. To base a union's strategy on boss-economics is betrayal of

workers' interests. Boss-economics result in more production and less consumption, more profits and less take-home pay.

### *Abel's "Foreign Competition" Hoax Exposed*

Even as Abel was shovelling out his swill about the threat of cheap foreign steel, the U.S. steel industry was further strengthening its competitive position against the foreign capitalist rivals. Due to the nearly 11 per cent growth in productivity of U.S. steelworkers (which previously was already twice the productivity of steelworkers in Western Europe and Japan), and due to the devaluation of the dollar, U.S.-made steel has been selling below the world price.

Since Abel has pictured the domestic steel industry as poor, sick and struggling to make it against powerful foreign steel competitors, let's examine the facts, as disclosed in *Fortune* and *Business Week*.

In 1973, there were 38 steel corporations in the capitalist world which reported net profits of \$10 million or more. (Figures for two major foreign steel companies were not available. The British Steel Corporation reported a net loss for 1973.) Of these 38 corporations, 17 were in the United States and 21 in other capitalist countries (Japan 6, Canada 3, Sweden 3, West Germany 3, and one each in France, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Spain, Australia and Brazil).

Combined, these 38 companies reported net profits totalling \$2.2 billion. Of that total 55 per cent was made by the 17 U.S. companies. The top six U.S. companies (U.S. Steel, Bethlehem, Armco, National, Republic and Inland) made 41 per cent of the total capitalist world net steel profits. All 38 companies showed fabulous profit increases, from 373 per cent by one company in West Germany and 116 per cent by another in Japan, to 66 per cent for the U.S. steel industry as a whole. U.S. Steel's reported net profits after taxes came to \$892,500 each day of the year. It made a net yearly profit of over \$2,600 on each production worker.

To get some idea of the competitive profit position of the U.S. steel industry, here is the score on the ratio of net profits to sales, according to the figures supplied by the companies:

To realize \$1 in reported net profits it took \$66.40 in sales for Thyssen-Hutte (West Germany), \$42.37 for Unisor (France), \$36.54 for Nippon Steel (Japan), and \$21.63 for U.S. Steel. Thus, U.S. Steel enjoyed a profitability in relation to sales three times greater than that of the German company, twice greater than the French and nearly double that of the Japanese!

While the sales of the U.S. steel industry rose by 35.5 per cent in 1973 over 1972, its net profits, as we have seen, rose by 66 per cent.

(The top three—U.S. Steel, Bethlehem and Armco—have 52 per cent of all U.S. steel sales and 55 per cent of all U.S. steel profits.)

Clearly, the U.S. steel industry was and remains the dominant force in capitalist world steel production. Its competitive position, far from being weak, as Abel said, is strong and, for the time being, getting stronger.

Abel lied; he deceived the steelworkers. It matters little whether he meant to do it or not. The fact is that the workers are paying the price of that deceit. And just as Nixon was forced out of office for deceit and other high crimes and misdemeanors, so will the steelworkers in good time force the collaborators-with-the-company out of union officer. Like the coal miners, they will bring back union democracy and militant, class-struggle policies.

The Abel leadership touted the last steel settlement as “the greatest ever.” When was a steel settlement not hailed as the “greatest ever” by the USWA leadership?

To be sure, there were a number of gains, such as the cost-of-living formula, the break-through pension improvement and the dental care provision. But no steel contract settlement which fails to include the demands of the primarily Black and Chicano coke oven workers for early retirement at full pension and for iron-clad safeguards against cancer-producing pollution, or which fails to incorporate the principles of the Fairfield federal court decision on plant-wide seniority, can by any stretch of the imagination be called the “greatest ever.”

As for the wage settlement, it is a fraud to claim that it was substantial or adequate when the union does absolutely nothing to stop the skyrocketing price spiral. For what looks like an adequate raise on one day can be reduced to total inadequacy the next day by rising prices and the resultant loss in purchasing power. The revised cost-of-living formula still doesn't bring wages into line with prices. In fact, all the cost-of-living formulas, even the best, tag behind the rise in prices and are therefore guaranteed to widen the disparity between wages and prices.

There is only one way labor leadership can make a valid claim that wage settlements are adequate and substantial today. It must reinforce the fight for wage increases, on the one hand by fighting for and winning annual wage reopeners, and on the other hand by an all-out, active policy of mass struggle and independent political action against inflation and for price rollbacks, up to and including work stoppages to demand that Congress roll back prices.

The steel union leadership has never fought the steel companies' policy of raising prices. It has never waged any kind of struggle

against inflation and for price rollbacks. I. W. Abel in particular has gone along fully with the steel monopolists' policies on prices, profits and productivity. What a pitiful, humiliated figure he cut as he stood before the American Bankers Association on July 18 in Washington, D.C. and told the assembled kings of high finance that he and George Meany "were zapped" after they served on Nixon's control boards (in which wages were controlled while prices were allowed to rise). Did he show that he had learned anything and would abandon his class-partnership policies after this wretched confession? Not by a long shot! He went on to repeat the hoary old lie that wages cause inflation; he testified that he had held down wages; and he begged and pleaded with the bankers that they "use restraint" in their drive for profits! It could only have been their awareness of how loyal and useful Abel is to them that kept the bankers from bursting out in laughter and sneering at him!

I. W. Abel has, of course, tipped his hat to the high cost of living. His answers have been "self-imposed wage restraints" with the never-to-be-realized hope that big business will hold down prices, plus more productivity (which, he claimed, would lead to lower prices), plus the no-strike sellout deal. In other words, every one of his programs has been at the expense of the workers. Today, even a school child knows that wages have been in a losing race with prices.

### *Detente and Job Security in Steel*

Abel and Meany both know full well that their talk of "equality of sacrifice," of holding down both wages and prices, is designed to hide the truth. They know that inflation and rising prices will never be stopped and reversed without the use of independent working-class power against the monopolist ruling class. They know that the capitalists and their government are always ready to keep wages down and, if possible, to cut them. They know that the only sacrifice is that made by the working class. They are conscious betrayers of the interests of the workers. In the words of Gus Hall:

. . . never in history has the trade union movement been dominated by a worse mob of totally case-hardened, reactionary, toadying bootlickers than it is today. They [Meany-Abel-Fitzsimmons] are more completely class collaborationist, racist, redbaiting and corrupt than any in the history of the AFL-CIO. Ideologically, they are more openly corrupt than any leadership of the past. In general, they constitute a most active reactionary force.

This mob is the most active anti-detente force. The fact is that trade with the socialist countries is the most job-creating of all for-

eign trade. That it is the only trade that does not take away jobs, does not stop this gang from doing everything it can to stop detente and put an end to the new job-creating trade relations with the socialist world. (*The Big Stakes of Detente*, Report to the Central Committee, CPUSA, June 20, 1974, New Outlook Publishers, New York, pp. 29-30.)

With this understanding of Meany and Abel as incorrigible cold warriors, we can fathom why they resist making inflation a focal point of mass trade union struggle. Their economic and trade-union policies are based on and deeply rooted in cold-war economics and policies. These have inflation and ever-rising prices built into them; they have speedup and disregard for health and safety built into them; they have racist discrimination built into them; they have high taxes built into them. If you base yourself on cold-war policies, you must accept all these anti-working class consequences.

The steel industry can produce for armaments and a war economy or it can produce for peaceful construction and peaceful trade. The tendency is to use the higher prices it can command from steel for armaments as leverage to jack up prices for consumer and all other steel. Recently, for example, the Federal Trade Commission charged U.S. Steel and Lukens Steel with violating a 1951 FTC order prohibiting them from fixing prices on alloy steel used primarily in the hulls of Navy ships.

As is commonly known, the cold-war economy is the chief stimulant of inflation. It provides a guaranteed market with one buyer, the government, and it is capable of commanding the highest prices. It is also non-productive, creating no new values of use to the people, unlike, say, the machine tool industry. The practice of raising prices has become built into the policies of the steel corporations for over 25 years now. For them, the cold war is the ideal state of affairs, one in which they can "have their cake and eat it, too." Thus, a heavy cold-war inertia hangs over the basic steel industry, especially in its topmost sectors, although some medium and smaller companies would like to break out of it.

But among many steel users, such as the machine tool industry, there is a growing and aggressive demand that detente be pressed forward to irreversibility. For example, *Metalworking News*, an industry trade paper, wages a consistent campaign for granting equal rights (the so-called "most favored nation" status) to the Soviet Union as a trading partner. It features just about every contract that any U.S. company signs with a socialist country. It castigates the Jackson-Vanik amendments which would put impossible conditions

on trade with the USSR. In a recent issue it reported one leader of the machine tool industry as scoffing at Jackson's phoney fears that trade would strengthen Soviet military might, saying that Jackson would "prevent the sale of garden spades to the Soviet Union because spades can also dig trenches!"

A sizeable sector of the metal-fabricating and machine tool industry is organized in the USWA. Other parts are organized in the Machinists, the UE, IUE and IBEW. Chemical and other industries that stand to gain from detente are also organized in the conglomerate-type USWA.

