

## U.S. Press:

# The President Sounded Un-American

*Journal of Commerce*, April 22 editorial:

Mr. Carter deserves every credit for stating bluntly the stark facts about the nation's energy crunch and for orchestrating them in the somber tones that occasion requires.... The crunch is not only going to be with us for a long while, but perhaps forever.... Our main criticism of his plan is that while it has the appearance of being comprehensive, it is nowhere near as comprehensive as it should be.... No energy policy that fails to bring about a drastic reduction in public consumption can rate as an energy policy at all.

*Detroit News*, April 21:

commentary column by John Peterson, "We Need to Ask More Questions About Energy":

...It (the Carter energy program-ed.) requires among other things a suspension of public disbelief — which is exactly what Jimmy Carter in his best soft-spoken 'I love y'all' manner was asking for this week....

Mr. Carter suggested it was our patriotic duty to limit national growth and to cut back our lifestyle...

He was aided by a conveniently timed CIA report that found the world's energy demands will far exceed the world's energy supplies within a decade. No one in the press so much as snickered. That alone ought to make the public suspicious.

The press — rightly or wrongly — never has hesitated to attack CIA credibility where the Agency was dealing solely within its area of expertise such as estimating the military strength of the Soviets...

If you're worried that civil liberties might be subjected to restrictions by an all-powerful federal energy czar you may lose some sleep over a proposal advanced by the President's old softball buddy, Ralph Nader on "Meet the Press" last Sunday. Nader, who has become the President's top adviser without portfolio in recent weeks has favored the creation of an energy conservation corps.... Cutting through his attempt to finesse the

## Wall Street Journal:

# Carter Will Return Us To The Dark Ages

*The following are excerpts from the Wall Street Journal editorial of April 22, entitled "Energy Psychology":*

...At best the package is a confusing mish-mash...some parts of it are actually destructive...the proposal to push prices up through taxes gives you all of the supposed disadvantages of price decontrol with none of its advantages.... His package should have more stress on production incentives...

Mr. Carter's call for sacrifice, his total emphasis on conservation instead of production, plays upon and nurtures one of the most dangerous psychological impulses at large in society today.

This is the neo-Malthusian notion that the essential task for mankind is rationing and parceling out a finite and constantly dwindling store of resources. The Club of Rome led this attack on the belief in progress, and then saw that it was in general undermining the intellectual and moral foundations of modern civilization, and in particular undermining the hopes of the poorest people everywhere. But though the Club of Rome recanted, its original paralyzing pessimism has taken an extraordinary grip on broad sectors of the American mind.

Yet the factual foundations of this notion are hard to discern....Mankind is in the extraordinary position of being able to see conceptually where its energy will come from for as many generations ahead as its mind can conceive.

Laying aside our own hunch that a good deal more oil and natural gas will be found when the price is right, everyone concedes that there are a couple of centuries worth of coal. Even without manufacturing plutonium, present nuclear power technology can probably carry us until fusion can make energy from seawater....There are no meaningful physical limits to energy; the problems are economic ones. And these problems can be solved....

...Investment in new energy sources must be encouraged, or at least not discouraged....In the Carter package, the revenues from higher energy prices would be dissipated....The package has no recognition (of this) whatsoever....

...We do worry that perhaps Mr. Carter's ringing call for sacrifice will not open and broaden the debate, but instead lead it down the path of sterile pessimism into self-realizing fears of energy disaster. We would even go so far as to say that if the neo-Malthusianism runs too long unchecked, it will lead not only to dim lights but to a dark age.

question, what Nader is talking about, pure and simple, are brigades of youthful and often uneducated government inspectors snooping into the private lives of Americans. Nader's proposals seldom are scrutinized for fascist intent but the gauleiter aspects of his Energy Conservation Corps are too pronounced to be ignored.

*Chicago Tribune*, April 19,  
editorial, "The Two Sides of the Energy Policy":

The *Tribune* views with "skepticism"... "the conclusion that we must so restrict energy consumption as to lower living standards and economic growth significantly.... Creating a jobless America for the sake of energy security is not an acceptable tradeoff... It is time to see more Edisons, Bells and Einsteins, perhaps yet unborn, to invent or discover new energy sources as yet undreamed of."

