

high-technology job-creation in manufacturing, utilities, mining, transportation, and construction, and into both agriculture and research and development programs.

What will be required is the establishment of a national bank, for which local banks act as correspondents, to get the credit into the places where it will bring our production back up toward capacity levels and get us out of this

deepening depression.

We need a government that can do that job. Impeach the Carter Administration and quickly install a new President and Administration, dedicated to act in concert with a mobilized Congress, to get us out of this depression.

Lyndon H. LaRouche

## Congressional Stampede Against Carter's Energy Package

Less than 48 hours after Jimmy Carter's April 21 presentation of his Administration's energy program to Congress, the *Baltimore Sun* reported the Democratic leadership in Congress was scrambling "to prevent a stampede of opposition" from the President's own party. Both Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.) and Speaker of the House Thomas O'Neill (D-Mass.) were described as "hopeful" the President's package could be passed "in September or October" before Congress adjourns; Deputy House Majority Whip Rosentkowski (D-Ill.) observed more honestly "That program is going to be difficult if not impossible to get people to vote for. People up here have to get reelected, but Carter doesn't seem to realize that."

As Democrats, particularly those from industrial constituencies, scrambled to disassociate themselves from energy package, Republican leaders Howard Baker (Senate Minority leader), John Rhodes (House Minority leader) and Republican National Committee chairman Bill Brock issued statements condemning the Carter plan as "not the American way" and stressing expanded energy production and high technology development of alternate energy sources as the solution to the USA's energy needs.

It was a Democrat, however, who most accurately assessed the content of the Administration's energy package. "It is treasonous," said Rep. Jack Hightower of Texas.

In this atmosphere, even such dependable allies of the Rockefeller interests as Senators Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) were forced to voice "reservations" about aspects of the program, notably the gasoline tax proposals, which Kennedy complained "hit the average worker too hard."

The explosion of opposition has been so violent that the Administration's lieutenants in Congress are telling the press that the first hearings on the Carter package will not occur for nearly a month, to give the situation a chance to cool down.

While the Administration house organs, the *Washington Post* and *New York Times*, are striving to picture the program as passable after a "tough fight," press in West Germany flatly reported it doesn't have a chance. Barring the creation of a "national emergency" in the USA through war or terrorism, that assessment is undoubtedly correct.

The Carter team is presently pursuing a "divide and conquer" strategy, attempting to channel the population's anger against the gas tax proposals in particular, generally seeking to play the program as a series of "constituency" issues subject to negotiation with individual interest groups; and attempting to pit fuel producing states in the south and southwest against the industrial northeast and midwest.

This "profiling" of Congress promises to be no more successful than the Administration's recent SALT II gambit with the Soviet Union.

First of all, the AFL-CIO organized labor-Democratic Party apparatus on which Carter depended to put him in the White House, and on which his congressional majority rests, is becoming convinced that American workers will not tolerate the energy program. Following Carter's nationally televised April 18 preliminary sales pitch for the Rockefeller energy policy, U.S. Labor Party lobbyists in Washington, D.C. found a mood of rising panic, particularly among Democrats from industrial areas, alerted to the devastating impact of the plan on the U.S. economy. A score of such Congressmen contacted early in the week were privately questioning the entire "conservation is our best source of energy" premise of the Carter program, ready to discuss a comprehensive alternative energy policy — all the way up to the USLP's Third National Bank proposal for reorganizing the U.S. financial sector. Most were extremely inquisitive about the Administration's motivations for putting forward a "Pearl Harbor" package which offered nothing but "sacrifice," and listened respectfully as representatives from the party which is well-known as the most vocal and hard-hitting opposition to Carter since his nomination as the Democratic candidate last summer unraveled the fascist "logic" behind the Carter proposals. "I've never heard opposition to the program expressed so cogently and forcefully. You could be right on down the line," was the way a staffer for a top Democratic policymaking body in the Senate expressed a general mood.

Highly placed labor officials in Washington are now reporting that the AFL-CIO union bureaucracy is split with a section of the leadership "wanting to hold the line and not go for the jugular against Carter, others know that if we don't go for the jugular, we're going to get killed." In the Building Trades, United Steelworkers,

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and even in the Carter-allied bureaucracy of the United Auto Workers, such debates are known to be raging at the highest levels.

Spokesmen for U.S. industry, while so far publicly guarded, are highly critical in private, and Congressmen from auto, aerospace, and oil and gas based constituencies have been doing some loud talking for them. An end of the week editorial in the *Wall Street Journal*, the nation's most prestigious financial daily, which warned of "a new dark age" in the wake of Carter's speech, could presage a burst of vigorous public opposition from business.