Thus, the overwhelming part of the membership of the steel union is employed in industries which would directly benefit from detente. The resulting vast expansion of trade would make existing jobs more secure and open up countless thousands of new jobs. Detente would create the most favorable conditions for slowing down inflation and winning the fight for price rollbacks. By making possible a drastic cut in the tremendous arms budget, detente could open the way for cutting taxes and using tax dollars for domestic needs of all kinds. And the climate and practical results created by detente could generate more favorable conditions for winning the shorter work week, ending all racist hiring and promotion practices and returning the union to fighting, class-struggle policies.

The AFL-CIO and the USWA top bureaucrats remain bogged down in the quicksands of the cold war while the reformist-led labor movement of Western Europe and most other parts of the non-socialist world have moved on to new positions of dialogue and working relationships with the trade unions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and with the Communist-led trade unions in capitalist countries.

There is a relationship between this and the fact that these unions are making greater gains for their memberships in the fight for wages and job security than has been the case in the United States. In contrast, the class-collaborationist leaders here consider it a mighty achievement if the "gains" that are won result merely in not falling too far behind the rising cost of living. The trade union bureaucracy has given up the fight to organize the unorganized, let alone to advance the working class to a qualitatively new status through achievement of the shorter work week and political independence.

Meanwhile, our brothers and sisters in Canada, who form a substantial part of the USWA membership, have begun to move for the right to determine their own policies, in the direction of autonomy. They have disagreed with the Abel leadership on the war in Vietnam

and on curbing steel imports. They have made it clear that the sell-out ENA does not apply to them. Unlike Abel, they have received and welcomed an official delegation of the Soviet Metalworkers Union. To the degree that they can, they have a fighting wage policy akin to class-struggle policy. And now they are virtually unanimous in demanding that the non-Communist clause, that infamous relic of McCarthyism which has robbed the union of its guts and some of its best unionists, be removed from the union constitution. All of this adds up to a renunciation and rejection of the Abel-Meany cold war policies and a definite move in the direction of detente. It is at the same time a move away from class-partnership, toadying policies and towards class-struggle, fighting policies in the interests of the membership.

There can be little doubt that the new currents sweeping through the Canadian section of the USWA are harbingers of what is to come within the U.S. section of the union. United States steelworkers and their growing rank-and-file movements in particular will welcome the fresh winds blowing from north to the border. For it is of tremendous help to them in their fight to turn the USWA to policies of detente and class struggle against inflation, racism, speedup and for democratic unionism.

The self-interest of the United States working class in achieving these goals is bound to assert itself. Already movement in this direction can be seen in a number of other unions. Unions such as the USWA cannot long remain immune to these developments nor to their own growing rank-and-file pressures for democratic, radical change. The fundamental self-interest of steel workers, as of all workers, is inextricably bound up with the struggle to make detente irreversible. The hand-writing is on the wall, and the time for the impeachment and removal from office of the toadying class-partnership labor bureaucrats draws near. It's time to dump the slag!

#### NOTICE TO OUR READERS

We ask that subscribers who move please send us both their old address and new address, including zip code, in order to assure uninterrupted receipt of the magazine.



BETTINA APTHEKER  
and JACK KURZWEIL

## A Communist Campaign in San Jose

Most people had never heard of San José, California, until the Angela Davis trial was moved here in February 1972. Its anonymity notwithstanding, the city of San José today has a greater population than Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and it is at the center of the fastest growing industrial region in the United States. Electronics is the name of the game.

"A few decades ago," *Fortune* magazine reported to the business world in June 1974, "Santa Clara County, California was a tranquil expanse of apricot, prune and cherry orchards. Now it's the place where American industry is thrusting out its newest branches and roots. Some 800 pioneering technology companies, along with numerous service and supplier firms, are clustered in the area, forming the densest concentration of innovative industry that exists anywhere in the [capitalist] world."

Since 1950 the county's population has quadrupled to 1.2 million. The county is huge, extending for 1,300 square miles. Its population is concentrated in a 240 square mile area.

In 1950 there were 3,000 high technology workers in the county. Today there are 150,000. By comparison, in 1950 there were 16,200 farm workers in the Santa Clara Valley. Today there are less than 6,000.

Twenty-seven per cent of the people in Santa Clara County are Chicano. Fewer than two per cent are Black.

Although few farm workers live in the county, the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee is a significant political force in the area. With a large Chicano population, and with the Salinas Valley, one of the centers of Farm Worker activity, nearby, support for the UFWOC is very great.

The electronics industry employs a large number of skilled workers, engineers, researchers, etc. There are 4,000 people in Santa Clara County who have Ph.D.s; that is to say, one out of every six persons in California with a doctorate lives in the county.

The electronics industry also employs tens of thousands of unskilled and semiskilled workers. The overwhelming majority are women. Of these, most are Chicano, Filipino, Japanese, Chinese and Black. There is hardly any union organization in the industry. A few shops have been organized by the International Association of Machinists and

the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. The United Electrical workers recently began an organizing drive. The typical starting wage for unskilled women workers is \$2.40. In some smaller shops the starting wage is less than \$2.00 an hour. In the world of high finance, Santa Clara County is known as "Silicon Valley." *Fortune* informed its readers that the area is considered the world capital of semiconductor technology. With sales of \$2.5 billion annually, the valley accounts for about eight per cent of total U.S. sales in electronics and some forty per cent of the nation's semiconductor output.

Many of the companies in the area are among the 500 largest industrial corporations in the United States: Hewlett-Packard, Food Machinery Corporation, General Electric, Sylvania, Varian, Fairchild, Lockheed, Admiral, Kaiser, General Precision, IBM, Memorex, Raychem Corporations, etc. Most of these companies were created or moved into the area in the last fifteen or twenty years.

Another basic industry in Santa Clara County is auto. Both Ford and General Motors have assembly plants in the area employing some fifteen thousand workers. Other industries include steel production and food processing, especially canneries.

There are a significant number of colleges in the county. Stanford University is the largest and the most lucrative. The University owns Stanford Industrial Park, which comprises 660 acres and accommodates fifty-five electronics corporations employing seventeen thousand people. The University caters predominantly to students from white, upper middle class families. It is a major center for industrial research and development, and its Vice-President, Frederick J. Terman, is considered by many to be the father of Santa Clara's electronics boom. Terman, a professor of electrical engineering before his administrative talents were discovered, was responsible for uniting William Hewlett and David Packard, both of whom had been young and aspiring graduate students under his tutelage.

San Jose State University and the University of Santa Clara are the other four-year colleges in the area. Santa Clara is a Catholic-run institution, and San Jose is one of eighteen state colleges in California. Combined they have a student population of approximately 50,000.

In addition, the county has some half-dozen two year colleges including San Jose City, Foothill, West Valley and De Anza, with a full and part-time enrollment exceeding 100,000.

At the state and community colleges the majority of students are from working class families. Many, if not a majority of them are employed, often as unskilled workers in electronics, the canneries and various service industries such as hospitals, restaurants and super-

markets.

Displaying a pattern which appears to be unique in the western states, especially California, a substantial proportion of the working people in Santa Clara County, including the Chicano people, own their own homes. Apartments are scarce and rents are prohibitive. It actually costs less per month to pay off a mortgage than to rent an apartment in reasonable condition to accommodate an average-sized family.

Public transportation in California in general, and in Santa Clara County in particular, is expensive and colossally inefficient. The only mode of public transportation is busses, and it is *impossible* to get to most industrial enterprises by bus. The vast majority of workers must own their own cars as a condition of employment.

During this twenty year period of industrial boom in Santa Clara County, land speculators, financiers and industrial developers have plowed through what was once a lush and beautiful agricultural valley, tearing it up in a ruthless drive to maximize their wealth and profits. In their wake, they have left a vast urban sprawl of chaos and crisis.

At the heart of this industrial operation has been the county tax assessor. For it has been through the office of the assessor that land-use policies were set, property taxes fixed and industrial property appraised. Most social services in the county, such as the public school, the community colleges, public transportation such as it is, public health facilities, parks, libraries, street and sewage maintenance, law enforcement and so forth, are heavily financed through property taxes.

To understand the nature and the extent of the publicly-organized and sanctioned looting of the community's wealth for the private gain of these monster monopolies, we offer a few facts which, when publicly stated, *were not denied by the incumbent tax assessor*:

\*Residential land in Santa Clara County, that is, the land on which the average working class family lives, is appraised at \$60,000 to \$100,000 per acre. By way of contrast, Hewlett-Packard's land is appraised at \$30,000 per acre; IBM's at \$20,000 per acre and Ford's at \$12,000 per acre.

\*These corporate interests are not only underassessed. Special arrangements are made so that they are often taxed at a *lower rate* on assessed valuation than the average home owner.

\*There is an inequality of expenditure so that schools, parks, health facilities, etc. in working class neighborhoods are under-financed in comparison to a few wealthier communities. At the same time, these working class communities have the highest tax rates in

the county.

San Jose's East Side, for example—a Chicano, Black and working class area—has the highest tax rate in the county, and the lowest levels of social services.

