A Test of Sincerity

AMERICANS really concerned with our country’s welfare will be struck by the contrast in the announcements that came from Washington and Moscow the very day President Eisenhower sent back to the Kremlin his SALT II offer.

In Washington, President J. F. Kennedy said the Administration was seriously considering Russian proposals to negotiate a disarmament agreement that would restrict the buildup of strategic missiles and for a $3 billion to $5 billion arms-control fund. 

In Moscow, the Soviet government proposed a disarmament plan, on the basis of the President’s offer, that would permit them to have the same number of missiles as the United States.

President Eisenhower said he was ready to test Russia’s sincerity on relieving world tensions. He has, however, warned of the dangers of disengagement and also for withdrawal of foreign armed forces from Germany, for ending all barriers to world trade, for settlement of the Far Eastern question, for elimination of military bases from foreign countries and for enforcement of the UN agreement banning incitement to war.

If Eisenhower doubts Soviet sincerity when he doesn’t accept the offer that he made to the British Foreign Office on the Soviet proposals:

They appear to have taken account of a number of political considerations, including the fact that the Disarmament Subcommittee has met in recent weeks.

This suggests that it’s Eisenhower’s sincerity that is being tested when he says he favors steps to peace.

The Soviet peace proposals contain one that was made by the historic Bandung conference calling for a nuclear-free zone, one that was added to A-bombs and H-bombs pending a new agreement on a ban.

Why doesn’t Eisenhower accept it? The Federation of American Scientists, an organization of Americans will be crippled by continued test explosions.

Public pressure is forcing the Administration to the conference table. But even greater pressure will be needed to make the steps of the cold war and acceptance of peace co-existence.

THE NEW BUTLER BILL

BOTH AFL and CIO are vigorously opposed to the new Butler Bill (S-68) for “loyalty” screening of practically all the workers in industry and other fields. This reflects the growing alarm and resistance to the Administration’s thought-control drive.

It has been recently estimated that already about 20 percent of the labor force is subject to screening in one or another form. The Butler Bill, now up for Senate hearings, would require a screening of workers in every field, and it would apply for contracts with the government for goods or services. That means almost every company.

The Eisenhower administration now wants specific legislation to implement its idea, as Joseph L. Ransby, Jr., speaking on behalf of the UAW said, America would be turned into a “nation of stooges.”

To carry out Butler’s proposals, it would have to be based on a mass-scale to fine active union workers as “subversives.”

However, Rank, who is also chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, called for greater clarification of the Communist Party by FBI informers to combat “stooges.”

Evidently eager to placate Butler, Ransby ignores the fact that the UAW itself is currently fighting screening cases brought on by informers ostensibly planted to fight Communists. How can a man of Rank’s stature be so naive as to think that the informer menace is limited to one sector of the labor-movement progressive movement?

The facts of life as we have seen them should be sufficiently clear-cut so that the fact that the UAW is not involved in the screening does not mean its members are not subject to screening. Moreover, those who operate the informer system are deliberately broadening its scope far beyond the left.

34 Backward Steps Proposed

To Unwind by King Henry Ford

By NAT CARNLEY

To get the “product” made, the “profit” made, and to keep his money-bags from being drained out at all costs, King Henry would do almost anything.

Henry says he’s a middle road, “in national and international” stagnation labor leaders and business men hate it, “creeping socialism” at every “security” post.

Behind his ideological mess of words King Henry really told his workers: Your demand for CWA wage, fringe benefits, a 20 percent auto-supply contract and improved local agreements are hereby denied. But if you are surly, you have a few more economic concessions.

Calling it a “new kind of prosperity,” he put it this way: “You throw it into the pot a penny grade or two. In return you’ll have to give up your other demands and even take some backward steps in the present lovely five-year speedway.”

Henry’s ClassNotFoundException, a member of 20 unions, is goods and services. This is the reason why the companies have a sure-fire answer to both alternatives, namely, forcing the companies to grant inflationary wage demands by a united, militant UAW, which would be a contribution to the company’s profits tomorrow, if necessary.

For Local 600 of the Ford company, headed by President Carl Stellato, have also shown their willingness to go to strike when it comes to protective equipment for the workers. They have already expressed their desire to voice of their policy by the police forces on the workers if the companies don’t agree on the model agreement.

For Local 600 and the other UAW locals in the area, the five-year contract is the real test.”

A lot of companies’ new strike-breaking weapon—stockpiling protective equipment in the shops—is the new strike-breaking weapon. They are already carrying out the agreement.
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