In the 24 hours after Carter spelled out the details to Congress, the lid came off on Capitol Hill: Rep. John Conyers, Democrat from Detroit and until now a loyal stooge for Carter, told the press, "There is no way I can support this program. It will cripple the auto industry." Rep. John Anderson of Illinois, a high-ranking Republican and a member of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, personally telephoned USLP offices to assure that he was "100 percent for nuclear power and the breeder reactor...My district is pro-growth and I represent my district." Rep. Slack of West Virginia, a major coal producing area, charged that the Carter coal conversion program was a hoax which could not be implemented as presently planned. Sen. Carl Curtis, from the farm state of Nebraska, blasted the program as "a blueprint for unemployment and a regimented economy." Dozens of other Congressmen rushed to voice their objections (see below).

Significantly, certain Congressmen are now speaking in support of a labor-industry alliance on behalf of expanded energy production and industrial growth. A spokesman for Rep. Thomas Kindness (R-Ohio) noted that

the Carter program has given the "GOP the opportunity of a lifetime — to go with a pro-growth energy program to create jobs and capitalize on labor's disaffection with the Democrats." Rep. Duncan (R-Tenn.) issued a public statement at a Knoxville press conference called by the Fusion Energy Foundation endorsing the idea of "a coalition for energy growth."

Increased motion in this direction is indicated by the explosion of activity in state legislatures in support of USLP-initiated pro-fusion power bills directly following the Carter speech (see below).

The press is currently reporting that the Republican Party leadership is closeted to hammer out an alternative energy program to be presented within the next week. Should the Republicans pursue the line laid out by Baker and Rhodes, making a frontal assault on the Carter program and proposing an alternative for broad-based energy and industrial expansion, Carter's days would be numbered. On the other hand, if Republican statements are couched in the "Conservation, yes, but..." mode in which much of Congress is still reacting, the Administration will have gained some precious maneuvering room and time for its nuclear confrontation policy.

Obviously fearful of the impact that a single decisive public action in defense of the national interest by a major figure could have at this critical juncture, Vice-President Mondale blew up at former President Gerald Ford on the front page of the *New York Times* last week, charging Ford with irresponsibility for "criticizing the President." Ford had stated the simple truth that had he been allowed to continue in office, the USA and the USSR would have already signed the SALT II pact negotiated last year.

## Congress:

## Carter Is Treasonous

*The following is a compilation of congressional response to Carter's energy program.*

### REPUBLICAN PARTY LEADERSHIP

*Senate Minority leader Howard Baker (R-Tenn.):* "This is not the American way. The American way is increasing production and developing new technologies to solve the energy problem."

*House Minority leader John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.):* "Carter's energy program means no-growth...Conservation is not a solution."

*National Committee Chairman William Brock:* "We should be finding new technologies to solve the energy crisis...We really like the idea of nuclear power."

### DEMOCRATIC PARTY LEADERSHIP

*Senate Majority leader Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.):* "I hope the package will get passed by October."

*House Speaker Thomas O'Neill (D-Mass.):* "We can get most of it through in six months if we get some help from the President."

*House Majority leader Jim Wright (D-Tex.):* "This will be the severest test Congress has ever had or will ever have."

### CONGRESSMEN EXPRESSING OPPOSITION

*The following Congressmen expressed opposition, in whole or in part, to the Carter proposals.*

*Rep. John Hightower (R-Tex.):* "It is treasonous!"

*Rep. Mike McCormick (D-Wash.):* "Carter's energy program is crazy."

*Sen. James McClure (R-Idaho):* "President Carter has apparently given up on finding answers — on the American system, on the future of this country. None have been more vocal than I about the energy crisis we face, but conservation is not the total solution...We don't have to give up; there are many alternatives. But the President acts as though we will learn nothing new."

*Rep. Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.), Deputy Majority Whip:* "That program is going to be difficult if not impossible to get people to vote for. People up here have to get re-elected but Carter doesn't seem to realize that."

*Rep. Gary Meyers (R-Penna.):* "I was disappointed in President Carter's speech...Nuclear fusion was not mentioned; nuclear fission was switched from a major to a minor emphasis...I am especially concerned about Carter's decision to scuttle the breeder reactor...(if Carter's current program stands) we can expect a severe electricity shortage."

*Sen. Carl Curtis (R-Neb.):* "This is a blueprint for unemployment and a regimented economy...Conservation is not enough upon which to build a program for a growing America, a strong economy and expanding jobs. We can save energy by cutting down activity, but when we do we cut down on employment. We could save energy by closing all of our factories and returning to a way of life of hermits and nomads, but this is unthinkable. A police state can compel everyone to ride bicycles or to drive only the smallest of compact cars. But what happens to the jobs involved? What happens to the economy of the most powerful industrial nation on earth?"