\*There are 38 different school districts in Santa Clara County, and many different flood control districts, sanitation districts, city districts, county districts, etc. *each with its own tax rate*. These districts criss-cross and overlap so that there are 1200 different property tax rates in Santa Clara County! Not only is this an anarchistic method of taxation, providing no rational basis for planning, etc. It is also an excellent method for concealing a multitude of special deals to save the big corporations millions of dollars a year in taxes.

It is not surprising then, that in the spring of 1974 financial disaster struck. County officials publicly admitted they were on the brink of a financial crisis that could bring a severe cutback in public services, a boost in the tax rate and the use of recently acquired revenue sharing money just to balance the 1974-1975 county budget. These are the same officials, by the way, who authorized the expenditure of three quarters of a million dollars for the renovation of the Santa Clara County jail and courthouse, to provide so-called necessary security for the Angela Davis trial.

#### *The Party Candidacy for Tax Assessor*

It was against this backdrop of the political economy of the Santa Clara Valley, and its particular impact on the working class, Chicano and Black families in particular, that the Communist Party of Northern California determined to run a Party candidate for tax assessor in the 1974 June primary election.

The tax assessor's office is a nonpartisan office. Thus, payment of an outrageous \$700 filing fee and the presentation of twenty valid signatures of registered voters in the county on a nominating petition guaranteed any prospective candidate a spot on the ballot.

Jack Kurzweil was in a particularly good position to run.

Jack is a professor of electrical engineering at San Jose State University. He is on the Executive Committee of his union, United Professors of California, Local 1362 (AFT, AFL-CIO), and represents his union on the Santa Clara County Central Labor Council. He has been a member of the Communist Party for twelve years.

During the 1971 and 1972 academic years, the chancellor of the California State Colleges attempted to fire Jack from his teaching position because of his political activity. Jack waged a political and legal fight for his right to tenure which ended in complete victory in February 1972. A federal judge ordered Jack's immediate rein-

statement as an assistant professor, with tenure.

As a Communist and an engineer Jack was in a unique position to understand both the political economy of the Santa Clara Valley and the main scientific and technical aspects of the electronics industry itself.

The Kurzweil campaign had two unique aspects: First, the campaign addressed itself to specific community issues in detail, and *offered a concrete program for immediate relief which could have been implemented had Jack been elected.* Thus, after exposing some of the facts about taxes in the county, we proposed to "open the books" and provide for the public scrutiny of all tax assessments and policies. We proposed to review all property assessments with a view toward lowering the assessed values of owner-occupied homes and increasing those of industrial and commercial property. We proposed to act to control and plan industrial growth. All of these things were within the immediate power of the tax assessor to implement. Then our program declared our commitment to seek other reforms, to change the property tax laws, to seek equal financing and expenditures for public services in all communities, and especially in Chicano, Black and working class areas, and we placed special emphasis on the need for universal, minimum-cost child care as a basic right of all families and a basic right of all women. The program ended with a general statement of Jack's position on national and international issues.

The second unique feature of the campaign was its united front character. It was our opinion that such a united front would make it possible to place our program before thousands in the community in a new and more meaningful way. In fact, the program was sent in draft form to many in the community who contributed crucial suggestions and ideas which shaped its ultimate character.

Our concept of a united front campaign was based upon a political estimate of the relationship of the Communist Party to the progressive, Left and radical movements in our community, especially in the aftermath of the successful effort to free Angela Davis. If anything, we *underestimated* the possibilities for a united front campaign.

While we felt that many individuals in the movement would lend their support to Jack's candidacy, we did not expect organizational endorsement. Nevertheless, it was forthcoming. In addition to the one hundred individuals who endorsed the campaign, representing trade union, campus and community activists, Jack won endorsement from La Confederación de la Raza Unida, itself a coalition of over seventy Chicano organizations in the county, from the Santa Clara County Black Caucus, the International Longshoremen and Ware-

housemen's Union Local 11, the County Council of the American Federation of Teachers, Social Services Employees Union Local 535 (SEIU) and three regional newspapers: *Sedition* (San Jose), the *Grapevine* (Palo Alto) and the *Bay Guardian* (San Francisco). This was, of course, combined with open organizational endorsement of the Communist Party of Santa Clara County, and the enthusiastic support and reportage of the *People's World*.

Once we became aware of the potential for organizational endorsement Jack appeared before many different groups, such as the NAACP, the United Auto Workers, the National Women's Political Caucus, the Committee on Political Education (COPE) of the AFL-CIO, and so on. In each instance he was well-received, and in virtually all cases Jack's appearance prevented the automatic endorsement of the incumbent. Instead, most of these groups voted "no endorsement."

COPE offered an unusual experience.

With two years as his union's delegate to the Santa Clara Central Labor Council, Jack was personally acquainted with virtually everyone on the COPE board. The Labor Council is among the most progressive in the United States. It has consistently supported the Farm Workers, opposed U.S. aggression in Vietnam, and most recently issued a scathing condemnation of the fascist coup in Chile.

Jack made a short presentation before COPE during the morning session of its endorsement meeting. He was the only candidate for assessor to speak before lunch.

During the lunch break, delegates expressed their particular interest in Jack's statement that he was a member of the Communist Party. Some had known this before. Others had not. All were impressed with a public declaration. After lunch the incumbent assessor, Dwight Mathiesen, addressed the delegates. At the conclusion of his talk, one delegate raised his hand with a question: "Mr. Mathiesen," he queried, "are you a member of the Communist Party?"

Mathiesen blanched. The room fairly exploded with laughter.

The delegates then flung a series of tough questions at him concerning his assessment practices favoring the big corporations.

The voting procedure brought the next unexpected event. Several COPE delegates were prepared to move for Jack's endorsement. Someone from the leadership of the Labor Council, however, shot his hand into the air first, and moved for what's called an "open endorsement." This meant that COPE would consider all the candidates "satisfactory." This was done to prevent Jack from winning the COPE endorsement. Only a majority was needed to pass this motion, while a motion to endorse a specific candidate would have required a two-

thirds majority.

The vote on the "open endorsement" motion passed 27 to 26; which is to say, in our opinion, at least twenty-six COPE delegates were prepared to vote for Jack's endorsement.

The Kurzweil campaign defined the race for tax assessor. After Jack began his campaign two other candidates entered the race to challenge the incumbent. One was a career man in the assessor's office. The other was a lawyer and property tax researcher, Robert Colonna, who was also a member of the Statewide Homeowners Association. By no means a Left or radical personage, Colonna nevertheless buttressed many of Jack's assertions concerning the inequities in the assessment practices, especially affecting the small homeowner.

The San Jose *Sun* newspapers, with a circulation of several hundreds of thousands in the county, featured the usually unnoticed assessor's race in its April 3rd issue. The antimonopoly thrust of the Kurzweil campaign was the focal point of the article.

The campaign stimulated independent community actions against current assessment practices. The Valley Coalition, an action-oriented coalition of more than one hundred organizations in Santa Clara County, for example, established a Taxation Task Force. The Task Force sent delegations to the assessor's office on two different occasions. Using research information generated by the Kurzweil campaign, they demanded explanations for the obvious inequities in residential and industrial property assessments.

Nearly two hundred people in the Santa Clara Valley participated in the Kurzweil campaign. Eighty thousand campaign brochures were distributed. In many cases campaign workers went door-to-door with the material. Several thousand posters with the slogan "Lower your Taxes/Make the Corporations Pay," and "Vote Kurzweil" bumper-stickers were displayed throughout the area. Sufficient funds were raised to allow for ads to be placed in local newspapers. Jack spoke before literally tens of thousands on radio and television. People organized small gatherings for him in their homes. He spoke before dozens of organizations.

Precinct work, door-to-door, proved to be the most effective and rewarding avenue for reaching the people. We concentrated in working class, Chicano and Black communities. All our literature was published in both English and Spanish. People were cordial, and often anxious to talk with our campaign workers in greater detail about the assessor's race and politics in general.

One experience, typical of many, is worth recounting. A young Chicano worker opened the door in response to a knock from one of our campaign workers. He was a warm and affable fellow. He listened attentively to our thirty second pitch, and glanced at the brochure

she had shoved into his hand. Suddenly, the young man looked up and said: "What party is this guy from?"

Our campaign worker hadn't expected the question. She said the first thing that came to mind: "He's not a Democrat and he's not a Republican."

The young man exclaimed jokingly: "Well, what the hell is he, a Communist?"

"Well, yes," gulped our campaigner, "that's exactly what he is!"

The young man stepped back, roared with laughter, and cheered: "Fa . . . aar out!" He got so excited he took several more copies of the brochure to hand out to fellow workers in his shop.

### *Election Results*

The success of the campaign, and of the political approach of a united front candidacy, was evident the morning after the election when we read the returns.

Jack had won just under thirty thousand votes, fifteen per cent of the total votes cast. A subsequent and more detailed study of the election returns showed that Jack had actually won a plurality in several precincts.

