

## U.S. Press Differs On Administration Energy Policy

Dallas Times Herald, *editorial, "Retreat from Reality,"* Nov. 8:

"...The United States already lags in development of new nuclear technology and the President's refusal to approve continued research is an unwise attempt to cordon off a broad area of knowledge which could be of vital importance to the United States in the years ahead.

"We urge the House and the Senate to override the veto sending the President a signal that this nation is not ready for a no growth policy nor prepared to accept the pessimism about future energy supplies that dominates the thinking of Mr. Carter and his energy aides."

Wall Street Journal, *"A Cosmetic Veto,"* Nov. 15:

"We have supported a strong policy to curb nuclear proliferation, and additionally think the Clinch River Breeder Reactor is the biggest economic turkey since the SST. So we were happy to see President Carter veto the breeder authorization bill. But we are disturbed that he left so many people with the mistaken impression that the veto stops the project. This only adds to our worry that his much-touted antiproliferation policy is merely cosmetic."

Baltimore Sun, *"U.S. Policy Delays Hurt Nuclear Sales Abroad,"* by Henry Trehwitt, Nov. 12:

"Developing countries are turning increasingly to non-American equipment for nuclear power production while the Carter administration and Congress debate the conditions of American sales.

"Iran has committed more than \$11 billion of a \$30 billion nuclear program to other suppliers without waiting for an American decision.

"Industry sources expressed fear this week that Spain, which so far has bought American for the most part, will turn to Germany for its next important purchase."

Chicago Sun-Times, *"Freeway Fallout? Odds Assessed,"* by Bruce Ingersoll Nov. 14:

"They (drivers who ship nuclear waste-ed.) haul everything from faintly contaminated clothing to deadly plutonium, but the few drivers who would talk seem almost blithe about their jobs or given to gallows humor. Said one off-duty driver in a Sheffield bar, 'I'm still living, ain't I?'" Within 25 miles of Interstate 80, ten nuclear power reactors are generating electricity and 14 more are under construction or planned."

Newsday, *"Scientists See Atomic Reactor Deaths,"* by Stuart Diamond, Nov. 17:

"A group of scientists critical of nuclear power (the Union of Concerned Scientists) released a two-year study this morning concluding that the United States should expect 15,000 deaths from atomic reactor accidents by the end of the century if 500 reactors are built..."

# Shah's Nuclear Offer Heats U.S. Energy Fight

In Washington, D.C. this week, the Shah of Iran put the Carter Administration's conservation antinuclear policy to the sword by demanding a transfer of nuclear technology and reactors from the United States in trade for an Iranian commitment not to push for higher oil prices at the upcoming meeting of OPEC. The Shah correctly predicted that unless the Carter Administration changes its policy "your present civilization is going to die," both as a result of inadequate energy growth at home and from curtailment of U.S. engagement in international trade.

Responding immediately to this pressure from the Shah, who billed himself as "a spokesman for the international community," the U.S. State Department today announced that it was recommending approval of a nuclear fuel export license to allow U.S. uranium to be shipped to Brazil. Also announced Nov. 17 by the Administration was progress toward a long-stalemated joint U.S.-Canadian export agreement that would result in ending the embargo of Canadian uranium supplies to the EEC and Japan.

The major remaining hitch in significant progress toward U.S. nuclear technology exports are the conditions relating to nuclear 'nonproliferation' which the Administration is apparently still demanding. The

Brazilians have already stated that they would reject any such condition, which involved U.S. control over actual nuclear processing in the receptor countries. The Shah has likewise made it clear that Iran will go elsewhere for its nuclear imports if the U.S. insists on imposing an antinuclear program on Iran.

## Senator Hits White House Sabotage Of Iran Deal

*Republican Senator James A. McClure of Idaho issued the following statement on Nov. 12:*

The Carter Administration antinuclear policy is directly responsible for the United States' loss of a \$5 billion contract to build four nuclear plants in Iran... President Carter's attacks on the breeder reactor and spent fuel reprocessing have been correctly interpreted by foreign governments, and as a result those governments will go elsewhere to purchase nuclear technologies...

