

head Frank Fitzsimmons encouraging the American bipartisan movement for nuclear energy. Yesterday this support was supplemented by two telegrams from Mexican trade unionists — one from the leaders of SUTERM, Mexico's largest electrical workers union, and another from the chairman of the nuclear workers union.

Initial reports indicated that the West German news media gave minimal coverage to the demonstration, including only a minute and a half on the evening news. However, the international wire services reportedly wrote and sent a story to their U.S. and other affiliates.

The groundswell of support for nuclear energy created by the Dortmund demonstration will be an important factor influencing the outcome of the Social Democratic Party's National Congress, which begins today in Hamburg. According to newspaper accounts, even if a number of antinuclear resolutions manage to slip through, the SPD is going to give the Schmidt govern-

ment a free-hand to implement a *carte-blanche* "Special Program" to maintain essential nuclear production and research activities.

An official "compromise" party policy is, meanwhile, being drafted jointly by Adolf Schmidt, pronuclear head of the Mining and Energy Union, and Herbert Ehrenberg, environmentalist Federal Labor Minister. Such a compromise would parallel that made by the Free Democratic Party at their congress last weekend, and would entail a six-to-eight-month halt to nuclear construction until temporary nuclear waste dumps are established (as opposed to the environmentalists' original demand that a moratorium last until a final reprocessing center is constructed in six years.) Similarly, the leadership of the West German Trade Union Federation (DGB) announced that it favors the issuance of nuclear construction permits "in well-founded cases," but has not elaborated what this includes.

The UAW On Nuclear Power: Then And Now

The United Auto Workers' current stance against the development of nuclear power stands in sharp contrast to the favorable orientation toward nuclear technology of the late Walter Reuther. For at least 15 years, concurrent with his term as president of the UAW, Reuther was committed to a crash program for the development of nuclear power that would involve both government and industry.

Reuther's declarations in behalf of nuclear energy development represent the positive side of an intense factional struggle between the Warburg and Baruch families' financial interests who were against nuclear power, and President Eisenhower, who favored nuclear development.

Today the UAW leadership has officially condemned the U.S. nuclear program, especially the potential for nuclear exports, as a major element contributing to nuclear proliferation and war.

Here are portions of a speech given by Walter Reuther on Jan. 25, 1956 before the Joint Congressional Committee. Reuther spoke as a member of the panel on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, but his remarks were not included in the panel's report to the committee.

...Access to low-cost nuclear power may prove the key to the economic development of backward areas and make possible the liberation of millions of people from poverty, hunger, ignorance and disease...

We shall not give leadership to other people if we refuse to exercise it in our own behalf. The fact is that the United States is failing to demonstrate the outstanding leadership in releasing atomic energy as a source of electric power... This is proceeding much too slowly.

For many years after the war no really significant beginning was made to apply the atom for peaceful

purposes. Finally, one year ago, the AEC invited private enterprise to submit proposals for participating in the development of atomic reactors for the generation of electric power. But no private reactors are now under construction and none has completed the initial stages of design...

Apart from this (the AEC demonstration reactor at Shippingport, Pa.) government project, the sobering fact is that today ten and a half years after the end of the war, America's peacetime atomic power program has not advanced beyond the drawing boards...

The need to develop atomic energy as a practical source of power for use in the United States is urgent. There are power hungry areas in our country today. There are other areas where the high cost of energy retards economic progress and is encouraging the flight of industry to other parts of the country.

Total power requirements in the United States will expand at a tremendous rate over the next 25 years. We shall need nuclear power to meet those requirements. I cannot accept the comfortable assurance that our conventional fuel resources will meet all our power needs for another 20-25 years. Nor will I accept the Federal Power Commission consistently conservative forecast of power requirements as reflecting the true growth potential of our economy or the increasing need of the American people.

No power ceiling should be placed on the normal and necessary expansion of our economy.