Although Jack came in last there was no significant difference between his vote and the vote received by each of the other two challengers. In other words, forty-five per cent of the electorate voted against the incumbent. At least thirty per cent of that electorate (the combined Kurzweil and Colonna vote) should be considered as a definite and conscious protest vote.

This represents a most serious political challenge to the incumbent, and to the taxation policies and class interests he represents. It was achieved largely as a result of the initiative of the Party. It is this fact, above all else, which is to be emphasized.

Only through a united front candidacy, which reached far beyond the confines of the Party organization itself, could the Party realize the potential of its appeal and the actuality of its political might.

As a result of such a united front, Communist candidacy the relationship of the Party to the mass movement was further enhanced. Most specifically, the campaign helped to lay the basis for new initiatives openly by the Party on such issues as inflation, the educational crisis and continuing efforts on the issue of taxation. A Marxist Study Series has been initiated, the membership of the Young Workers Liberation League has grown significantly, including among workers in the electronics industry, and the circulation and influence of the *People's World* was appreciably increased.

While the general thrust of our effort was correct, we think there are still many weaknesses to overcome. For example, we seriously



underestimated the possibilities for expanding the united front character of the campaign. We were never able to secure a campaign manager; nor were we able to open an office. All our volunteers, without exception, were employed or in school full-time, including the candidate. These problems made it impossible for us to *organize* the support we were generating on one level into a more cohesive political force on another level. Throughout the campaign we also had great difficulty in projecting the independent role and position of the Party, so as to maintain its organizational identity as a leading force within the electoral coalition we had created.

The cutting edge of the ultra-Right movement in this country, epitomized by the policies of both Richard Nixon and California Governor Ronald Reagan, has been racism. Most particularly, the Right has used the issue of rising property taxes, claiming that social welfare programs require vast expenditures which they are unable to meet except through increased taxation.

We think, therefore, that it is extremely important for the Left to campaign on this question and to show, especially white people, that their financial plight is not the result of poor people, Black and Chicano people "ripping-off" the system, but the result of the plunder and greed of industrial, banking and agricultural interests that seek to amass unlimited and unlimitable profit.

Finally, we are in the throes of a continuing and deepening constitutional/political-economic crisis such as this country has not experienced in more than a hundred years. One consequence of this crisis—and one that we experienced throughout the campaign—is the widespread cynicism among our people about politics and all politicians. A new slogan appearing on many a bumpersticker in this election in California read: "Impeach all the bastards." This, in spite of the fact that one of the most important campaigns in California today is the reelection of the Black Congressman from the Berkeley-Oakland area, Ronald Dellums. This cynicism is also a manifestation of the impotence which people feel in the face of the power and corruption engulfing them.

We believe that the Party's initiatives now become all the more consequential, especially as they focus on specific issues and on concrete proposals and solutions to the crisis. And it is through united front efforts that our proposals and solutions become practicable; that is, realizable, to masses of people.

The Kurzweil campaign was an important experience for the progressive movement. A Communist candidate succeeded in uniting a significant number of people in the Chicano, Black, working class and campus communities in opposition to the policies and practices of the largest industrial, banking and agricultural interests in the area.

# The United Nations and the Struggle for Detente

Many questions of national as well as international concern press for positive answers during the three-month course of the 29th regular session of the United Nations General Assembly. The answers will be forthcoming to the degree that the UN resolutions, decisions and actions

a) extinguish the embers of conflict that threaten to expand into nuclear catastrophe;

b) further the progress towards strengthening detente;

c) support the just struggles of the developing countries to exercise their right of self-determination, including their right to dispose of their natural resources for their economic and social progress and the improvement of living standards;

d) speed the liquidation of colonialism, racism, apartheid and Nazism that still pollute the global environment;

e) promote the construction of the new relations of economic, scientific, technical and cultural cooperation among the states that are developing on the basis of equality and mutual advantage.

The importance of the answers to these questions for the people of the United States, as for the peoples of all other countries, is self-evident.

Experience during the 29 years of the world organization has demonstrated the UN's potential for influencing global processes conducive to progress. It has shown that the UN is not merely a mirror reflecting these processes, nor only an arena of the international class struggle. It is not and cannot be a "world government" standing above its member-states. It came into being as the instrument of states with different social systems but with a common interest in the maintenance of peace, that is, as an organization of, by and for peaceful coexistence. It is one of more than 2,000 international organizations extant today. However, to use the words of Leopoldo Benites, president of the 28th General Assembly, the UN is "the supreme organ of the international community and the highest expression of world public opinion." It is therefore capable of an independent role in determining the course of events.

The seemingly endless rounds of meetings and debates which

feature the session from mid-September to mid-December are not, as the UN's detractors stress, meaningless exercises in rhetoric and time-consuming wrangles among diplomats. On the contrary, they bring into focus the ideological positions reflecting the basic national interests and class alignments of the 135 member-states. The clash of ideologies is resolved in the resolutions and actions that ensue from the debates. By crystallizing and codifying the will of the majority in its resolutions and decisions, the UN brings this will to bear on the foreign policies and activities of its member-states.

Among jurists the question is still undecided as to whether these resolutions and declarations, accumulating year after year during the General Assembly sessions, possess the authority of international law. Nor has the increasing influence of international public opinion on the policies and activities of member-states become universal, as is evidenced by the brazen flouting of UN decisions by the apartheid regime of South Africa and its NATO supporters.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the pressure of world public opinion which the UN helped to generate did indeed contribute to the decision of U.S. imperialism to withdraw the bulk of its military forces from Indochina, to the isolation of the Israeli aggressors in the Middle East and Africa, and to the initial steps of the new Portuguese government towards the dismantling of its colonialist administrations and recognition of the rights of the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola to self-determination and national independence. Moreover, the international public opinion which the UN helped to crystallize has reacted on the activities of the UN itself, bringing into the forefront of its deliberations problems of vital global concern despite efforts to divert it and derogate its activities for preserving peace. Only in conditions of peace can it act effectively to protect the environment. Only if detente is made world-wide and irreversible can it effectively tackle the tasks of eliminating the hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy and disease that now plague three-quarters of the world's population.

Recognition of the importance of this UN potential for influencing the policies and activities of its member-states is the first requirement for enabling the masses to make conscious use of UN resolutions and decisions. The two processes are dialectically inter-related. By influencing the activities of governments, the UN affects the conditions of the people; and the people, by influencing the policies and activities of their governments, help to determine the decisions of the UN.

Realization of the opportunities created by this inter-relationship can be an asset for all peoples struggling for social progress. By using

UN resolutions and decisions, the people of the United States could strengthen the struggle to safeguard constitutional government and further the democratization of the country's governmental structure and institutions. The world organization's decisions could be used in the struggle to preserve living standards from the intensifying offensive of monopoly capital. They would render powerful support for the struggle to stabilize and consolidate international detente.

### *The UN and the Crisis of Everyday Living*

To understand what the people of the United States have going for them in UN decisions and activities, it may be helpful to review the work of the world organization in the past year. In addition to the General Assembly's regular 28th session with its agenda of more than 100 items, its Sixth Special Session convened in April on problems of raw materials and development. Moreover, UN organs with year-round responsibilities, such as the Security Council, Economic and Social Council, regional economic commissions and standing committees of the General Assembly and the Secretariat, conducted activities during this period. And many developments took place under auspices of UN specialized agencies and affiliated non-governmental organizations. For purposes of this review, however, only the most important actions need be considered.

Consider, first, the paramount need to combat inflation, to check the decline of the masses' purchasing power and their increasing pauperization. It is common knowledge that this process is fed by the \$100-billion U.S. military budget and more billions to support military dictatorships in other countries and to maintain a global apparatus for espionage, provocations, psychological warfare and subversion. The reduction of these massive sums would help the fight to cut the tax burden on the working people. The diversion of a portion of the rest for satisfying social needs, such as low-rent housing, education, health care, child care and real aid for the aged and disabled and for the 40 million persons living in poverty, would be an immense boon to the people.

The official alibi for this wasteful squandering of the people's tax funds is "national security." It is alleged that the country is threatened with destruction if it does not maintain military superiority in the existing climate of tension and confrontation. Obviously, the remedy for this imagined and invented malady is not continuance of the arms race. The first-strike nuclear capability pursued by the financial-industrial-military-political complex in this day of overkill, of the growing universality of scientific and technical knowhow, and of the interna-

tionalization of economic life, is a chase after the rainbow. The remedy is relaxation of tensions and the restriction of competition to the spheres of economic, diplomatic and cultural endeavor. The remedy is military detente to consolidate the political detente that is now in process of development. The struggle of the masses to improve living standards is indissolubly linked with the struggle for detente.

