

U.S. Press On Carter's 'Imperial Presidency'

Chicago Tribune, May 4, "Earl Butz Blasts Carter Energy Plan":

Former Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz charged Tuesday (before the National Liquid Petroleum Gas Association convention meeting in Chicago -ed.) that President Carter's energy proposals threaten to transform the United States into a 'no growth' society.

'It is true that we need to conserve energy as the President says,' Butz said. 'But we also need government policies that encourage exploration for and drilling of, new sources of oil.'

'Carter talks a lot about the need to conserve, but I wish he also talked about making it profitable to seek new oil sources and sink new wells.'

'One way Carter could encourage exploration of new energy sources, is to put a 'halter' on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).'

'We shouldn't have to spend ten years preparing environmental impact statements before turning a shovel,' he said. 'We don't need the EPA to regulate us.'

Chicago Tribune, May 4, "Warn Atom Fuel Limit May Hurt Energy Supply":

'The United States may sacrifice energy resources in vain if it follows President Carter's policy and limits production of bomb-grade nuclear fuel,' a U.S. industry spokesman (Edwin Wiggins, senior vice president, Atomic Industrial Forum -ed.) said Tuesday (at the Salzburg, Austria International Atomic Energy Agency conference on nuclear fuel cycles -ed.).

Wiggins challenged Carter's policy... 'The President appears to be asking the United States to forego an essential element of its energy future in an effort to influence other countries to take comparable initiatives,' Wiggins said.

'Since we have no reason to believe that other countries will be persuaded that these are logical steps toward halting the spread of nuclear weapons, it leaves us with no other conclusion than that our domestic sacrifice will be for naught.'

Chicago Tribune, May 3, "Mr. Carter, Meet Congress," by nationally syndicated columnist, Father Andrew Greeley:

It might be a good idea if Jimmy Carter read the Federalist Papers. The United States of America is governed by three institutions, not just the President... I can see little difference between the Nixon imperial presidency, in which the president tried to govern without Congress, and the present one... You accomplish change in this country not by opinion polls but by getting legislation through Congress.

President Carter does not seem to realize this elementary fact. Nor does he seem to have grasped that Congress was elected by the people, too. Indeed, most of its members were elected by far more votes in their own districts than he was...

Congress is not the Georgia state legislature. The

bizarre notion that he can force Congress into cooperation by appealing 'over their heads' to the people merely demonstrates Carter's ignorance of American Constitutional history and political reality...

(Carter's) tax program is already in trouble. His energy and anti-inflation programs are going to be torn apart. The men whose help he needs most are spoiling for the chance to cut him down to his constitutional size. They do not like him; they do not trust him; they think he and his staff are inept, if not downright dumb...

We are in for four more hard years. The American people don't deserve it.

Detroit News, May 3, "Disputed Data May Peril Carter Energy Program":

The Carter Administration could be in danger of turning off the public... by basing its program on figures that are being criticized as exaggerations or falsehoods.

This is the feeling of dozens of environmentalists, scientist, industry officials, Congressmen and federal energy personnel — experts as well as politicians — surveyed last week.

...The President's Council of Economic Advisers, White House sources say, also was puzzled at Mr. Carter's assertion in his April 18 fireside chat that, 'Unless we act, we will spend more than \$550 billion for imported oil by 1985...'

'We've asked the White House for data to back up that figure,' said a member of the Senate Energy Committee, 'but so far we've had no response.'

'It's an incredible figure — particularly when you consider that it's about 20 percent more than the current federal budget, and the nation imports only about \$40 billion worth of oil right now.'

... 'Speculation as to the Administration's motivation probably is pointless,' said Rep. John Dingell (D-Trenton, Mich), chairman fo the House Energy and Power Subcommittee, which will consider part of the energy package. 'We've requested the pertinent information needed to make an intelligent judgement from them repeatedly and repeatedly we've been stonewalled.'

'The Administration has dangerously over-estimated uranium reserves and under-estimated oil and natural gas reserves, in an attempt to hard-sell its energy package,' said Rep. Mike McCormack (D-Wash), chairman of the House Energy Research Subcommittee.

Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, May 3, "Carter Energy Program Is A Flop":

Most of the reaction so far to Carter's energy program resembles an elaborate modern version of the minuet, with great courtly and formal gestures considered necessary by all the participants...

The trouble with this kind of obeisance is that it might lead the casual observer to conclude that the U.S. finally does have the beginnings of a sensible national energy

policy — whereas in reality, the emperor is still stark, shivering naked.

