

# U.S. Press Critical Of Carter Energy Plan From All Directions

*The Knoxville Journal*, (Tenn.), April 22,  
Editorial, "Fairytale Logic."

(With his program) Carter has drifted into never-never land...." After attacking Carter's proposals on gasoline cutbacks, etc., the editorial continues, "Combine these goals with the Administration's scuttling of the breeder reactor program and its general deemphasizing of nuclear power and its support of costly and restrictive controls on the more widely available grades of coal and (you) may reach the conclusion that the Carter Administration has its feet planted firmly in the clouds ... his concept of a remedy is akin to curing malnutrition through starvation.

*Knoxville News Sentinel*, April 22.  
"Policy Called 'Fraud, Disaster'"

A spokesman for the Fusion Energy Foundation, New York City, said here yesterday (that) President Carter's announced energy policy is a disaster and a fraud.

Eric Lerner, director of physics research for the independent, non-profit educational foundation, said the President's policy is a fraud because its basic premise — that we are running out of energy — is false.

He said it is a disaster because Carter's tens of billions of dollars of energy taxes and zero energy growth goals will mean mass unemployment on a scale greater than that of the 1930s.

Mr. Lerner is on a tour of the Southeast to help build a national coalition for energy growth to demand that Congress reject President Carter's energy taxes and zero growth policy.

Mr. Lerner claims President Carter has lied to the people about an energy shortage because he is protecting the biggest "special interest" of all — the New York banks.

'As Arthur Burns stated last week, the New York banks are demanding energy cutbacks because they want the money now being spent on energy diverted to the payment of the gigantic debt owed to them,' Mr. Lerner charged.

*The Indianapolis Star*, April 24.  
Editorial, "Velvet-Gloved Fist?"

(Carter's energy proposals are) an almost incomprehensible mishmash of higher taxes, lower taxes, excise taxes, incentives, punishments, rebates, credits, allocation orders, prohibitions, mandatory fuel standards, and on and on. Mr. Carter's proposals ... were ultra-heavy on energy conservation and light to non-existent on development of new energy sources....

Not once, for instance, did he refer to frontier-area oil exploration as a means to obtain enormous fresh supplies of natural gas. Nor did he point to the extraordinary progress made by other countries in such exploration — using American technology — while United States efforts are frustrated by endless government red tape and judicial meddling.

No. Instead he dwelt on a blood-curdling mixture of more government red tape ... backed by threats of all

kinds of new taxes....

The President described his program as the least expensive to cope with the nation's energy problem. To the contrary, the program could prove extremely expensive in money, in national security, in jobs.

If Mr. Carter had offered a balanced program involving both conservation and increased production, particularly of oil and natural gas, he could scarcely have been faulted. His emphasis on conservation to the virtual exclusion of increased production, however, cannot but leave doubts as to exactly what he seeks to achieve.

*Seattle Post Intelligencer*, and *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, April 24, and *Colombus Dispatch*, April 26.

OpEd, "Positive Approach Needed," by King Features syndicated writer Jeffrey Hart.

It seems quite clear that the solution of the energy problem lies in the development of a fusion reactor able to use hydrogen as its fuel.... Experts believe ... that if a much greater investment were made a fusion generator could be a reality by the year 1990 ... in nuclear energy ... advances require the support of a vigorous nuclear power industry. For that reason Washington ... should push steadily ahead with the traditional uranium fission reactor, and should put much greater effort into the development of fusion power.

*The Washington Star*, *Chicago Sun-Times* and *Chicago Tribune*, April 25.

Lead article in all three papers entitled, "U.N. Experts See Enough Oil, Gas to Last 100 Years."

United Nations, N.Y. (AP) — Estimates compiled by experts at a U.N. conference disagreed with President Carter's televised warning that "we are now running out of gas and oil."

A newly issued summary report of last summer's conference says the dozens of specialists who attended generally agreed that oil and gas from conventional sources "would last at least until about the time period 2020-2030."...

The summary said... "additional petroleum and gas resources would most probably be available, albeit at a substantially higher cost ... during the period of transition to the use of renewable energy sources"...

The U.N. experts also took a different view of the outlook for oil than did the CIA in a report made public before Carter's TV speech last Monday....

The U.S. summary said ... that oil would remain the world's most important hydrocarbon source of energy "for many years to come."...

*St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, April 26.  
Editorial, "GOP Energy Alternative."