These inter-related struggles were supported by major actions of the 28th General Assembly, the Assembly's Sixth Special Session and the Security Council. The 28th regular session opened on a note that signalled the world organization's concern for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems: it admitted to membership both the German Democratic Republic and the German Federal Republic. During the general debate that traditionally features the first weeks of the session, representatives of many countries denounced the bloody imperialist-fascist putsch on September 11 against the Chilean working people's struggle for better living conditions. The 28th session then acted to extinguish existing hot-beds of conflict, to curb the arms race and promote disarmament, and to strengthen international security. Of 15 resolutions adopted to realize these objectives (for students and others desiring to study the texts, resolutions are identified by reference numbers in parentheses), the more important were:

1. A call to "all States to make renewed efforts aimed at adopting effective measures for the cessation of the arms race, especially in the nuclear field, including the reduction of military budgets, particularly of the strongly armed countries, with a view to achieving progress towards general disarmament." Adopted without objection, it was entitled "Economic and Social Consequences of the Armaments Race and its Harmful Effects on World Peace and Security" (3075/XXVIII). This item was carried over from the 25th, 26th and 27th sessions, and reflected views of a group of experts (published as "Disarmament and Development") and a report by the Secretary-General entitled "Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures." The latter report declared that a substantial reduction in the military expenditures of all countries, particularly of those whose military budgets are highest, should be brought about as soon as possible.

2. A recommendation that all States which are permanent members of the Security Council (USA, Britain, USSR, France and China) reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent and allot 10 per cent of the funds so released for assistance to developing countries. This, a Soviet proposal (basically similar to others made by the USSR in

1957, 1958, 1961, and 1964), was adopted by 83 votes for and 2 against (China and Albania), with 38 abstentions (3093/XXVIII). The text expressed belief that "political detente in the world should be supplemented by military detente."

3. A decision to establish a committee of 40 non-nuclear weapon member-States to examine all views and suggestions of governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference, with an appeal for cooperation by the nuclear powers, said committee to report to the 29th General Assembly. Another Soviet proposal, it was unanimously adopted despite voiced opposition of the USA and China (3184/XXVIII).

4. An appeal "to all militarily significant States to exert efforts in order to extend the political detente so far achieved to military detente, to stop the arms race as well as to take practical steps to reduce armament" and to all States "to broaden the scope of detente to cover the entire world and to reaffirm the principles of friendly relations as the basis of relations between States, irrespective of their political, economic and social systems." This resolution, calling for concrete measures to implement the "Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security," was adopted by 97 for and 2 against (Portugal and South Africa), with 18 abstentions including the USA, Britain and the FRG; China did not participate in the voting (3185/XXVIII). It also reaffirmed "the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under alien domination to achieve self-determination and independence," and declared that "any measure or pressure directed against any State while exercising its sovereign right to dispose of its natural resources constitutes a flagrant violation of the right of self-determination of peoples and the principle of non-intervention, as set forth in the Charter."

5. Recognition of the independence of Guinea-Bissau and condemnation of the Portuguese government (then headed by Caetano) for "perpetuating its illegal occupation of certain sectors of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and the repeated acts of aggression committed by its armed forces," and a demand that it "desist forthwith from further violations . . . and all acts of aggression . . . by immediately withdrawing its armed forces" from Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands. It was adopted by 93 for, and 7 against (USA, Britain, Brazil, Portugal, South Africa, Greece and Spain), with 30 abstentions (3061/XXVIII).

6. A declaration that "Israel's policy of annexation, establishment of settlements and transfer of an alien population to the occupied territories is in contravention of the purposes and principles of the

Charter of the United Nations, the principles and provisions of the applicable international law concerning occupation, the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity, and the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people, as well as an impediment to the establishment of a just and lasting peace"; a call to Israel to desist immediately from such practices; and a call to all States, international organizations and specialized agencies "not to recognize any changes carried out by Israel" and "to avoid any assistance to Israel's pursuit of such policies." It was adopted by 90 for, and 7 against (USA, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Barbados, Costa Rica and Israel), with 27 abstentions (3092-B/XXVIII).

In three other resolutions relating to Israel, the 28th General Assembly:

a) condemned "the unholy alliance between Portuguese colonialism, South African racism, Zionism and Israel imperialism," adopted by 88 for, and 7 against (USA, Britain, Portugal, South Africa, Nicaragua, Bolivia and Israel), with 28 abstentions (3151-G/XXVIII);

b) demanded that Israel cease exploiting "the human and natural resources of the occupied Arab territories," adopted by 90 for, and 5 against (USA, Israel, Nicaragua, Dominican Republic, Bolivia), with 26 abstentions (3175/XXVIII);

c) declared "that full respect for and realization of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, particularly its right to self-determination, are indispensable for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and that the enjoyment by the Palestine Arab refugees of their right to return to their homes and property . . . is indispensable for the achievement of a just settlement of the refugee problem and for the exercise by the people of Palestine of its right to self-determination" adopted by 87 votes for, and 6 against (USA, Israel, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Barbados), with 33 abstentions (3089-D-XXVIII).

7. A decision to dissolve immediately the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, thereby removing the cover for continued occupation of southern Korea by U.S. armed forces, their interference in the internal affairs of the country and support of the Seoul regime's intransigent opposition to Korea's peaceful unification. It was adopted without objection as the consensus of General Assembly members and without a resolution to that effect.

The Security Council acted during the 28th regular session on the hostilities in the Middle East which began October 6. In three resolutions (338, 339 and 340) adopted October 22, 23 and 25, the Council called for a cease-fire to be followed immediately by the imple-

mentation of Council Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967 in all its parts, and decided to set up a United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East under its own authority and composed of personnel from non-permanent member-States. For the first time military forces of a socialist state (Poland) were included in UN peace-keeping operations, and Soviet Army officers were incorporated in the UN Truce Supervisions Organization in Palestine. China did not participate in the voting on these resolutions and disassociated itself from all decisions of the Council.

The Sixth Special Session of the General Assembly on May 1, 1974 adopted without a vote two resolutions with the objective of furthering the process of detente by laying a foundation for economic relations among States on the basis of equality and mutual advantage. These principles were incorporated in the "Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order" (3201/S-VI), and the "Program of Action on the Establishment of a New Economic Order" (302/S-VI). Convened on the initiative of Algeria as the chief coordinator and chairman of the Non-Aligned States in the UN, the special session again re-affirmed the right of every country to choose its own social system, to sovereignty over its natural resources, and to control over the activities of multinational monopolies.

### *The UN and the Struggle for Democratic Freedoms*

In considering next the concern of the people of the United States to safeguard their constitutional freedoms from subversion and further to democratize their governmental structure and institutions, support for this struggle also was rendered by the 28th General Assembly. Of the many resolutions and decisions favoring this struggle, two relate to the main obstacle to the unity of the working class and other working people in defense of democracy. This obstacle, which divides and fragments the working class and its allies and diverts them from struggle against the monopoly capitalist sources of subversion, is racism.

The significance of the struggle against racism is made evident in the *New Program of the Communist Party, U.S.A.*, which characterizes it as "a central part of the class struggle and the basic question facing the entire country today." (New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1970, page 58.) The urgency of the struggle has been emphasized by disclosures of the Watergate conspiracy. These disclosures showed racism was a basic ingredient of the process by which monopoly capital, operating through the Presidency and the Executive Branch of the government, was able to construct a secret apparatus



for repression. They showed further that the Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Native American, Asian and other oppressed minorities were the conspiracy's first and main targets.

In designating the ten-year period beginning on December 10, 1973 as the "Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination," and in approving the Program for implementing this struggle, the 28th General Assembly placed its prestige and its considerable authority in the struggles for equality of the racially oppressed minorities and their allies among the majority of the population. The resolution, which was adopted without a vote (3057/XXVIII), puts teeth into the "International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination," which was adopted in 1965 by the 20th General Assembly (2106/XX). The Convention has not yet been ratified or acceded to by the U.S. government.

The Program for the Decade and the International Convention merit widespread distribution and study. Both enunciate principles inimical to racist ideology. Both declare "discrimination between human beings on the grounds of race, color or ethnic origin is an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations among nations and is capable of disturbing peace and security among peoples," thereby linking the struggle for equality with the struggle for detente and peaceful coexistence. Both specify practical measures for combatting racism.

However, the measures proposed in the International Convention are applicable only for States which have committed themselves to implement it by ratification or accession, whereas the Program for the Decade specifies measures for all States. It calls for "a continuing effort by all peoples, governments and institutions to eradicate racial discrimination." It presents an elaborate complex of measures to secure this objective. It demands annual reports on the progress of the Decade from the Economic and Social Council and the Secretary-General. It proposes a world conference on combatting racial discrimination to be convened by the General Assembly "as soon as possible and preferably not later than 1978."

In the second action against racism, the 28th General Assembly adopted the "International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crimes of Apartheid." Adoption was by 91 for, and 4 against (USA, Britain, South Africa, Portugal), with 26 abstentions. The resolution (3068/XXVIII), called for ratification at the earliest possible date and implementation without delay. This Convention also outlines a program of practical measures for achieving its objective, applicable for states party to it. In addition, however, it defines apar-

theid in terms applicable to conditions not only in South Africa but also in the United States.

The policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination set forth in the Convention's Article II, characterizing "the crime of apartheid," are widely extant in the United States. Ratification of this and other Conventions promoting peace and the defense of human rights by the United States could greatly assist the democratic and progressive forces. Widespread publication of the anti-apartheid Convention, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the Program of measures to implement the Decade of Actions to Combat Racism would facilitate efforts for their ratification. Moreover, it would contribute to the unity of the working class and other working people in the indissoluble struggle for democracy and detente.

The 28th General Assembly also expressed again the hope that member states which had not done so would ratify the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This resolution (3142/XXVIII), was adopted by 125 for and none against. These Covenants, which were adopted and opened for ratification in 1966, are especially important for U.S. progressive forces, and particularly for the working class. States party to them are committed to adopt measures accelerating democratization and promoting security for working men and women.

The foregoing survey cites only a few of the important actions of the UN, and mainly of its 28th General Assembly which support the struggles of the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States. Space limitations restrict discussion of many others, *viz.*, seven more resolutions organizing action to combat apartheid; 12 relating to aspects of decolonization in southern Africa; 14 on social and humanitarian matters, including care of the aged, the rights and duties of youth, drug control, the prevention of crime and punishment of offenders, and human rights in relation to scientific and technological developments; assistance to developing countries; the inalienable rights of States to permanent sovereignty over their natural resources; measures pertaining to the world environment, the world economy, peace-keeping, outer space and the resources of the sea. Virtually no sphere of human activity is unaffected by the all-encompassing actions of the world organization. At this writing attention is focused on the population conference in Bucharest, and in November a food conference will take place in Rome. But the main achieve-

ments of the 28th session were its contributions to the development of detente, which is the basic condition for successes of the peoples' struggles for democracy and the improvement of their living conditions.

### *Mass Actions in the U.S. and UN Decisions*

Expectations are high that the 29th General Assembly will continue the positive trends of the 28th. Many items on the agenda of the 29th session reflect the ongoing struggle for these basic objectives of the masses. Problems of disarmament, peace-keeping and strengthening of international security—the UN's paramount aims and reason for being—again assume priority.

The balance of forces in the membership of the world organization justifies these expectations. The majorities which secure the adoption of the positive resolutions and decisions represent the new power of the great currents that propel the world revolutionary process. They comprise the states of the socialist community and the states of the developing and non-aligned countries. It was the prodigious growth of the economic, political and military might of the Soviet Union and the socialist community, and the employment of this power in pursuit of policies of peaceful coexistence, which constituted the main driving force of this process. This force joined with the increasing militancy and strength of the working class in the non-socialist countries and the continuing struggle for liberation from colonialism and neo-colonialism by the peoples of the colonies and new states to bring about the new relationship of world forces reflected in the membership and activity of the United Nations. Anti-imperialist struggle within the framework of a developing new structure of international relations has produced the new progressive majority of the UN member states.

However, if the imperialist powers are no longer able to prevent adoption of UN resolutions and decisions which further positive trends in the world, they retain sufficient strength to block implementation of many of these measures. The bulk of U.S. imperialist forces have been withdrawn from Indochina, but the U.S.-imposed and -supported police-state regimes in the southern part of Vietnam and in Cambodia still forcibly obstruct peaceful resolution of the problems of the Indochinese peoples. The isolation of the Tel Aviv annexationists has grown (38 African states broke off relations) and their dependency on U.S. imperialism is absolute, but their swift rearming by U.S. imperialism has restored Israel's role as a catspaw of the oil imperialists in the Middle East. Moreover, because of the

NATO-engineered subversion of Cypriot independence, the eastern Mediterranean and Middle East have again been transformed into a global danger-spot. With the economic, political and military aid from the NATO powers, principally from the USA, Britain, France and the FRG in violation of UN decisions, the South African apartheid state in alliance with the Rhodesian racists have assumed the role of guarding imperialist interests in southern Africa and promoting imperialist strategic aims in the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans.

The imperialist powers receive unvarying support in obstructing implementation of UN positive actions from the present Peking leadership of China. This is shown by Peking's consistent opposition to all proposals for relaxing tensions and eliminating the causes of war. To the detriment of the Chinese people, the Peking leaders are dragging China on a collision course with objective global processes which are laying the foundations of peaceful coexistence. They are indifferent to the calamities their policies—if successful—would inflict on their own as well as other peoples, particularly the peoples of the new and developing states whom they profess to champion. For these states, detente is a precondition for further progress. Yet, in their zeal to isolate the Soviet Union and embroil it in a nuclear war, the Maoists have opened a second front in alliance with the most intransigent cold war forces of imperialism against the cause of detente and international security.

From this it is evident that the problem of implementing the UN's positive resolutions and decisions must be resolved in the national arenas of the imperialist states. Because they express the consensus of international public opinion, UN resolutions and decisions may influence the policies of governments. But the task of preventing their governments from obstructing the implementation of these UN decisions rests basically with the democratic and progressive forces in each country.

In the United States it is a task of the peace movement in concert with other segments of the population struggling to safeguard freedoms and living standards. It is preeminently a task of the working class and all working people, of the minorities battling racism, of the poor fighting pauperization and destitution. In today's world, the conditions of the workers and the liberties of the people are indissolubly linked to the development and consolidation of international detente.

## 25 Years of the German Democratic Republic

The development of the German Democratic Republic, which celebrates its 25th anniversary on October 7, vividly illustrates the changes that have taken place in the world since World War II. The country's very existence shows the shift in the overall world balance of forces and the gains made by the socialist camp. It illustrates the inability of imperialism to impose its plans for world conquest and the steady progress by which the socialist community of nations implements its peace policy and has been able to initiate the relaxation of tensions or detente.

The GDR experience also illustrates the struggle of the working class and its vanguard party that stayed the efforts of subversion by the capitalist West and was able to achieve consensus of the people despite all difficulties.

Through the momentum of the heroic struggle of the Soviet Union and the democratic and peoples' movements throughout the world in the fight against fascism, a new, higher level of the revolutionary world process was initiated. This was reflected in the Potsdam Agreement entered into by the members of the wartime anti-Hitler coalition on August 2, 1945, which laid the basis for denazification, demilitarization and decartelization of Germany.

The diversity of purpose among the allies was obvious then as it had been throughout the war. It had, for example, been expressed in the struggle to open the Second Front in Europe to relieve the fascist assault on the Soviet Union. It was resisted by the United States and Britain, and it came only when Soviet advances clearly indicated impending military defeat for Hitler.

The imperialists' purpose was also expressed by the fact that six days after the unconditional surrender of Hitler Germany on May 8, 1945, Western occupation authorities ordered the dissolution of the anti-fascist action committees that had formed in the liberated parts of Germany and prohibited *all* political and trade union activity, hampering the development of the democratic forces when victory had barely been won.

At the Potsdam conference the Soviet delegation had submitted a proposal for the formation of a central German government, which

was rejected by the Western allies because it would have strengthened the influence of anti-imperialist forces in postwar Germany.

In entering the anti-Hitler coalition as allies of the Soviet Union, Western imperialists had been motivated by the hope of ridding themselves of the competitive threat of an aggressive German imperialism. For this purpose various plans had been formulated—among them the so-called Morgenthau plan—designed to clip the wings of German imperialism. But faced with a world-wide anti-imperialist upsurge, reaction decided that the primary task was to weaken the anti-imperialist forces.

### *Emergence of Two German States*

Motivated by fear of socialism, plans to *contain and roll back* socialism were formulated at the expense of imperialist rivalries. The United States—the only country to emerge from the war economically unscathed and in fact strengthened—embarked on an anti-Communist crusade and for that purpose found it necessary to rebuild German imperialism as a bulwark of international reaction against the growing influence of socialism.

This was stated clearly by John Foster Dulles in his book *War Without Peace*. German imperialism, he wrote, was to be “a trump card in the hands of the West. By incorporating East Germany into the sphere of influence of the West, an advanced strategic position can be won in Central Europe which can undermine Soviet Communist military and political positions in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and other adjacent countries.” (*Krieg ohne Frieden*, Vienna 1950, p. 163.)

The unequal nature of the occupation zones made the West's task of reestablishing imperialism easier. The three Western occupation zones comprised more than two-thirds of the territory of post-World War II Germany. The industrial potential was even more disadvantageously divided. The most important natural resources and centers of heavy industry, all overseas ports, and the most fertile agricultural areas were in the Western occupation zones. In prewar Germany, the territory that was now the Soviet zone had produced only 2.9 per cent of the country's anthracite, 1.6 per cent of the iron ore and 7.7 per cent of the steel.

And right across Germany, between the Western and the Soviet occupation zones, runs the longest common frontier between the capitalist and the socialist camps.

On Soviet insistence, the prerequisite for democratic reform had been built into the Potsdam Agreement. In the Soviet zone these

provisions were scrupulously observed and everything was done to encourage the democratic forces. Meanwhile in the Western zones strenuous preparations were made to rebuild imperialism and to carry out the program of "incorporating" the Soviet zone into the West.

The most important step in this was to discredit and silence the anti-fascist, democratic movement—especially its working-class vanguard. The bourgeoisie, with the aid of Right-wing Social Democrats, resisted every move for unity of the working class.

