

The response to Carter's energy addresses

LaRouche: Carter offers to lead way to New Dark Age

"Lame duck" President Jimmy Carter finally appeared in front of TV cameras last night, to deliver what was supposed to be his much-postponed report on the Tokyo summit conference. In fact, he broke the agreements on nuclear energy he made at Tokyo. What he proposed instead was austerity modeled on that introduced to Germany by Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht. He proposed to lead the United States into a New Dark Age.

Carter presented himself as a person dedicated to traditional American moral values. In fact, he proposed to wreck the industrial economy our predecessors spent more than two centuries creating and maintaining. He proposed to repudiate the deep dedication to technological progress and growth of opportunities for which our forefathers fought Britain in the American Revolution, and which values have been the principal feature of our nation's moral and economic achievements.

His energy program was outrightly fascist.

First, without vastly expanded development of nuclear energy, the United States economy will proceed to shrivel and then ultimately collapse. Without nuclear-energy development, a large portion of the three billion people of the developing sector are doomed—beginning right now—to the spread of famine and epidemic disease, as well as the spread of bloody forms of social disruption creating hideous chaos and confusion to accelerate the breakdown of their economies.

It is false to argue that nuclear energy is either too costly or politically unfeasible. The Stanford Research Institute report is right in condemning Carter's coal programs as an unworkable farce, but is dead wrong on nuclear energy. Nuclear energy has become the cheapest source of increased energy supplies, and is the safest—provided existing security rules are efficiently enforced. Nuclear energy would be no political problem

either, if the campaign of lies about the Harrisburg incident were exposed for what it was and is.

Second, Carter's "alternative energy" programs are a cruel hoax. "Solar energy" is the most inefficient form of energy substitute proposed—except for the burning of "biomass." The apparatus required is monstrously costly for the energy delivered, astronomically costly by comparison with any existing conventional or nuclear technology.

True, coal can be used as part of a balanced energy package. Modern technologies should replace old in steel-making. Otherwise, apart from large-scale industrial uses, coal can be used efficiently with new technologies which the Carter administration has scrapped—so-called magnetohydrodynamic processing of coal. Coal can be converted to other forms of fuels. This can be done efficiently only through existing techniques involving high-temperature nuclear reactors.

What Carter proposes—a 50 percent conversion of coal from oil by 1990—would require using the methods the Nazis used in their Auschwitz coal-conversion installation. That method, which the Carter administration is moving to copy directly, is monstrously uneconomical. It would require the herding of large portions of an increasing number of unemployed into virtual slave labor in coal-conversion programs.

In blaming OPEC for the present crisis, Carter lied. There is, admittedly, a rise in the price of oil from OPEC. There is no oil shortage. The present oil price crisis is orchestrated by the Carter and British Thatcher governments, acting in collusion with the seven major oil multinationals. As far as OPEC itself is concerned, the problems there are a direct result of the U.S. State Department's action in putting Khomeini into power in Iran, combined with the Camp David agreements which world Zionist leader Nahum Goldmann has rightly proposed be junked.

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Presidential candidate,
Chairman U.S. Labor Party

GOP: we can lead the way to a dark age, too

President Carter's energy addresses prompted an immediate response from the many announced candidates for the Republican presidential nomination. The following selection gives a flavor of their "critical support," which fairly translates into a statement from the candidates that the GOP could do a better job at energy crisis management.

John Connally, "If I were President," New York Post, July 17: It should have been evident to any observer after the oil embargo in 1974 that this nation was vulnerable to the whims of OPEC. Yet since that time, Congress has done nothing to improve the situation. Indeed, our vulnerability is more acute today than it was in 1974....

While I fully support the all-out development of solar, geothermal and every other kind of potential or synthetic energy source, we will be dependent on oil and gas, coal and nuclear energy for the rest of this century whether we like it or not.

My top priority would be to seek congressional authority to relax environmental standards to permit the mining and burning of more coal in this country...

I would immediately deregulate all oil and gas to encourage every possible exploration for new hydrocarbon reserves in the country, to reverse the current trend of a 3.5 percent loss in production....

I would urge Congress to get rid of red tape and regulations which now make it impossible to build a nuclear power plant in less than 13 years when the rest of the world does it in 6.5 years...

We should renew research on the fast breeder reactor, focus on reprocessing of spent fuel, and strive to regain leadership in the field which we pioneered.

Nuclear power already supplies 16 percent of the country's energy and it is not realistic to hope that we can meet our needs without substantially more of it in the near future.

I would move to create a massive effort in the development of synthetic fuels.

It is imperative that we make gasoline out of coal, and make gas out of coal. It will require a staggering investment, but our natural resources are enormous, and every dollar spent on that development is a dollar that won't be sent overseas.