To meet the challenge and to realize the opportunity of peaceful uses of atomic energy, we must mobilize every segment of our economy. We must make full use of the capabilities of both government and private enterprise. Only by drawing on the contributions of each can we make satisfactory progress toward our objectives — fortifying the strength of our nation, advancing the

welfare of our people, and discharging the responsibilities of the nation...

The technological barriers ahead of us are formidable. Enormous investments are required. The financial risks are great. But all these difficulties can be overcome by a united determined effort...

It would be tragic to destroy this great opportunity for national achievement and world leadership by dissipating our strength in ideological warfare over the respective roles of government and private enterprise. That is a sure fire way of standing still, while the rest of the world moves forward in the practical application of atomic power to human needs...

America's leadership in the world contest must rest upon and be a reflection of the highly developed and advanced nuclear energy industry. I am at a loss to understand how the U.S. can be in a position of technological leadership in building nuclear power plants in the Third World if we have not advanced the level of our technology...

I recommend to the committee that it remove all reactor technology from the restricted data category including such areas as fuel element fabrication and processing techniques leaving specific military applications of such technology to be protected in so far as national security is involved...

Only bold initiative by government can accelerate needed progress and get full scale reactors in operation so that the time lag between theory and practice can be minimized...

The shortage of highly-trained, scientific, technical personnel will continue to be the most serious retarding

and limiting factor both in our domestic progress and in our ability to carry out our role as a world leader...

Current UAW Policy

A spokesman for the UAW in Washington D.C. described the union's current policy on nuclear energy in the following way:

We are officially extremely skeptical that nuclear power should play an important role in the nation's energy supply. We feel that not sufficient attention has been given to the risks involved, especially the potential for harmful leaks and for theft by terrorists of nuclear materials and of the general problem of waste disposal...

Nuclear power has never measured up to people's expectations. It has always provided less projections for its role in the total national power picture. That is the way it should be. It is simply less cost effective on an individual plant-by-plant basis...we think that Project Independence emphasized it much too much...

While we may be a little ambivalent on the nuclear (fission) question (we do allow individual locals to decide on a case by case basis whether they might want to support a nuclear plant here and there), we are totally clear on the fast breeder. We are against it and we are against a plutonium economy...We think that the President is 100 percent right to veto the breeder and support him on it across the board.

We think that there should be a greater emphasis on the development of viable energy technologies like solar power...I guess you can say that we are close to the way Barry Commoner thinks on the energy question...closer to him than say the Building Trades of the AFL-CIO (who support nuclear power.)

The Plot To Rationalize U.S. Steel And Who's Behind It

Last week the tempo of the calls for the rationalization of the U.S. steel industry quickened noticeably. While Under Secretary Anthony Solomon was dangling the bait of a new and improved "anti-dumping" apparatus before increasingly desperate steel companies and steel workers, he was meeting with Viscount Etienne Davignon — the architect of the European Economic Community's (EEC) plan to reduce steel capacity by 25

SPECIAL REPORT

percent — and plotting to do away with "excess" steel capacity worldwide. Many business leaders in the U.S., including the policymakers of the National Foreign Trade Council, perceive that the steel policy that Solomon and his taskforce are formulating will be close to the Davignon strategy. Moreover, the steel companies which belong to the NFTC "would welcome" the

equivalent of a Davignon plan for the U.S., the NFTC officials said.

The American Iron and Steel Institute, which is headed up by the U.S. Steel chairman Edgar Speer, is in agreement with Davignon-style rationalization. At hearings on steel held by the U.S. International Trade Commission in Los Angeles Nov. 9-10, the AISI speaker went on record as opposing any plan to save the steel industry with low-interest government credits. This would be unwanted "government interference," he claimed. A spokesman for the AISI in Washington confirmed that the U.S. Steel-dominated trade group is looking favorably on the on-going "elimination of peripheral facilities." More marginal firms will go, he said — "it's a fact of life."

It is clear that unless a positive national program to put industry back on its feet is adopted, the steel industry can look forward to a future of crunch, purge, and consolidation. The *Wall Street Journal* Nov. 8 more than hinted that the proposed Jones and Laughlin-Youngstown Sheet and Tube merger is just the begin-