...The program is an active disaster when it comes to the genuinely central task of increasing U.S. energy supplies...In reality, Carter's program will discourage energy exploration, retard energy development, and foster the very energy shortages he decries.

Chicago Daily News, May 2, editorial, "Not-So-Ingenuous Yankee":

The very roots of (American) ingenuity (its research scientists, inventors and engineers -ed.) ...are withering for lack of nourishment...In blunting its technological edge, Americans may lose something else: a robust future...Even if problems facing today's society are solved, tomorrow's problems will be festering beyond the ability of today's technology to cure them. That cure will depend on the technology of tomorrow, which depends on the research and development of today.

New York Post, April 30 "An Energetic Dissent," by nationally syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft:

Precisely because he says out loud what other people only think...Gov. Edwards (D-La) is worth listening to on the subject of President Carter's energy package. He doesn't pay lip service to the package as many officials and executives in this part of the world do...On the contrary, Edwards is an energy dissident, opposed to the package in root and branch...

Edwards points out that the Carter package has no incentives for nuclear power, and that many plants are now tied up in litigation by environmentalists...Edwards claims companies will not invest millions of dollars in opening new coal mines when the stuff can't be burned because of rigorous clean air standards. He asserts that strip mining restrictions pose a big obstacle against development of Western coal.

Edwards is not prepared to let his state 'be drained' of its energy resources because other states refuse to accept offshore drilling or strip mining or nuclear plants... 'That may sound provincial to you,' he said. 'But we'll rejoin the Union when New York does, and California and West Virginia.'

I hope Gov. Edwards is not right on the energy question. But his view...express the price we may have to pay if the Carter program cannot be made to work.

Detroit News, April 29, "Flaws Seen Lurking in Energy Plan," by nationally syndicated columnist J.F. terHorst:

To my knowledge, the President has not publicly identified Roger Williams and Martin Luther as two of his principle advisers on energy policy. Surely, that is merely an oversight, because there is much more theology than geology in his national plan for conserving oil and gas.

Well, the profligacy of man is a sin of the flesh, and as recognizable in the Baptist traditions of Jimmy Carter as in the Lutheran background of Schlesinger. And sin, when not repented, cannot be condoned.

From that shared premise, it was only a logical hop to the central doctrine of what now stands as Carter-Schlesinger energy policy. If Americans will not turn

away from the sin of gasoline waste, then as surely as crime must have its punishment, the President will tax the hell out of them...

If the President is serious about saving us from energy perdition why did he reject...a booster for public transportation...? On this as on other points, we have heard the President's trumpet but we are uncertain about the call.

Kansas City Star, April 28, "Carter Foe Discounts Energy Crisis":

There is no energy shortage as set forth by President Carter, Leo Scanlon, a worker for the U.S. Labor Party, said in an interview...

The U.S. Labor Party came to national attention last year on the eve of the general election when its chairman and presidential candidate, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., bought a half hour of prime time television and castigated Carter, predicting among other things, a nuclear war within six months if he (Carter) were elected.

'There are adequate supplies of fossil fuels...and nuclear energy,' said Scanlon. 'The shortage Carter talks about means the shortage of available reserves, not known reserves. Turning reserves into available reserves is a matter of technology.'

'Instead of conserving energy, we should have a crash program to develop high temperature technology and nuclear fission and fusion,' he said.

The Carter Administration has halted...the development of breeder reactors as a possible source for generating energy.

'Carter's policy...is a financial policy. The guts of that policy is to enforce domestic austerity...It's a way of stabilizing the lower Manhattan banks like Chase Manhattan, which are technically bankrupt and need bailing out.'

'It is similar to Hitler's (policy in) Germany in the 1930s, which was deindustrialized and labor intensive to prop up the debt...'

Scanlon said expressed fears that terrorists could steal nuclear fuels or wastes and build a bomb were a 'hoax.'

Charlotte Observer, April 28, editorial titled, "Palace Guard; Is Carter Now Isolated?":

White House press secretary Jody Powell's behavior these days reminds us of some of those white folks who, during the early days of the civil rights movement, would attempt to convince reporters that everything was just fine, just fine. To prove their point they would ask some poor black if everything wasn't just fine, just fine. Yes sir boss, sure is.

...We hope both the President and his press secretary will do some serious thinking about the direction of the Carter White House. Mr. Carter has some tendency toward arrogance and self-righteousness, qualities not unknown in previous Administrations. But Mr. Powell's irreverent humor had tended to ease that. Now, however, he is sounding rather like the latest version of a palace guard. The guard and the guarded ought to take seriously what other White House folk...are saying (about Carter's self-consoling isolation).

