COMMUNISM—at least that of the Soviet totalitarian type—received its most smashing defeat in postwar Germany on Sunday, Dec. 5. In fact, the city election which took place that day in western Berlin was more in the nature of a plebiscite against communist totalitarianism and the Soviet-imposed blockade than an election in the customary sense.

Because the outcome could be guessed in advance, the Soviet-sponsored Socialist Unity Party (SED) refused to participate in the election and the Soviet Military Administration (SMA) made polling in its sector impossible.

Of the 1,586,090 eligible voters (603,101 male and 982,989 female) in the three western sectors, approximately 1,331,270 went to the polls, representing 86.3 percent participation. This was a much higher participation percentage than many of the German political leaders had anticipated. Participation in the October 1946 election in the US, British and French Sectors reached 91.4 percent of the eligible voter total but that figure included the 13.7 percent registered by the SED which this time was not on the ballot by its own (or Soviet) choice.

IN OTHER WORDS, the 86.3 percent participation in the Dec. 5 election indicates a repudiation of the SED and a rejection of totalitarian communism based on a police state. Between 1921 and 1933, the highest city-wide participation in a Berlin City Assembly election was 70.3 percent of the qualified voters, and in 1925 it was only 63.7 percent.

Spoiled ballots in this December's election numbered 36,156 or 2.7 percent of the total cast, compared with 1.9 percent in 1946, despite the SED exhortation to its adherents to cast spoiled ballots this time in protest against that party's allegation of an 'illegal and terrorist' election.

Because the election campaign this time by the three democratic parties—the Social Democratic Party (SPD), Christian Democratic Union (CDU), and Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)—was not conducted along party platform lines but against totalitarianism and its Soviet-sponsored bearer, the SED, no significant shifts had been generally anticipated in their relative party strength as registered in the 1946 election.

The actual outcome, however, was otherwise, as may be seen from the following tabulation based on preliminary returns in which the figures in parentheses indicate the 1946 election results (in the three west sectors):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>858,461 (674,209)</td>
<td>64.5 (51.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU</td>
<td>258,604 (316,203)</td>
<td>19.4 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP</td>
<td>214,145 (133,433)</td>
<td>16.1 (10.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly over one-half the total valid votes cast in 1946 in the three west sectors went to the SPD, but that party this time received almost 65 percent of the total. This large gain, in part at the expense of the CDU but chiefly, it is assumed, from the SED, is probably due primarily to the very strong and uncompromising stand taken by the SPD in the ideological battle for Berlin, particularly since the Soviet-imposed blockade last June.

The Soviet-sponsored groups—the SED, FDJ (Communist-led youth organization), FDGB (trade union), DFB (women’s league) and so on, considered the SPD their most hated enemy, and the Soviet-licensed press reserved its worst epithets for the SPD leaders Neumann, Reuter, Suhr and Matück, although LDP leader
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Schwennicke also shared in the honors.

As in the 1946 election, many Berliners double-voted SPD not because of the Marxist socialist convictions or leanings, but because they considered such action the most effective protest against the Soviet-sponsored groups which have supported the blockade, mob demonstrations against the constitutionally-elected city government, the establishment of a puppet Magistrat in the Soviet Sector deprived of any legal basis whatsoever, and other high-handed acts against the vital interests of the Berlin citizenry.

Instead of sharing in the proportionate gain over the 1946 election anticipated by the three democratic parties by reason of the SED non-participation this time (the SED accounted for 13.7 percent of the total valid votes in 1946), the CDU dropped from 24.4 percent to 19.4 percent.

It may be because the Berliners felt that the CDU was not consistently energetic enough in opposing the Soviet-sponsored groups and their injurious activities, or at least not as determined and adamant as the SPD and also the LDP. Some observers feel that a speech in the City Assembly a few weeks ago by the CDU chairman, Dr. Schreiber, in which he failed to come out clearly for the Westmark as sole legal tender in the Western sectors cost the CDU a substantial number of votes and helped the LDP correspondingly.

Comment is also heard to the effect that Dr. Ferdinand Friedensburg (CDU), acting mayor of the city during the recent long illness of Mrs. Louise Schroeder (SPD), by the futile tenacity with which he held to maintaining the Magistrat intact in the Old City Hall in the Soviet Sector in the face of all warning signals, also cost the CDU votes, although Dr. Friedensburg at times took an extremely strong attitude towards the SMA.

The phenomenal gains of the LDP percentagewise are due in large part to the very strong stand taken on the Berlin "cold-war" front by its leader Carl-Hubert Schwennicke. The LDP received a sizable share of the votes lost this time by the CDU. Many non-Marxist voters evidently felt the strongest way to voice their repudiation of communism and all Soviet-sponsored activities in Berlin was to cast their ballot for the LDP. There is considerable elevation in the LDP (and also in the SPD) for the gains made, coupled with introspective analysis by the CDU leadership on their vote decline.