*Rep. Robert Bauman (R-Md.):* "The issue at hand is one of growth versus zero growth."

*Rep. Thomas Kindness (R-Ohio):* "The GOP now has the opportunity of a lifetime — to go with a pro-growth energy program to create jobs and capitalize on labor's disaffection with the Democrats."

*Rep. Phillip Crane (R-Ill.):* "Few Democrats are enthusiastic about the message. It stands not the remotest chance of passing."

*Rep. D. Derwinski (R-Ill.):* "The speech was unrealistic, contradictory, and probably the most demagogic speech any U.S. president has ever made. Carter's program is automatically in trouble."

*Rep. John Duncan (R-Tenn.):* An aide to Duncan stated at a Fusion Energy Foundation-sponsored conference, "We agree that there is a need for a coalition on energy growth."

*Rep. Henry J. Hyde (R-Ill.):* Attacked Carter for not opting for nuclear power, which provides an immediate solution.

*Rep. Manual Lujan (R-N. Mex.):* Accused the Administration of violating the nonproliferation treaty, and thereby contributing to the dangers of nuclear proliferation.

*Rep. Olin E. Teague (D-Tex.):* Scored Carter's plutonium ban and nuclear proliferation policy.

*Rep. Barber Conable (R-NY):* "This is not the American way. We can do anything, we can solve any problem. That is how Carter should mobilize the American people."

*Sen. Dewey Bartlett (R-Okla):* "Carter's energy program is a disaster for the nation and a calamity for Oklahoma. It invades and destroys the free intra-state market...We cannot ignore the relationship between energy and the standard of living of the American population. This will have an adverse effect on lower income layers with its stress on conservation, sacrifice, and deprivation. This will drastically reduce employment. This is not a positive program."

*Rep. James Abdnor (R-S.D.):* "I am more worried about what the President didn't say than about what he did say." Particularly upset about the program's effect on farmers, "who can't pass along the costs."

*Rep. E. Thomas Coleman (R-Mo.):* Worried about the "impact the energy program would have on the American farmer" and its lessening of food production.

*Rep. Ted Risenhoover (D-Okla.):* "The rich will not suffer under this proposal and the welfare recipients will be taken care of. I am not going to stand for the middle-class working people of America having to bear the full burden of the cost of conversion from oil and gas to nuclear and coal energy...I will venture to say that this legislation will look a lot different when it gets back to the White House."

*Rep. Al Ullman (D-Ore.), Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee:* "The President has prescribed a tough, direct approach that leaves no doubt about his personal commitment to ease the energy crisis...(The Committee) will test and challenge each proposal, seeking energy goals that are achievable...Two years ago the House defeated any gas tax increase by a five-to-one margin...The House is not likely to reverse itself for yet more severe measures."

*Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.):* "The gas tax hits the average working man too hard." His office: "Forcing industry to convert to coal when there is not evidence that coal could be mined cleanly and efficiently, much less transported, could tilt production in the U.S."

*Sen. William Roth (R-Dela.):* Had an economist study the impact of the program and found that \$38 billion would be taken out of the economy. "The study raises serious questions about the implications of the energy program."

*Sen. Russell Long (D-La.):* "It could be a year before (the Senate Finance Committee) acts on the bill...We won't act on it until the House has passed the measures."

*Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.):* "There is no way I can support this program."

*Sen. Don Riegle (D-Mich.):* "I basically have a mixed reaction...I am concerned about some of the recommendations that will affect the auto industry in Michigan and the economy in Michigan."

*Sen. Robert Griffin (R-Mich.):* "Frankly, part of (Carter's) program have just got to be bad news for Michigan. And I think it's discriminating against hundreds of thousands of workers in our state whose jobs depend on our three big industries — automobiles, tourism, and agriculture."

*Sen. Harrison Schmitt (R-N. Mex.):* "Carter's energy goals are aimed in the right direction but most of his steps are way off course... I remain adamantly opposed to any new massive government intervention into our private lives.... Throwing away the breeder project and plutonium as a possible fuel is an unfortunately premature decision."

*Rep. James Florio (D-N.J.):* "President Carter's plan gives the Congress something with which to work ... (but) personally I have found that generally the idea of levying taxes as a way of rationing fuel to be inequitable.... We need plans to develop new resources."

