

rejection front, openly threatening the obstructionist steel companies in particular. If anybody can crack U.S. Steel and the BCOA, Strauss can, said one aide to a coal state Senator. "They'll break by weekend — regardless of how rotten they are..."

Strauss is being backed in his pressure campaign against the rejection front by key coal state Governors Jay Rockefeller of West Virginia, Julian Carroll of Kentucky, and Milton Shapp of Pennsylvania. The three went to the White House late in the week to assure the President that they stood behind a negotiated settlement based on the P-M accord and felt that the coal operators were "acting against the interests of the country."

Media "Policy Shapers"

It is the media — especially the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* — who have given credibility to these sabotage operations and who according to several reports, are "wearing the President down." "I hate to say this," said one Capitol Hill staffer this week. "But Carter could make a tragic mistake in the coal strike because he reads the goddamn papers..." The press, he stated, has been playing up every Schlesinger leak about the collapse of negotiations, giving the President the impression that "He must assert his leadership through some bold gesture.... There is this sense created that there is a steamroller out there calling for Taft-Hartley or something like that and that Carter can either ride it or wind up under it..."

The problem with Carter, said an aide to a coal state Governor, "is that he has been trained to listen to public opinion.... That's dangerous, especially when the public is being misinformed by the media. If he is going to nationalize anything he should nationalize the *Washington Post* and shut it down.... If Carter can just keep clear of Schlesinger until this weekend we can have a negotiated settlement.... it's that close."

—L. Wolfe

Schlesinger Is Responsible For The Coal Crisis

Secretary of Energy James Schlesinger is personally responsible for continuing the sabotage of energy supplies due to the national strike of the United Mine Workers. He has been instrumental in planning the crisis, has interfered with state and regional efforts to mitigate the effects of coal shortages, and has and is undermining the efforts of President Carter and honest state officials to settle the strike through negotiations.

Schlesinger's role in the coal crisis requires an immediate congressional investigation. The points of evidence provided below strongly suggest that Schlesinger violated the law — and the U.S. Constitution — in his actions around the coal crisis.

Charge: Planning the Coal Crisis

* Schlesinger has been given sole responsibility for federal policy in dealing with energy crises. The September 1977 document of the Department of Energy's Winter Energy Emergency Plan (WEEP) task force provides

absolutely no alternative but confrontation to deal with a "severe crisis" due to a coal strike. Coal allocation or other measures are not included in WEEP.

* According to WEEP: "Implementation of coal allocation by the federal government could exacerbate labor-management relations and hinder negotiations to end the work stoppage. In the event that a prolonged strike should seriously diminish stockpiles and threaten vital services, a back-to-work order under Taft-Hartley would probably be more appropriate than allocation."

* It has been stated by federal and state government officials, including the Department of Labor, that Taft-Hartley, at best, would do nothing, but, if federal troops were used to try to enforce it, bloodshed and violence could result.

Charge: Undermining Presidential Initiatives

* On the ABC-TV program *Issues and Answers* on Jan. 29, Schlesinger responded to questions about federal intervention into the coal strike by saying that "Taft-Hartley had not been addressed yet." This put the President in the position of having to call a press conference the following day to reassure the industry and union that this was *not* under active consideration.

* On Jan. 31, the Department of Energy ordered cut-backs to the nation's three uranium enrichment plants, indicating that WEEP was in Phase 3, though the activation of WEEP was being categorically denied by Energy Department officials. In early February, the department admitted privately that WEEP would be their plan for intervention, outlining nothing but Taft-Hartley.

* On Saturday, Feb. 11, President Carter announced that he was instructing the Energy Department to draw up federal guidelines for coal allocation. State officials had made clear their plans for large-scale industrial shutdowns by mid-February if there was no settlement in the strike. The Economic Regulatory Administration, under David Bardin, began drawing up the guidelines.

* At this time, the Energy Department has yet to complete the guidelines that the President requested. The department is insisting that coal cannot be allocated until *after* Taft-Hartley is invoked. This is in direct conflict to the President's instructions.

* On Feb. 13, Assistant Energy Secretary John O'Leary stated to the press that the problems in coal allocation "are overwhelming" even within states. This would only lead to violence and tension, he intoned. The federal government could do virtually nothing to help mitigate the increasingly serious effects of the strike. Ignoring such predictions, the governors of the states of Ohio and Indiana began to ensure the safe movement of coal the same week.

* On Feb. 14, Energy Department officials, who refused to be identified, insisted that neither of the President's requested actions of moving coal or power sharing would have any likely effect. The department put out the statement that there would not be sufficient transport capability to move the coal, and that violence could not be avoided. On the same day, Governor Bowen of Indiana began the movement of coal without incident.