*Chicago Tribune*, April 20:

President Carter's energy message Monday night misled the American public by almost ignoring the potential and existence of nuclear power, a nuclear advocate charged Tuesday.

It is very misleading to the American public to mistake the fact that nuclear power is one of the few existing possibilities for growth without major resource or environmental impact, said Dr. Chauncy Starr, president of the Electric Power Research Institute. Starr spoke to the American Power Conference at the Palmer House here....

*St. Louis Globe-Democrat*  
(Newhouse Newspapers), April 22,  
editorial, "Jimmy's Jumbled Energy Plan":

Attacks Carter's proposals for their restraint on the oil and gas industry, and strongly endorses the need for the breeder reactor program.

*New York Daily News*, April 22,  
editorial, "The Energy Plan":

...However, Americans just haven't responded to calls for self-discipline. Somehow, it has to be brought home to them that the careless wastefulness of the past cannot be tolerated.... There shouldn't be a question in anyone's mind about the need for cutting way back on the amount of gasoline we burn.... But for a long-term solution, we need to expand our search for new energy sources — and Mr. Carter's proposals, admirable as they are in many respects, were disappointingly sketchy in that area.

*Boston Globe*, April 19 news analysis by Martin Nolan:

Carter is restoring a "commodity even more rare than petroleum — presidential credibility."

*Newark Star Ledger*, April 19,  
editorial, "Energy — A Sound Beginning":

Any sound energy policy must begin with conservation... Americans must learn to be prudent with the use of energy in the future.

*Greensboro Record* (N.C.), April 20,  
editorial, "Energy Czar Jimmy":

Jimmy has warned us, "don't expect the best, don't

even expect the mediocre." His program consists of silly taxes and will lead to silly conservation.... If you must hear all the details watch Carter's message but if you want to save energy turn off your TV set.

*San Francisco Chronicle*, April 19,  
editorial, "That Nuclear Fuel Decision":

Commenting on the recent Persepolis meeting on nuclear power in Iran, the editorial quotes Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Sigvard Eklund, who said that Carter's proposals violated the nuclear non-proliferation treaty of 1969. Says the *Chronicle*, "We do feel the President must face the objections that came from the Iran meeting. He cannot be unmindful of the desperate energy needs of other countries."

*Tacoma News Tribune*, April 14, editorial:

Work on the breeder reactor is continuing in the Soviet Union, France, Britain, West Germany, the Benelux nations, Italy, Japan and India.... So while France and the other nations with similar programs are moving ahead, the U.S. will be lagging further and further behind. And it seems to us to be totally unnecessary.

*Tacoma News Tribune*, March 28  
editorial, "Harming the Energy Search":

The breeder reactor which produces more atomic fuel than it consumes, is considered the next step in nuclear power technology.... Furthermore, exciting advances in nuclear fusion research have been taking place. What was only a theory a few years ago has progressed to the point where ERDA had set 1981 for the first production of significant amounts of controlled thermonuclear fusion energy. The date for demonstration will now be set back six to nine months because of the Carter Administration's slowdown order.

*Portland Oregonian*, April 14,  
editorial, "Atomic Backfire":

President Carter's plans to curb the export of plutonium, vital for breeder reactors that would stretch out the world's energy supplies, has had a not-unexpected reaction among the nation's allies that depend on the United States for reprocessed nuclear fuels....

The Japanese, who ratified the treaty (non-proliferation treaty — ed.) only last year, were greatly upset by the Carter proposals.... Two other allies, West Germany and France, both deeply involved in breeder technology requiring plutonium, were highly critical, as expected, of Carter's proposals... The United States, as the principal world supplier of peaceful nuclear technology, will lose vital trade dollars by restricting it....

*New York Times*, April 18,  
William Safire column, "Bless the Blitz":

This week, Jimmy Carter will make the most extensive use of the television medium of any President in our history. If he goes through with it, he will become the first one-man mini-series.... Understandably, many media-men are queasy about becoming doormats for the selling of a Presidential policy. They worry, rightly, about being criticized tomorrow for participating in an

unprecedented orchestration of opinion-molding today. Accordingly, some networks are planning coverage of divergent points of view, providing time for rebuttal, and engaging in what used to be called 'instant analysis.' That is to the good....