Immediately preceding the election there were widespread rumors—doubtless SED-inspired—that severe disorder would occur in many polling places in the Western sectors. Another was to the effect that the Soviet Zone police surrounding Berlin were in a state of high alarm. A whispering campaign, again SED-inspired, was launched saying the polling lists with voters' names checked off, would come into Soviet hands upon the early Soviet evacuation of Berlin and then the voters would be subject to severe reprisals.

In an attempt to make the whispering campaign more plausible, the Soviet occupation organ "Tagesliche Rundschat" on the Saturday morning preceding election day carried an ADN (Soviet-licensed news agency) dispatch under a big front-page headline, "The Western Powers Will Leave Berlin in January."

To all these veiled threats and intimidations interspersed with certain Soviet-SED blandishments, West Berliners responded by going to the polls in a most orderly but determined fashion and indicating unmistakably their stand. There were no disorders at the polls and only a few minor incidents. (Continued on next page)
The election was conducted in a fair and democratic manner in accordance with the Election Regulations (Wahlordnung). This was the conclusion of the Special Allied Inspection Committee based primarily on the work of 12 Allied inspection teams (one in each West Berlin borough) by whom 477 polling places were visited on election day.

Soviet-licensed press reaction to the outcome of the Berlin election has been vituperative, coupled with the use of falsifications as was to be expected. According to these sources, the election was rigged by the American and British, terroristic methods were employed, and the result is "neo-fascism." Soviet-controlled radio comment was equally flattering. Some of this reaction stems from the Soviet realization that election results stated clearly West Berlin's reaction to Soviet strong-arm tactics.

NINETY-EIGHT City Assembly members were chosen in the three western sectors' election on Dec. 5 (full membership of the City Assembly is 130 for all four sectors). Because polling, in effect, was banned by the SMA in the eight boroughs comprising the Soviet Sector, the 32 City Assembly members elected from that area in October 1946 (16 SPD, 5 CDU and 11 SED) remained in office until a free, democratic election in those boroughs is possible.

Of the 98 newly-elected City Assemblymen, the SPD accounts for 63, the CDU 19 and the LDP 16. Including the 32 holdovers from the Soviet Sector elected in 1946, the party strength of the new City Assembly which will take office in mid-January, with 1946 comparisons, is provisionally estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This gives the SPD a clear majority in the new City Assembly sufficient for the enactment of ordinary legislation.

In addition to a new City Assembly, borough assemblies (Bezirksverordnetenversammlungen) were also separately chosen in each of the 12 boroughs of West Berlin on Dec. 5. Here again, the election returns reflect the large gains made by both the SPD and LDP and corresponding losses by the CDU. The SPD now has a majority in 11 of the 12 boroughs, instead of in only seven resulting from the 1946 election. Disregarding the SPD (not on the ballot this time), the LDP ran third in all the 12 boroughs in 1946, but now ranks ahead of the CDU in Schoeneberg (US Sector) and Wilmersdorf (British Sector).

By sectors, the highest participation of qualified voters was in the American (87.9 percent), followed by the British (86.2 percent) and the French (82.5 percent). By borough, the highest was Tempelhof (90.8 percent) in the US Sector, and the lowest Reinickendorf (82.4 percent) in the French Sector.

Western world press reaction to the Berlin election results was highly laudatory for the courageous stand taken by the electorate. Berlin democratic press comment stressed that Germans in the Soviet Sector and in the Soviet Zone (where elections apparently have been indefinitely postponed) look to West Berlin after the Dec. 5 election as a rampart of political and social freedom and the outcome of that election as really speaking for them, the disenfranchised. As to West Berlin proper, a German newspaper editorial headed "Berlin Chose Freedom" aptly characterizes the result.

**3 Plants Allocated**

The Inter-Allied Reparation Agency (IARA) has announced the sub-allocation of three additional plants located in the US Zone. Geiseler in Bavaria and Kalle & Co. in Hesse have been sub-allocated to the Netherlands, and Hommel-Werke in Wuerttemberg-Baden has been sub-allocated to India and the Netherlands. Of the 126 plants in the US Zone which have been allocated to the IARA, 122 have not been sub-allocated to specific recipient nations.

---

This summary and analysis was prepared by Dr. Franklin whose office, the Civil Administration and Political Branch, OMG Berlin Sector, had the responsibility of observing and checking the conduct of the election and its results for the US Military Government. Dr. Franklin was the author of the article, "Berlin Votes," a preview published by the Information Bulletin, Issue No. 149, Nov. 30.

* Hold-overs from 1946 (as SED refused to participate in the Dec. 5, 1948 election) who have not appeared in sessions of the City Assembly since the latter was forced to move from the Soviet Sector City Hall to West Berlin on Sept. 6.