* Since the President brought the negotiations into the White House last week, Schlesinger has not offered public support for the Executive's initiatives.

Charge: Sabotaging Regional Efforts

* In October 1977, Ohio, West Virginia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and other midwestern states began preparations for monitoring supplies and moving stockpiles. Various state officials complained at that time that federal guidelines were imprecise and understated the potential crisis.

* On Feb. 1, David Bardin held a meeting at the Energy Department with 100 representatives of government and industry from 12 midwestern states. The Ohio delegation, facing serious power shortages and possible industrial shutdowns, charged that the federal government had failed to act to end the strike. They complained that federal coal stockpile figures were misleading since they did not take serious local and regional situations into consideration.

* On Feb. 13, the Energy Department sent "technical experts" to Canton, Ohio and the East Central Area Reliability (ECAR) headquarters to "help" manage the crisis. According to responsible experts, the department's people have been making "asinine suggestions,"

"insulting people's intelligence," and making it more difficult for the specialists to do their work.

* Similarly, representatives in West Virginia Governor Jay Rockefeller's office have indicated that the 10 percent statewide power cut made early in February was based on information supplied by the Energy Department which was found to be incorrect upon independent analysis. The cutback was then rolled back to only be in effect in a small area of the state.

* On Feb. 15, a meeting of the federal-state task force was held in Cleveland, Ohio and led by Energy Under Secretary of Institutional and Governmental Affairs Sam Hughes. Since the task force was not to meet again for two weeks, and from the experience the state agencies had had with the department up till then, there was little expectation of any significant results. Governor Bowen's office expressed fear that the department might try to force states to take "hasty actions" which could be destructive.

—Marsha Freeman

Fight For Control Of White House

"President Carter has come to one of those forks in the road where he may have to choose which way he will go," said James Reston in his *New York Times* column Feb. 24. "Sometimes, as Robert Frost says, the choice between the road not taken and the road taken makes all the difference." Reston's recommendations? Carter should end the coal strike by imposition of the Taft-Hartley Act and enact a hard-line U.S. foreign policy for the Middle East and Africa.

Other options to the dilemmas Carter now faces, were posed by a Washington insider. "The Administration has to make big decisions soon," he declared. "The key is trade and development policy. That issue affects East-West relations, the fate of the dollar, the question of nuclear power."

That President Carter is indeed at a critical point in his presidency is not at question. Faced with the two key issues that will determine the fate of the U.S. economy—the collapse of the dollar and deteriorating relations with the Soviet Union over the Middle East, Africa, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, Carter's actions will decide the direction the Administration will take. There are two policy-making groups in a position to influence the Administration, one being those around Office of Management and Budget Director McIntyre, Special Trade Negotiator Strauss, Presidential Assistant Hamilton Jordan, Attorney General Griffin Bell who are committed in varying degrees to a policy of technological development, industrial expansion, energy growth—including development of nuclear power. Although this group lacks strong programmatic direction, they understand that a firm commitment to a policy of economic growth is fundamental, not just for a sound U.S. economy but for a stable world peace as well.

Their initiatives have so far been stymied by Energy Secretary James Schlesinger, Treasury Secretary

Blumenthal, and National Security Council chief Zbigniew Brzezinski who, working closely with Henry Kissinger, are determined to steer the Administration into a strong anti-Soviet Cold War posture, coupled with a military build-up and austerity.

The Coal Strike

The immediate focus of the battle for control of the White House is the coal strike. How the strike is settled and when will reflect who has a significant margin in controlling economic policy. James Schlesinger is determined to escalate the economic dislocation caused by the strike in order to begin use of the emergency powers of the Executive for allocating energy supplies and shutting down industries. He and his press collaborators such as James Reston, have been urging invocation of the Taft-Hartley and other crisis-management measures. Taft-Hartley is recognized by all knowledgeable people as useless in the present situation, as the coal miners have previously disobeyed the law. "Any one who promotes Taft-Hartley either wants to sabotage an agreement or is duped," one Capitol Hill source said. In effect, Schlesinger's proposals aim at keeping the strike going.

The *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* have daily attacked Carter in editorials and articles for being weak in the face of the coal strike. Reston's Feb. 24 column is exemplary: he warns Carter that if he fails to use the Taft-Hartley law, then "the confidence of the country in his leadership will obviously decline." When the Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Companies settled with the coal miners and the White House began using this settlement as the basis for ending the entire strike, the press then cautioned Carter against putting pressure on the other coal operators to accept. He would lose the support of the business community, they said. Senator