*Sen. John Heinz (R-Penn.):* "I strongly approve the President's emphasis on conservation and increasing reliance on coal... (but) I am skeptical about the gas tax... Price increases have doubled in the last five years and not reduced consumption."

*Rep. Jim Mattox (D-Tex.):* "My constituents are

prepared to make sacrifices to conserve energy and they fully understand the gravity of the energy crisis, but don't believe that the hardship caused to working people by taxing gas is fair." Said his constituents favored rationing over a gas tax by an eight-to-two margin.

*Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.):* "I have grave doubts about some aspects ... the gas tax increases and the wellhead tax on crude oil...."

## Congressmen Expressing Support

*These Congressmen were in favor of Carter's energy proposals.*

*Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.):* "Carter's program is

bold and imaginative." Claimed that it will have more support from the Republicans than from the Democrats. "This is a nation of swine."

*Sen. Thomas Eagleton (D-Mo.):* "I will support rationing and coupons for low cost energy."

*Rep. Robert Nix (D-Penn.):* Although he had received calls "all morning" from "rural electric people crying, 'Help! Help!,'" he feels that Carter's energy policies won't hurt the rural producers.

*Sen. John Glenn (D-Oh.):* Generally supports the program and especially likes its emphasis on conservation.

*Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D-Tex.):* "The President is doing what has to be done. He has proposed a broad, comprehensive national energy policy and it should be given a fair hearing, not nibbled to death."

## States:

# Legislatures Pass Memorials For Fusion

Within hours of President Carter's energy messages, legislative bodies in three states voted in support of memorial bills calling upon the U.S. Congress to ensure the expansion of fusion and breeder-fission research and development in this country. These state actions are the clearest indicators of national resistance to the Administration's energy plan — which calls for the essential elimination of breeders and fusion development.

The combined Delaware State Legislature passed a fission-fusion memorial yesterday 31-3 with six abstentions, and has sent the bill on to Congress.

The Delaware legislative victory marks the second state to follow Maryland's example and pass a fusion memorial. This week, U.S. Labor Party-initiated fusion energy memorials passed the Washington State Senate 27-0 and unanimously passed the House Trade and Economic Development Committee in Oregon.

Fusion memorials have been introduced in a total of 11 states so far. This week, energy memorials are expected to be introduced into Ohio, Missouri, Colorado and are under consideration in New York, Texas and North Carolina.

The rapid movement of fusion energy memorials through state legislatures has been a self-feeding process since the unveiling of the Carter energy plan this week. U.S. Labor Party initiated fusion resolutions were introduced into the Vermont Legislature on April 14 by State Senator Melvin Mandigo (R-Glover) and into the New Jersey State Senate on April 18 by State Senator Pat Dodd (D-Essex).

The Delaware memorial, Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, was introduced and passed in two days under the sponsorship and management of Democratic Rep. Ronald Darling and Republican Senator Robert Berndt. The day after Carter's energy message, Berndt, a chemist at Du Pont motivated the need for the bill on

the floor by citing Carter's incompetent proposals and explained the role which the breeder reactor and fusion had to play in solving world energy needs. There were no comments or questions. The Senate voted up the resolution 18-0, including Senator McDowell, the head of the Energy Committee, who had asked Berndt to water down the resolution. The resolution then went to the House, where it passed by a voice vote of 35-4.

Other Mid-Atlantic region legislators expressed delighted surprise that the Delaware legislature could pass such a resolution so quickly, noting that Delaware was formerly "crawling with ecologists." Evidence of the turnaround in the state came in last week, with the favorable coverage by the DuPont-influenced *Wilmington News Journal* of the Fusion Energy Foundation's forum on April 14 at the University of Delaware, which formerly misdirected resources into solar energy research. In the wake of the quick passage of the pro-breeder and fusion resolution, a coalition of legislators in Delaware is now preparing legislation to repeal most of the Coastal Zoning Act — a law which has effectively banned new plants from Delaware.

Pennsylvania, a heavily Democratic and highly industrialized state, is now shaping up as a bellwether national fight for a pro-breeder and pro-fusion memorial which directly attacks the Carter policy. After state Rep. Ivan Itkin (D-Pittsburgh) drafted such a resolution, subsequently sponsored by the entire Energy and Mines Subcommittee, a Carter Democrat from Erie County and a Rockefeller Republican from Montgomery County began an hour-long floor fight on April 20 with a motion to remove three clauses of the memorial which attack the Carter Administration's cuts in the breeder and fusion budgets. Rep. Itkin, a nuclear engineer, took up their challenge with a strong 20-minute defense of why the United States must have a national energy policy which rests on the development of new energy sources such as