The President's strong stand against nuclear develop-

ment will mean that the rest of the world will continue trading nuclear technologies amongst themselves, and the result will be that the United States will be left behind, and out... The President's dream of stopping nuclear proliferation will result in foreign countries moving ahead in the nuclear field to maintain some international control. This purchase of nuclear technology by Iran from another country spotlights the fact that other nations will continue to develop nuclear power regardless of America's policy.

...The loss of the Iranian contract would mean that 60,000 man years of potential American jobs were lost when the Iranian contract was awarded to West Germany.

## Shah To U.S: Find New Energy Sources Or Perish

*An interview with the Shah of Iran appeared in the Nov. 13 Chicago Tribune. Excerpts:*

What we have been advocating for several years is that you (the U.S.) have got to find new sources of energy — one, two, three, four, five, — as many as you can. Atomic energy we know, solar we almost know too... you're not looking for new sources of energy because maybe there is not enough incentive. What we say is if you want to find what remains of the world's hydrocarbons and then think of new sources of energy, your present civilization is going to die.

*(Responding to a question on the possibilities for American industries to invest and build in Iran, he said:)*

Oh, a lot, if they're only willing — petrochemicals, the automobile industry, agricultural machinery, electrical machinery, electronics, computers...

*Asked about the problem of a lack of skilled manpower, the Iranian leader said that U.S. industry could train Iranians and that Iran is currently enlarging its own training programs.*

## The Press On The Iran-U.S. Deal

*The Washington Post of Nov. 16 ran an article entitled "Shah Reportedly Pledges Neutrality on Oil Prices" that included the following on nuclear cooperation:*

Other sources said one subject that will definitely come up today (in the meeting between the Shah and President Carter —ed.) is that of a nuclear cooperative agreement. The two nations are close to signing such an agreement under which the United States could agree to provide

nuclear technology, including reactors, to Iran.

*On Nov. 17 the New York Times, in its Business and Financial Section, reported the Shah's offer as:*

The biggest plum of all, however, will be eight nuclear power reactors that Iran says it wants to buy from the United States at an estimated cost of anywhere from \$20 billion to \$35 billion. The deal must wait for a mutual agreement between the two governments, which has been held up by discussions over the new United States approach to supplying nuclear power generators and the need to restrict reprocessing capabilities. Westinghouse leads the competitors for these contracts, but Combustion Engineering and General Electrics have also held talks with Iran.

## Carter Hails Nuclear Fusion...?

President Jimmy Carter's Administration has attempted to slash funding for U.S. fusion research, has classified Soviet fusion advances to prevent their dissemination among the U.S. scientific community, and is now engaged in a battle with Congress over its attempts to cancel the Clinch River fission fast breeder test reactor—a project viewed as a necessary intermediate ment of fusion. Yet Carter surprised observers last month by sending a message to U.S. fusion scientists hailing the prospects of the nuclear fusion program.

The occasion for the little-publicized letter was the groundbreaking for the Princeton Tokamak fusion device, and the President's message for the occasion declared, "We must move ahead dramatically in fusion research during the next few years" and that "sustained cooperation among all nations in fusion research is more important than ever."

The story behind the letter, we have learned, is that pro-fusion and fission energy forces in the Administration, centered in the Energy Research and Development Administration and elsewhere in the Department of Energy, are preparing a major statement on future new energy sources in which fusion is expected to figure prominently. While still far from reversing the Administration's budgetary opposition to the necessary research for a truly effective fusion effort, their plan might be described at this point as an attempted "end run" past rabidly antifusion Energy Secretary Schlesinger (who pooh-poohed prospects for ever developing fusion energy in congressional testimony earlier this year), and gives a new dimension to recent Fabian complaints that a "palace coup" by prodevelopment DOE forces is in the making against Schlesinger. It was these same forces who were responsible for the President's unexpectedly encouraging letter to U.S. fusion scientists.