Finally, and of great significance, I would attempt to arrange an immediate meeting with the newly elected Prime Minister of Canada and the President of Mexico to explore the establishment of a North American Common Market for energy. The combined resources of our three nations, both natural and technological, are of awesome magnitude if developed in harmony on a fully equal basis...

Senator Howard Baker, National Association of Counties Convention, July 17: This is not the time to nickel-and-dime these (President Carter's) proposals to death. It is time, instead, to enact a bipartisan national energy program which the country can support, and which will get the job done. It is time we exercised the responsible political leadership the American people have a right to expect of us.... No one is now seeking perfection. Everyone recognizes that we have a real problem on our hands. I think it's time to give the president his turn at the bat. I am willing to work with the president if he would let me ... on a bipartisan coalition to work on solutions to the nation's energy crisis.

Ronald Reagan, from his headquarters, July 16: President Carter identified the problems clearly, but spoke as if he and his administration had not been at the center of them for the past two-and-a-half years. He talked in his speech about freedom, but his proposals seem to lead away from freedom.... They are based on massive new taxes and government programs. He proposes setting up a new superagency to cut away the red tape produced by another superagency he created, the Department of Energy.... We can all agree that synthetic fuels can play an important role in a U.S. energy program, but these proposals are coming from the same government that has not been able to supply gasoline. ... We need tax credits and incentives to encourage industry to invest in new energy sources.... We need a creative use of our coal resources, and intelligent use of nuclear power....

George Bush, from his headquarters to NSIPS, July 18: President Carter's speech was a proper attempt to arouse the American people to focus on the energy crisis. There were components of the president's program which I not only support, but which I have already called for. The success or failure of the program will depend on Carter's ability to constrain the special interests of the Congress and his own party. Among the specific proposals made by Carter, I support his call for conversion from oil to coal, a massive synfuels program, and the Energy Mobilization Board. I also believe that the windfall profits tax should be passed to Congress with a "plowback" provision to the energy

industry to encourage new exploration. I wish the president had placed a stronger emphasis on the need to expand nuclear energy in the event the commission investigation of the Three Mile Island makes that feasible....

George Bush, Washington Post, July 18: If there is a lack of confidence in government, it is the fault of Mr. Carter's policies, not the men and women entrusted to carry them out.

Simon says: Carter's cracked

Former Treasury Secretary William Simon termed President Carter's energy speeches "frightening" and his request for sweeping Cabinet and staff resignations "evidence of mental instability" in an interview made available to Executive Intelligence Review. Simon should know. Now based at the New York investment firm, Blyth Eastman Dillon, and reportedly nurturing presidential ambitions of his own, Simon is often described by those in a position to know as "flakey" if not downright "fanatical." Excerpts of the interview follow:

Q: How would you characterize President Carter's speeches of this past week?

A: In one word—frightening. The president is proposing a massive government response to a problem that was created by the government. The reason for the current energy crisis is simply due to excessive government regulation. If we didn't have price controls and regulation, then the industry would be producing plenty of energy. Look, we've got half of the free world's coal resources, at least 2,000 years of natural gas, and 100,000 billion barrels of oil in the Outer Continental Shelf. Yet we can't develop these sources because of government interference.

Q: Don't you think that the kind of effort involved in synthetic fuels development requires some kind of government funding?

A: No. The private sector can do it if the government lets them, especially since the rise in the world price of oil will soon make synthetic fuel production economically viable.

Q: What do you make of Carter's move to get his Cabinet to resign?

A: Nothing would surprise me about the president at this point. He's showing all the signs of a very unstable president.

Q: If that's the case, do you think that some of the Cabinet members may choose not to stay on if their resignations are not accepted?

A: Look at it this way: It's hard enough to get competent people to take jobs in government; to get some-

one able to take a job with a president who's so obviously unstable, well....

Q: I've heard rumors that the president may try to forge a kind of government of national unity, bring in Republicans, that sort of thing. Al Haig's name has been mentioned as someone Carter may have to turn to. Do you think that's possible?

A: No, I don't, though I must say it would be great if Haig were brought into the administration.

Q: Do you think Carter might be forced to resign if this mental instability you talk about keeps up?

A: No, I think we'll have to suffer through the next months....

AFL-CIO hails 'sacrifice'

The AFL-CIO issued a press release the day after President Carter's energy address which we reprint below.

AFL-CIO President George Meany today made the following comment on President Carter's energy message Sunday night:

In his speech, the president accurately stated the depth of the energy crisis confronting the nation and properly pointed out that failure to deal with this crisis had shaken the confidence of the American people in their government and its leaders. We agree with the president's somber description of the problem and the need for action.