In 1946, congresses of the Communist and the Social Democratic Parties decided to merge and form the Socialist Unity Party (SED).

In the Western zones this move was vigorously opposed with the help of Right-wing social democratic class-collaborationists. Anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism were coupled with repression to side-step anti-fascist democratic change. Communists and anti-fascists were harassed, isolated, jailed and disenfranchised in a drive comparable to the McCarthy offensive in our country. In the course of this drive organizations working for a united, anti-fascist Germany were outlawed, the Communist Party among them.

The drive to undermine the Potsdam Agreement and to prepare for the rollback of the socialist camp proceeded on all fronts. In September 1946 the British and American military governors formed an economic unit of their occupation zones in violation of the agreement. A year later, in September 1947, the Marshall Plan conference—attended by 16 states—adopted a decision to incorporate the Western occupation zones into their planning. In February 1948 the Western occupation powers held a conference in London to discuss a joint policy toward Germany, a conference from which they excluded the Soviet Union, but included the Benelux countries in violation of all postwar agreements. At that conference the decision was made to charge the Minister Presidents of the West German *Laender* (states) with drafting a constitution for Germany.

In June 1948 the Western occupation powers instituted a separate currency reform which they also extended to their sector of West Berlin, 110 miles inside the Soviet occupation zone. In response to this provocation Soviet authorities closed off Western access routes to Berlin and offered to supply the city with all its needs. The West responded with the "air lift" during which hundreds of planes transported personnel and materials to the city—at times at the rate of 4,000 tons of material a day—rather than to abide by the contractual provisions for the city. This crisis brought Europe to the brink of war.

On May 23, 1949, the Federal Republic of Germany was founded. In those years the initiative had been clearly on the side of the imperialists. They had undermined the Potsdam Agreement and created a new imperialist German state. However, they had not succeeded in their main goal—the annexation of the Soviet zone.

Throughout those years the Soviet Union, its allies and progressive Germans in all occupation zones had fought to prevent the abrogation of the Potsdam decisions. Soviet occupation forces, enlisting the aid of German anti-fascists, had immediately set about the implementation of the Potsdam Agreement.

While the Western occupation powers claimed the need for “experienced” cadres as an alibi for their failure to carry through denazification, the state, judicial and educational apparatus in the Soviet occupation zone was thoroughly cleansed, not only of Nazis but of reactionary elements. Denazification, demilitarization and decartelization were undertaken with vigor.

But all this had to be accomplished with a population poisoned by 12 years of fascist rule, decimated and demoralized by its war. German anti-fascists, thousands of whose brothers and sisters had died in Hitler’s prisons and concentration camps, were faced with the task of realizing the historic opportunity offered and building up an anti-imperialist German state.

The population had one important common bond and that was the desire for peace. Therefore, shortly after the surrender, the Communist Party of Germany called on all working people to help set up an antifascist, democratic and peaceful Germany. A few days later the Social Democratic Party followed suit and a preparatory trade union committee called for the formation of free trade unions. The task was to unite the working class and enable it to play its historic role. Uniting the two working class parties to form the Socialist Unity Party (SED) was the first step on this path.

Immediate steps were taken to form alliances with other sectors of the population, not on the basis of the struggle for socialism—though that was the stated, long-range aim of the Communists—but on the basis of a democratic reconstruction of the country. In this context Nazi war criminals were punished, and enterprises belonging to them or having contributed to the conduct of the war were expropriated. At the same time a land reform was carried through by taking over large estates and dividing them among farm workers, tenant farmers and others who wanted to work the land.

All these measures were taken after conducting discussions and referendum votes to assure the broadest possible consensus. Another



means of involving people with the developments in the country was to encourage the building of political and mass organizations based on antifascist, democratic principles. Besides the SED, the party of the working class, other parties were the Christian Democratic Union representing the religious elements, the Democratic Farmers Party, the Liberal Democratic Party representing artisans, small business men and professionals, and the National Democratic Party which organized the formerly conservative element including nominal members of the Nazi party. These and public mass organizations such as the Free German Trade Unions, the Free German Youth, the Democratic Women's Federation and the German Cultural League, were all invited to join the Democratic Bloc which had committees on every administrative level.

This policy laid the basis for the democratic transformation of the population, just as the policy of denazification, decartelization and demilitarization had laid the basis for an anti-imperialist economic order despite the imperialist plans of the Western occupation powers. When the formation in the west of the Federal Republic of Germany made a united, antifascist, democratic Germany impossible, this development in the Soviet zone offered the basis for the formation of the German Democratic Republic, which was constituted on October 7, 1949.

Though this showed that the imperialists were not accomplishing their aims, it speeded their offensive. An early demise of the GDR was predicted by high FRG officials, and actions followed words. A brain drain on an enormous scale was organized in an effort to lure professionals, skilled technicians and members of the intelligentsia to the West. A network of organizations engaging in espionage and provocative activities was set up.

One method of disruption of the GDR was the FRG's refusal to honor economic agreements with the GDR and to boycott transport, especially critical since, at that time, the GDR had no overseas ports of its own and relied on FRG ports for its trade with non-socialist countries. Large-scale economic manipulations through West Berlin encouraged black-market operations and currency swindles.

Under the guidance of Christian Democratic Chancellor Konrad Adenauer the imperialist German bourgeoisie worked to consolidate its position among its imperialist partners. The FRG was permitted to join the international organizations of monopoly capital. In May 1952 the Western powers concluded the Paris agreement which further violated postwar agreements with the Soviet Union. Its most far-reaching initiative was the formation of the European Defense

Community with the FRG as a member. The FRG also joined, as an equal partner, such groupings as the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

While the barriers to contain the socialist community were thus built on an international level in the military, economic and diplomatic spheres, efforts at instigating counterrevolution in the GDR continued. In 1953 justified demands of the GDR working class were utilized to attempt the overthrow of the antifascist democratic state. When this failed, the FRG continued its economic efforts through Berlin and went on the offensive on the diplomatic front. It formulated the Hallstein doctrine which arrogated to the FRG the claim to "sole representation" for both German states and threatened to break off diplomatic relations with every state that recognized the GDR which, at that time, had diplomatic relations only with socialist countries. It was all part of a large-scale, united drive of the imperialist powers against the socialist camp.

The big turn came in 1961 when the Berlin Wall was built to end interferences and subversive activities directed against the GDR from West Berlin. "The joint action of the GDR, the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries on August 13, 1961 showed the imperialists the limit of their power," Kurt Hager, a secretary of the SED Central Committee points out. "August 13, 1961 is among the historic events which strengthened peace and forced imperialism to recognize the changed relationship of forces. Imperialism's concept of rolling back socialism had failed." (*Twenty-five Years of the GDR: The Rise of Socialism in Fraternal Ties with the Soviet Union*. Speech at the Central Scientific Conference for the 25th Anniversary of the GDR, Berlin, April 25-26, 1974.) The material basis for this changed relationship was the phenomenal economic development of the socialist community.

The partners of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid (CMEA), organized in 1949, comprise one-tenth of the world's population and occupy about 18 per cent of its area. But between 1950 and 1973 their share of world industrial production rose from 18 per cent to 34 per cent. During the same period the share of the capitalist countries in the world production declined from 75 per cent to 54 per cent. Further proof of the great economic advance of CMEA countries in that period is that the national income rose by 570 per cent and industrial production by 840 per cent. (Hermann Axen, *Questions of the International Situation and the International Relations of the SED*, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1974.) In the GDR itself,

the gross national product increased sixfold between 1949 and 1971.

This economic upsurge laid the basis for the transformation from an antifascist, democratic form of government in the GDR to the building of socialism.

"In the German Democratic Republic the contradiction between the aggressive policies of monopoly capitalism and the peaceful interests of the German people were solved by the antifascist, democratic transformation," declares the *Program of the Socialist Unity Party*, adopted at its Sixth Party Congress in January 1963 (p. 38). "This created conditions for the peaceful transition to socialist revolution, for the power of workers and peasants and for building of socialism. With the founding of the German Democratic Republic and the transition to socialist revolution the socialist nature of state power emerged. The antifascist, democratic order became the power of workers and peasants, the dictatorship of the proletariat. The strengthening of the workers' and peasants' power, the changed relationship of forces in the world in favor of socialism and freedom and the fraternal ties of the German Democratic Republic with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries enabled the working people to accomplish the transformation to socialism and its construction along a peaceful, democratic path."

### *Consolidation of Socialism in the GDR*

But despite its peaceful nature the transformation to socialism did not diminish the need for broadening socialist democracy and at the same time ever more securely anchoring power in the working class.

This was discussed by Erich Honecker, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the SED at its Eighth Party Congress in June 1971. He said: "The experiences of our alliance policy shows that it will also be necessary in the future to take every step in our development together with our partners. This will help them integrate themselves ever more consciously into socialist society."