The full text of the President's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Washington

October 27, 1977

I extend my best wishes to all those attending the groundbreaking ceremony for the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor.

The initiation of this project is symbolic of our growing success in the development of fusion energy. It has the scientific objective of producing, for the first time in history, significant quantities of controlled thermonuclear energy.

Achievement of fusion power will have a profound effect on all nations. Our hopes for the future rest largely on the continued availability of energy. Fusion is the last energy source available and presents the highest challenge for this nation's capability to put science to work for the benefit of all mankind.

We must move ahead dramatically in fusion research

during the next few years to gain the insights we need to make wise choices among our few long-term energy options.

Fusion development is a national objective that will require the best of our academic, industrial and laboratory talent. It is also a world objective, and sustained cooperation among all nations in fusion research is more important than ever. In this respect, I also welcome the opportunity to congratulate our European friends—many of whom are present on this occasion—on agreeing this week to proceed with the Joint European Torus, a complementary facility to the Princeton test reactor. The United States looks forward to working in close partnership with other nations in an endeavor that is so crucial for all of us.

May the spirit of cooperation that is so much in evidence on this occasion characterize our on-going achievements in fusion energy development.



## Purge Of Energy Dep't Nuclear Advocates Stepped Up

Leading Senate environmentalists on that body's Energy Committee have delayed until next year the final confirmation vote on the nominations of nuclear energy advocates Robert D. Thorne and Lynn R. Coleman for top posts in the Department of Energy. Senate Energy Committee chairman Senator Henry Jackson (D-Wash) and Committee member Senator Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio) announced this decision on Nov. 15, and made it clear that the postponement was the first step toward killing the nominations.

Opposition to Thorne, who is nominated for the key position of Assistant Secretary for Energy Technology, centers on spurious charges that he biased the outcome of a California referendum on nuclear energy while directing the Energy Research and Development Administration's San Francisco office. Coleman, the nominee for the Department's general counsel, is now being scrutinized on similar "conflict of interest" charges stemming from his ties to John Connally's Houston-based law firm. The firm mainly represents the oil and gas industry and Connally has distinguished himself recently as the Republican Party's main proponent of industrial growth.

The environmentalists' campaign to purge the DOE of all nuclear energy advocates seems to have shifted to center on Energy Secretary James Schlesinger himself. On a certain level, the attacks on the energy czar are being orchestrated by his own allies who want to reprogram his image as "pronuclear energy." But the environmentalist crazies are also upset that Schlesinger — who frequently resorts to the "carrot" as well as the

"stick" appears to be yielding to pressure to downplay the "soft path option" in favor of gestures toward nuclear and other "hard" technologies. These far-gone environmentalists in organizations like Friends of the Earth and their congressional allies like Rep. Richard Ottinger (D-NY) would like to see "soft" technology advocate Amory Lovins sitting in Schlesinger's seat.

This environmentalist-led "dump-Schlesinger" sentiment was reflected in a rash of articles and statements this week led by Jack Anderson's Nov. 15 syndicated column which warned that a "growing number of voices on Capitol Hill are calling for the resignation of Energy Secretary James Schlesinger." Largely diversionary, Anderson's column limits this "palace revolt" to congressional liberals like Rep. Ottinger in order to both hide and dissuade growing conservative opposition to Schlesinger and his no-growth program. Simultaneously, the environmentalists see their "dump-Schlesinger" campaign as a tactic to "keep President Carter in line." The liberal community which prides itself on its antagonism to nuclear energy fears that Carter is deserting his own "hang tough" energy program in favor of a more growth-oriented and nuclear-centered program.

This latter tactic was apparent in a recently "leaked" Oct. 31 Memorandum to President Carter from the White House's own environmental hot-bed: the Council on Environmental Quality. In this memo (see below), Carter is warned that he will lose his "environmental constituency" if he doesn't immediately move toward "solar and soft path options" rather than nuclear energy.

— Carol Lerner