I am not worried about the Carter media blitz because a one-shot rallying of support for a 'package' does not result in the passage of that package....He (Carter) has been a malleable President; he wants to be popular....We'll take what we like, and he'll like what we take. Years from now, when our children ask "Where were you during the blitz?" we'll tell them we dutifully tuned in, believed what the President said the first night about saving energy so we turned off the television set and picked up a book.

CBS Morning News, April 18,

by Jerry Landay:

What scientists want to harness is nothing less than this: the energy that powers the sun. The energy is called

fusion energy...There's still a long way to go, but in tests like these completed last month, Alcator (MIT fusion project — ed.) has come within shooting distance of proving the feasibility of fusion power...Practical commercial fusion is forecast for the 1990's. Some scientists say, with a crash program, it could come sooner; but President Carter has cut \$80 million from the new fusion budget...In Alcator C, the scientists here say they hope to achieve break-even in two years, the possible "open sesame" to the achievement of unlimited power.

*Indianapolis Star*, April 20:

"Carter has sounded strangely un-American on Monday..."

*Boston Herald*, April 20:

Carter ignores the need to "expand our energy supply and to develop new alternative sources of energy to meet the nation's demands of future economic growth..."

---

## Media Covers Fusion Energy Foundation Drive For Pro-Development U.S. Policy

*Some newspapers have expressed their opposition to Carter's energy plan with increased coverage of the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF) campaign for an energy policy based on the transition to a fusion-based economy. During the first two weeks of April, FEF Director Morris Levitt toured Texas and Oklahoma. The following is a sample of the press coverage of the tour.*

The Houston Post, April 9, by Jim Maloney,

*"Fusion Proponent Criticizes Carter Policies":*

If President Carter's energy policies in regard to nuclear power prevail, "The United States is on the way toward becoming a second-rate power," Executive Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation said here Friday... Depending on what happens internationally, Levitt said, these policies are a prescription for either a slow or a fast suicide for the country... During a visit to Austin, Levitt said he got a commitment that a bill will be introduced in the Texas legislature "supporting the full use of fission and all out fusion research and development effort."

The Houston Chronicle, April 12, "Labor Party Exec. Plugs Fusion Energy":

The research director of the U.S. Labor Party says fusion energy must be developed if the nation is to resume its dynamic growth by fulfilling the needs of Third World nations.

Dr. Morris Levitt says the alternative to a dramatic change in the nation's monetary and energy policies is disintegration of the economy beginning next year... Development of fusion as well as fission energy has received a sharp setback by President Carter's decision

to delay indefinitely the commercial reprocessing of plutonium..."

The Austin American Statesman, April 7, by Larry Besaw *"Massive Fusion Effort Urged":*

A federally financed \$6 billion effort to produce electricity from nuclear fusion by 1990 was called for Wednesday by the director of the Fusion Energy Foundation. Otherwise, said Dr. Morris Levitt, fusion may never be commercially available and the result could be 'deindustrialization' of the country...

Tulsa Daily World, April 14, by War Byers, *"Nuclear Fusion Called Energy of the Future":*

Nuclear fusion can draw enough energy from the world's oceans to provide power for the next one million years as the first step in a 'new industrial revolution', an energy expert said here Wednesday... "With sufficient research and development commitments, we could have fusion reactors on line by 1990," Levitt said. "This would provide a nice, smooth transition with high use of existing energy resources..."

*Levitt also appeared on KLIF radio and WFAA radio in Dallas, KTRH radio, KHOU-TV and KPRC radio in Houston as well as on talk shows in Austin, Texas and Tulsa, Okla.*

*Other coverage of the Fusion Energy Foundation:*

4-21 — Morris Levitt appeared on the Roy Fox show on KDKA radio in Pittsburgh, one of the largest talk shows in the Midwest

4-21 — Levitt Press Conference in Pittsburgh drew reporters from AP, the Pittsburgh Press, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, three radio stations and a TV station.