This relationship between the proletariat and its allies is reflected in every aspect of GDR life. The alliance policy is shown in the fact that among 500 deputies to the *Volkshammer*, the parliament, there are 127 from the SED, 52 each from the four other political parties, 68 from the Free German Trade Unions and 97 from other public organizations. But despite this varied composition the majority of deputies are from the working class: 43.8 per cent are workers, 20.4 per cent are employees, 20.2 per cent are members of the intelligentsia and the remainder are members of agricultural cooperatives or

agricultural workers on state farms. The composition of lesser elected bodies is similar.

A further index of socialist democracy is the broad participation of citizens in various functions of government. The National Front has 17,000 commissions throughout the country in which 335,000 people participate. The Workers and Peasants Inspection consists of 15,000 committees and commissions who oversee matters of everyday life, with about 177,000 elected members who work after working hours and on a voluntary basis.

The Free German Trade Unions have 7.3 million members of whom about 1.6 million participate actively in various aspects of union work. Such work, incidentally, embraces such diverse fields as social insurance, cultural and sports activities and production control in addition to the traditional union activities such as grievance committees, job safety, etc.

So profound had been the socialist development in the sixties that the Eighth Congress of the SED could project "a continuation of the program of comprehensive construction of socialism and the formation of the developed social system of socialism."

As a result of the development of the socialist community of nations and the GDR as one of its components, the imperialist policy of incorporating the GDR into its sphere of influence became impossible. The West was forced to acknowledge this new situation by entering into a series of East-West agreements that voided the substance of Western postwar plans. Among them are the agreements between the FRG and the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia as well as the four-power agreement on West Berlin.

Political isolation of the GDR had also proven impossible. First, developing countries entered into diplomatic relations with the GDR and then leading capitalist countries, including members of NATO. By July 1974 the GDR had diplomatic relations with 109 countries, among the remaining hold-outs being the United States and Canada.\*

In 1973 both German states were admitted to the United Nations, a move the FRG had resisted tenaciously because it officially nullified the "sole representation" claim.

A document issued by the Council of the GDR's National Front characterizes the situation in these words: "The imperialist powers were forced to recognize the realities which emerged as a result of

*(Continued on p. 12)*

---

\* On September 4, 1974, subsequent to the writing of this article, formal diplomatic relations were established between the GDR and the United States.

# COMMUNICATIONS

JOSEPH NORRICK

## On Dealing with the "Ultra-Left"

George Meyers' fine article, "Build the Rank and File Movement," in the August issue, should be kept around and read and re-read by all of us who are trying to work in united front rank-and-file movements in the unions. It is a difficult, very difficult, task, but we have no choice. It must be undertaken *now*.

This old-timer would like to add his observations on two of the points Comrade Meyers made.

One is the question of how we deal with the "ultra-Left" without isolating the honest worker who has been to one or the other of such "revolutionary" groups. Before condemning such workers, or writing them off, would it not be better to put oneself in such a worker's place?

Consider the "brain-washing" he has undergone. If he is 40 or under the likelihood is that he has never known a Communist, never read a book or a pamphlet by a Communist, never heard of the *Daily World*. All that he has heard has been directed against his ever learning the truth about Communism.

"Socialism" to him is another matter, and with good reason. It has been given something of a

blessing by the ruling class as a matter of holding itself in power. As a "Cold War" tactic it deliberately sought, and in many cases won, the collaboration of socialist parties here and abroad in its efforts to defeat the Communist world. Foundation money was given generously to these so-called socialist groupings, in and out of the unions; likewise government money. The media, by and large, were not unfriendly, nor were the colleges and universities. Those so favored could present themselves as the "true revolutionaries," as opposed to the Communists. They ignored the fact that up to now the Communists have been the only ones who have successfully led a socialist revolution.

The average worker, though, knows none of this. He does know that something is wrong. So he listens, and he is often attracted to these "ultra-Left" groups.

We, for our part, will not win the best among them by attacking their so-called leaders, or by name-calling, and the like. Our need, as Comrade Meyers writes, is to be on the job and at the union meetings.

One incident here underscores

the point. A member of the "ultra-Left" called a meeting of steelworkers. After a film showing he made an absurd proposal for action. A young comrade was there ready to take the floor, but he did not have to do so. A worker, who up to that time might have been written off, got there first, and tore the proposal apart as "ridiculous." It was good, though, that the comrade was there. He got "the feel" and knew what was happening, and learned something about the good sense of the workers. So, in truth, our need, if the course of organized labor is to be changed, is to be right there among the workers, helping them with their grievances, winning their friendship and confidence, and then sharing our insights

with them.

We have just concluded here, as an instance, a very successful Marxist study course, conducted by a young steelworker for steelworkers and their wives. A number who were there had had their "initiation" in one or the other of the "ultra-Leftist" groups.

The second matter discussed by Comrade Meyers that I should like to go into is this business of "making the balls for somebody else to shoot." I agree that "the day of sitting back and doing that is long past." In fact, it never should have been. I would add that we are living today with the consequence of doing just that. I hope that some day some one will do an article on the subject.

The Soviet people will not tolerate any encroachment on the sovereignty of our state, the protector of their socio-political gains. This sovereignty is not an obstacle to contact and exchanges; it is a reliable guarantee of the rights and freedoms hard-won by our people.

Soviet laws afford our citizens broad political freedoms. At the same time they protect our system and the interests of the Soviet people from any attempts to abuse these freedoms. And this is in full conformity with the International Covenants on Human Rights ratified by the Soviet Union, which say that the rights they enumerate "shall not be subject to any restrictions except those which are provided by law, are necessary to protect national security, public order, public health or morals or the rights and freedoms of others . . ." We subscribed to this. . . .

It is impossible to fight for peace while impinging on the sovereign rights of other peoples. It is impossible to champion human rights, while torpedoing the principles of peaceful coexistence.

To put it in plain language, no one is any longer able to subvert the socialist world, but regrettably it is still possible to subvert peace. (Leonid Brezhnev, Speech at the World Congress of Peace Forces, October 26, 1973.)

## STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation (Act of August 12, 1970; Section 3685, Title 39, United States Code)

1. Title of Publication: POLITICAL AFFAIRS.
2. Date of Filing: October 1, 1974.
3. Frequency of Issue: Monthly.
4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010
5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.
6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor:  
 Publisher: POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUB., INC., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.  
 Editor: HYMAN LUMER, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.  
 Managing Editor: None.

7. Owner (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 must be given.)

POLITICAL AFFAIRS PUB., INC., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.  
 HYMAN LUMER, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

8. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and other Security Holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of Bonds, Mortgages or other Securities (If there are none, so state): None.

10. For completion by Nonprofit Organizations authorized to mail at Special rates (Section 132.122, Postal Manual).

The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes (Check one)

- Have not changed during preceding 12 months       Have changed during preceding 12 months  
 (If changed, publisher must submit explanation of change with this statement)

11. Extent and Nature of Circulation:

	<i>Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months</i>	<i>Single Issue Nearest to Filing Date</i>
A. Total No. Copies Printed (Net Press Run)	4,550	4,550
B. Paid Circulation		
1. Sales through Dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales	3,005	3,005
2. Mail Subscriptions	1,495	1,495
C. Total Paid Circulation	4,500	4,500
D. Free Distribution (including samples) by Mail, Carrier delivery or other means	none	none
E. Total Distribution (Sum of C and D)	4,500	4,500
F. Office use, left-over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	50	50
G. Total (Sum of E & F—should equal net press run shown in A)	4,550	4,550

I certify that the statements made by me are correct and complete.

HYMAN LUMER, Editor  
 (Signature of editor, publisher, business manager, or owner)

## THE BIG STAKES OF DETENTE

Gus Hall

Report by the General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. to the June 29-July 1 meeting of the Party's Central Committee. Analyzes detente as the class struggle at moment when both classes have state power; shows that monopoly capital is forced to recognize present-day realities while its basic aims remain unchanged. Emphasizes centrality of detente as an issue; relates it to world-wide crisis of imperialism, economic and political instability of the capitalist world, problems of developing countries. Places detente as the central issue facing the people of the U.S. Shows who are the enemies of detente and why. Discusses the direct self-interest of the U.S. working class and the overwhelming majority of the people of the U.S. in detente. Relates it to domestic affairs, the crisis in everyday living, economic problems, the Nixon Administration. Deals with aspects of the Party's work, the need in this period for the Party to take leadership initiatives.

48 pages—50c

### NEW OUTLOOK

205 W 19th Street, 9th Floor  
New York, N.Y. 10011

---

## ANNIVERSARY TOURS ALL YOUR TRAVEL NEEDS

- \* Youth Bargain Travel  
—on your own and in groups
- \* Special Tours For Workers
- \* Many Other Tours For Groups & Individuals
- \* Air Tickets, Domestic & Foreign
- \* Cruises, Auto Rentals, etc.

### SPECIAL SERVICES

Sanitoriums & Spas Everywhere  
Visiting Relatives in USSR & Other Countries  
Bringing Relatives to the U.S.A.

### SEND FOR OUR 1975 BROCHURES

250 West 57th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10019  
(212) 245-7501

1741 Ivar Avenue  
Hollywood, Calif. 90028  
(213) 465-6141