President Carter has handed the Republican Party a golden opportunity to regain much of its lost popularity, by opting for an energy program heavily laden with punitive taxes and new federal controls....

Republican Senators Brock of Tennessee and Schmitt

of New Mexico responded to Carter's energy program on CBS TV last week by stressing the need for increased production...

The GOP would also continue to work on the fast breeder reactor, which gets sixty times as much energy from uranium as present nuclear fission methods....

Mr. Carter's proposals are taking the U.S. toward a controlled society. The Republican Party alternative would take the country toward a freer more productive and responsible society.

*St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, April 21.

Lead editorial, "Ford's Right to Free Speech."

...(Vice President) Mondale, with a crybaby attitude ill-befitting a super liberal, is annoyed because Ford has spoken out in opposition to certain economic and foreign policies of the Carter Administration....

Perhaps Carter and Mondale aren't as interested in an 'open Administration' as they pretend. Perhaps they fear that Ford's comments will cause some dip in the President's exceptionally high popularity ratings.

For his part Ford can render invaluable service to the American people by speaking out as often and as bluntly as he likes against policies that he knows to be ill-conceived or hazardous. In this way he can make the best possible contribution to openness....

*Detroit News*, April 26.

"Nader Seen Defaulting on Consumerism; Coercion Appears to be His Technique Now," column by John Peterson.

Nader and his associates stand four-square against further development of nuclear energy, although experts in both the Carter and Ford administrations see it as a vital source of clean, low cost energy. The West Germans, the Japanese, the French, the British and the Russians are all proceeding quickly to develop their nuclear energy potential with an eye to the time when petroleum supplies run out. Without nuclear energy, American consumers undoubtedly will face not only higher utility bills but greatly restricted life styles. That of course would be alright with Ralph Nader, who is proud of the fact that his own life style is already greatly restricted.... As social critic R. Emmet Tyrell, Jr., recently remarked, "In too many matters of choice and tolerance, Citizen Nader has opted for coercion. On matters of his liberalism and devotion to progress, he spoke volumes recently when he lamented in the New York Times magazine that 'we ask our people to think instead of asking them to believe ... and history has always gone to those who ask people to believe....'"

For journalists to persist in calling Nader a 'consumer advocate,' goes beyond the veil of unconscious editorializing. Given his recent record, it smacks of outright propaganda.

*Detroit News*, April 26.

Page one article by John Peterson, "Major Oil Reserves Ignored in CIA Report."

(Quotes CIA chief Stansfield Turner talking about the CIA's report) "We ignored new reserves because we don't think new reserves are part of the issue." When asked by Rep. Clarence Brown (R-Ohio), — "That means

that if you had made your report ten years ago it would undoubtedly have ignored the Alaskan oil reserves in projecting future supply, doesn't it?", Turner gave no answer.

*Detroit News*, April 27.

Page one article, "CIA Forecast of Soviet Oil Pinch Called Incorrect," by John Peterson.

(Quotes experts saying that the notion that the Soviets are on their way towards an early depletion of oil reserves is) "incredible... totally fantastic."

One of the report's most oft quoted detractors, John Luchblau of the Petroleum Industry Research Forum (says), "(the report is) questionable and not based on the superior knowledge which only the CIA has access to... You also have to understand that the Soviets have no environmental roadblocks to overcome — in addition they have coal, breeders (etc.)."

The report is incredibly unsophisticated because it makes no attempt to consider the input of other fuels ... it's amazing that Carter would invoke a CIA report just at the time when the CIA's credibility is at an all time low.

*Chicago Tribune*, April 27.

Articles, "Simon Labels Energy Plan 'Quackery' "

The article reports an April 26 speech by former Treasury Secretary William Simon at a dinner in honor of Representative Philip Crane (Rep.-Ill), Chairman of the American Conservative Union. Responding to Carter's energy program Simon declared, "This massive intrusion by government in a most critical sector of the economy would result in disaster." Simon said that the plan means the creation of a national energy police state, with less energy at higher prices, administered by those persons "who brought us Amtrak and the Post Office." Representative Crane seconded Simon's remarks and added that Carter's proposals amounted to "corporate socialism."

*Detroit News*, April 29.

Page one article, "Carter's Staff Tries to Stop Conflicting Gas Report," by John Peterson.