Pittsburgh Press, April 22, "Pro-Nuclear Groups Hit Carter Plan":

Two pro-nuclear groups have taken bitter exception to President Carter's energy plan.

Dr. Morris Levitt, national director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, termed the Carter policy, 'The first step toward deindustrialization of the United States.'

And the Concerned Citizens for the Nuclear Breeder stated flatly that 'The cancellation of the breeder reactor development program proposed by the President will have a disastrous effect on our country's future energy supply.'

Levitt, in Pittsburgh yesterday to promote an energy and technological development conference at the William Penn Hotel next Friday, also stated: 'We can have as much energy, at reasonable prices, that we need if we are willing to develop the technology.'

By banning the use of plutonium, Mr. Carter has

knocked out 99 percent of the available nuclear power, Levitt said. And the President has refused to recognize fusion energy as the power of the future despite being advised of very recent fusion research breakthroughs, Levitt charged. 'The President cannot be unaware of testimony before Congress that we are now at a 'break-even' point in fusion research,' he said.

...Levitt described the Fusion Energy Foundation as a 'high technology think-tank for the pro-fusion development segment of our society.' The concerned citizens group is a 'community group of people within the nuclear industry and others supporting nuclear development,' according to its president, Thomas Galioto, a Westinghouse employee.

... 'Development of a commercial U.S. breeder industry will in no way increase nuclear proliferation,' Galioto said. 'Carter is using the breeder reactor as a political football at the expense of our country's future.'

Nixon Lifts The Watergate Albatross Off Conservatives

Richard M. Nixon dished out more than he took in his nationally-televised May 4 confrontation with interrogator David Frost, once and for all lifting the Watergate albatross off the necks of American conservatives.

The show attracted 57.2 million viewers, an historic record for a TV interview. The filmed interview was carried by the Westinghouse Broadcasting Corporation, having been rejected by the financier-controlled networks, CBS, NBC and ABC.

The former president's reemergence onto the national political scene through the interview elicited cries of alarm from the New York financier-controlled press such as the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. Nixon's successful appearance has only served to force the impression of the weakness of the Carter Administration and its Trilateral Commission backers.

CBS' judgment on the interview was expressed frankly: "Frost was like a weak softball pitcher who kept lobbing pitches to Nixon who kept batting them out of the ballpark for a home run."

In the course of the interview, Nixon did manage to drop some political bombshells. For the first time, he let out his knowledge that "there may have been a conspiracy to get me," describing the months of Watergate as "a five-front war with a fifth column." While not making himself perfectly clear, Nixon did directly allude to "some Republican, some Democratic circles," and to "CIA shenanigans" which "haven't yet been told" — all part of the conspiracy. Informed circles recognize these statements as references to the Rockefeller private political intelligence networks inside the major political parties, the intelligence community proper, and the Nixon Administration itself (i.e., Nixon's Secretary of State Kissinger, adviser Alexander Haig, et al.).

Nixon's comeback to the position of at least a factor in

American politics comes in the context of a general political shift which finds traditionalist-conservative forces, including "the Nixon faction," increasingly confident and active. Nixon's and Ford's former Secretary of the Treasury, William Simon, went public in the past week to endorse fusion power against the Carter Administration's no-nuclear energy program. Early this week, former Vice President Spiro Agnew, himself an apparently finished Watergate victim, issued a public statement saying, "I've got information that will allow me to be elected to public office in the future." By contrast, Vice President Walter Mondale was forced into making a public apology to Gerald Ford for demanding that Ford quit criticizing Jimmy Carter's economic program.

A Trick That Didn't Work

The Trilateral Commission expected that in an interview Nixon would come off as badly as he had during his last weeks in the White House. In March, David Frost and his research assistant, James Reston, Jr., of the *New York Times*, were given the green light by the Rockefeller circles to film an interrogation of the ex-president, in the full expectation that the well-profiled "broken man" would be finished off, and thereby contribute to the consolidation of the fraudulent Carter presidency.

But Nixon refused as he put it "to grovel." Seizing the initiative from his startled inquisitor, Nixon not only deftly demonstrated that the Watergate charges brought against him were half-truths and fictions, but (correctly) insisted repeatedly that his single serious failing was not to have contained and destroyed the political opponents of his presidency for the overriding good of the country.

Nixon also got in some cracks at the expense of the