4-21 — New York-CBS all-news radio played interviews with Dr. Morris Levitt, FEF Director in response to Carter proposals to Congress.

4-22 — Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, by Henry W. Pierce, "Nuclear Energy's Full Push Urged"

A New York physicist yesterday called for full development of nuclear energy, including the controversial breeder reactor and the more glamorous but technologically uncertain, fusion reactor. "We have a beautiful spectrum ahead of us of ever more efficient nuclear processes," declared Morris Levitt, executive director of the Fusion Energy Foundation. Levitt, here to

announce an energy conference to held next Friday at the William Penn Hotel, said failure to develop nuclear energy and other forms of power represents "the first step toward deindustrialization of the United States..."

4-22 Pittsburgh Press, *Pro-Nuclear Group Hits Carter Plan*":

Dr. Morris Levitt, National Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, termed the Carter policy "the first step toward de-industrialization of the United States."

## European Press:

# U.S. Won't Accept An Energy Diet

### West Germany

*Die Welt, April 20, editorial by Heinz Heck "A Report on the Plague of the Nation":*

... since 1973, the words "energy conservation" have been spreading throughout the world... except in the U.S., where the search for new energy resources was systematically blocked by an incorrect energy policy. Conservation can be used, pedagogically, to convince the critical environmentalists that the government's energy program is fine, so that they will agree to extending energy production. But otherwise, even with conservation, — you will not get zero growth. Whoever is demanding that it be implemented in this way either does not know anything or is lying...

Take that meeting of the SPD leftists in Erkenschwick. If they want what they voted for, then they should also tell the population what this means: more unemployment, fewer industrial jobs... There is no realistic alternative to nuclear energy.

... the Federal Republic of Germany, as an export-oriented, highly industrialized country, needs more energy... the Third World, especially those nations which are just at the threshold of industrialization, need abundant and cheap energy... conservative estimates say that the Third World alone will need 400,000 MW in the next twenty years... which can only be supplied by the industrial nations... otherwise, we can tell our highly skilled workers to go home.

I hope this is not what those leftists who met at Erkenschwick really want... but we will get the same bad results if we bow down to Carter's energy program. This will not be accepted by the U.S. and the reactions from the U.S. Congress and the BRD too in this connection will be very interesting..."

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, April 20, by New York correspondent Sabina Lietzmann:*

The U.S. population really does not believe that there is a "real" energy crisis, they think it has been artificially created by the multinationals to raise prices... As an industrialist from Texas said: "America didn't come about as a nation by conservation, but by expansion"...

Henry Ford says: "I don't see any reason to build small cars for this country"... A representative of an oil company says: "It's not an energy crisis, it's a political crisis"... Another oil firm representative says: "The environmentalists are the main evil." Already, 20,000 letters have gone to the White House that reject Carter's energy policy.

*Die Welt, April 20, by Kurt Leissler, Washington correspondent:*

...The only way to get rid of dependency on oil is through fission... Europe wants it, Carter does not. Until something better is available, (solar and fusion energy are still far away), Europe needs fission too... Neither Europe nor Japan can drop plutonium, for then they would become more dependent on oil than they were before 1973. Carter should remember that this was what was behind the BRD government's rejection of transporting U.S. weapons to Israel in 1973... Viewed in terms of foreign policy and strategy, Carter has to ask himself if he can go on like this if he really wants the tripartite alliance between Europe, the United States and Japan. When two of these three still depend on resources whose transportation is endangered, this is a strategic question.

*Die Welt, April 21, front page article by Heinz Heck, "The German economy is protecting itself against Carter's Atomic Reprimand. It is too late to reject the use of Nuclear Power":*

The German nuclear industry has rejected Carter's nuclear energy policy. Yesterday, the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Industrial Association was established in Bonn...

Guenter Scheuten, chairman of the board of the German Society for the Reprocessing of Nuclear Fuel, said: "The USA can afford to reject uranium, but it is not possible for Europe and the Third World to do this, because of limited raw material supplies. There is no other solution if people do not want to be dependent on oil..."

State Secretary Schmid-Kuester from the Federal Research Ministry: "No sovereign state can be prevented from introducing nuclear energy. One cannot reject its peaceful use... We could not and we cannot