The White House has asked ERDA not to release a study that contends that the nation's natural gas supplies are far greater than indicated by the Carter Administration... Both the White House and Office of Federal Energy Chief James Schlesinger declined immediate comment, except to acknowledge that their conclusions were based on 1974 data. In drafting its national energy plan, the Carter Administration assumed the U.S. has only 216 trillion cubic feet of proven natural gas reserves, barely a ten year supply. But portions of the agency study leaked to newsmen show that the nation has enough available natural gas to last through the year 2000 and perhaps well beyond.

(Peterson discloses that the actual figure for economic production of natural gas based on a U.S. Geological Survey estimate, show 1800 trillion cubic feet of gas that can be cheaply tapped in the next 20 years, more at higher costs.) Enough to last for more than one thousand years at current rates of consumption.

Why is there such a large gap between ... the figures

used by the Carter Administration ... and those developed by the agency?

According to American Gas Association spokesmen, referring to a briefing they gave Schlesinger earlier this month, their officials came away "bitterly disappointed" that the Administration "chose to ignore virtually all the facts laid out to them... We basically cannot understand how Schlesinger failed to grasp what we told him at that time," said one association official.

*Seattle Post Intelligencer*, April 24.

Front page editorial, "In the Open At Last," by William Randolph Hearst.

Except for passing and casual treatment, the President neglected the subject of development of nuclear energy, which is of course anathema to some vocal environmentalists. Many leading physicists say, however, that electric power generated by the atom is one of our greatest potential energy sources. Why leave it out of our planning at this time?

## The Republican Party At The Crossroads

Republican National Committee Chairman Bill Brock told the party's National Committee conference meeting in Chicago April 29 that most of the Carter program on energy was the antithesis of the Republican philosophy. "For reasons no one has ever fully explained," Brock said, Carter's advisors have assumed that world supplies of energy are quickly running out, an assumption so pessimistic that it is not widely shared. Some people like the sound of the words 'no-growth,' but most Americans can't afford the economic stagnation that could follow adoption of the Carter energy program. In short, there is much in the President's proposals that is diametrically opposed to Republican traditions and Republican philosophy."

Brock went on to promise that Congressional Republicans would "vehemently oppose" any new taxes on gasoline, oil or automobiles, in what the Carter Administration's house organ, the *New York Times*, characterized as "a broad partisan attack on President Carter's energy program."

During the week prior to Brock's speech, leading Republicans continued to assault the Carter program; particularly noteworthy was a speech by former Treasury Secretary William Simon, who warned that the Carter policy would lead to a national energy police state, according to the *Chicago Tribune*.

However, the Senate Republican Policy Committee has so far been unable to agree on a comprehensive energy counterproposal to the Carter program, and other party leadership bodies are similarly split, according to Capitol Hill sources, between those who want to emphasize a program for increased energy production and those who want to tail the Administration on conservation.

The Administration is terrified of what the Republicans could do if they endorse a broad economic growth program. Congressional sources have revealed that when key Republicans attempted to have a strong energy development plank endorsed by the House Republican

Policy Committee, the Rockefeller Republicans allied with the Administration and threatened to "split apart the party." And when ex-President Gerald Ford made his strongest criticisms of the Carter Administration two weeks ago in California, both Vice-President Mondale and House Speaker O'Neill were quick to chastise Ford in the national media for "criticizing" the Administration so soon after leaving office.

The Rockefeller faction has also used some of its strongarm tactics to keep tabs on and stifle action by Republican leaders against the Carter program. James Cannon, former aide to New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, and his chief assistant on the Domestic Council, began work April 18 as the Administrative Assistant to Senate Minority leader Howard Baker. And Don Kellerman, a top aide to New York Senator Jacob Javits will shortly begin working for the joint Senate-House minority leadership. The Rockefeller agents are telling the rest of the party that because the Republicans are a "minority party" they must "appeal to blacks, to labor," and so forth with modified versions of the Carter policies.

### *A Republican-Labor Alliance?*

"You can work with us, who are labelled 'anti-labor' but are 'pro-jobs'; or you can work with people like Frank Church, who is called pro-labor but is anti-jobs." With those remarks, a midwestern Republican Senator identified for a trade-union lobbyist last week of the real common interest between the Republican Party and labor. The choice presently facing the party is to back up such appeals with a comprehensive approach to expanded energy development, emphasizing that fusion power means a greatly increased standard of living for the U.S. population, or fall victim of the present "minority party" fear psychology with which the Rockefeller Republicans are attempting to beat down resistance to the Carter program, and undergo step-by-step disintegration.