He sounded a call for all Americans to rally in the spirit of sacrifice to convincingly assert the nation's independence in energy and, thus, free its economic system from domination by foreign cartels, which threatens the nation's political as well as economic stability.

The president's six-point energy program is good, long overdue and warrants the support of the American people. If his program is forcefully executed, America will be on the road to energy independence, free from coercive pressures.

Obviously, the twin economic evils of inflation and unemployment, which are greatly affected by both the supply and price of energy—likewise require the same resolve and commitment the president has displayed on energy. Eliminating these problems will also necessitate clear goals and specific programs.

The president's speech was forceful; the goals it set are both necessary and attainable. We can assure the president that American workers will do their part as they have always done when the nation was in trouble. They will accept their fair share of the sacrifice that must be forthcoming from everyone.

We have long been urging action of the type the president is now spelling out, and we will strongly support the thrust of his program.

What the international press is saying

From the U.S. press

Over the course of the week, the U.S. press editorialized pro and con on President Carter's series of energy addresses and his demand for Cabinet and staff resignations. The following is a selection.

The Arizona Republic, editorial, July 16: The specific proposals he made in last night's address were not encouraging. The nation did not tune in Carter to hear a sermon. It wanted answers. It didn't get them.

Tulsa Tribune, editorial, July 16: Jimmy Carter's much-anticipated Sunday night address to the nation revealed a harassed and tired man, beginning to show age, whose gestures were reminiscent of golfer Tom Watson selling tires that "grip the road."

Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, editorial, July 16: As we listened to his energy address, we had the feeling we were listening to a president. ... While delighted with the tenor of the president's address, we fear that some of the proposals may create more problems than they solve. ... Regardless of our quarrels with some specific of Carter's plan, however, he is to be congratulated for his aggressive and forthright attack on the energy issue.

Chicago Sun-Times, editorial, July 16: Sunday night Americans saw a more somber, yet stronger President Carter than they have seen before. Monday they saw a more determined and more specific Carter than they saw Sunday, as he filled in some blanks that had been left in his prime-time speech. On balance, we think Carter has faced up to the leadership and energy challenges that threaten the country. ...

Boston Globe, "Carter Approach is No Solution to the Energy Crisis" by Richard Goodwin, July 17: Although decontrol will not increase the supply of oil, it will help achieve another objective. It will raise the cost of energy. And this seems to be the administration's real goal—prices high enough to "discourage consumption." At the heart of the issue is a simple reality. There is no energy crisis. ... We may have become somewhat sloppy in our use of energy, and that should be ended. But most of the energy we consume contributes to that marvelous diversity of goods and human possibilities which we call "the American standard of living." And the phrase "cutting back consumption" is only a contrivance designed to impart a noble, almost patriotic,

ring to the demand that we deliberately accept a reduction in a standard of living achieved over two centuries of national effort. And that is only a beginning.

The New York Times, editorial, July 17: Once again, President Carter has defined the problem, boldly and correctly. Once again he proposes a "war" to rescue the country from a crippling dependence. ...

So what does the president prescribe? A collection of measures that, at best, will keep the crisis from getting worse in the next five years and relieve it some thereafter. ...

If there is such an urgent danger to the nation's security and economy, then why does the president not propose a clear and present antidote? Why does he not capitalize on the people's willingness to follow his lead? If he is right about the peril and the opportunity, then he must be judged timid in his response ...

Joseph Kraft, OpEd in the Washington Post and the Baltimore Sun, July 19: Before delivering his energy messages, Jimmy Carter broadened the discussion to include what he called a "national malaise." He thereby raised a question crucial in judging the presidency: Is Mr. Carter part of the solution, or is he part of the problem. ...

...In many different ways, Mr. Carter sows discord and works against a return to national harmony. ...

Thus his nationally televised speech on Sunday was built around an unbridled assault on Washington. He followed that up by asking and getting the resignations of the Cabinet and the White House staff—a step that looks to outsiders at least like a government in a state of collapse. ...

Hobart Rowan, Op Ed in The Washington Post, July 19: From his sermon to the nation last Sunday night after his return from Camp David and his followup appearances in Kansas City and Detroit, we now have the full measure of President Carter's new energy proposals.

As rhetoric, and as a battle plan to restore his viability as a presidential candidate, the Carter plan has elements of brilliance. As a program to meet the nation's short-term and long-term energy requirements, it is a disappointment. ...

The New York Times, lead editorial, July 19: If it's theater that Jimmy Carter now means to give us, the first thing to do is appreciate the performance for what it is. ...

The script for this melodrama is literally adapted from the opinion polls. "Washington, D.C. has become an island." ... So our hero deserts the island, and his loyal servants there, and swims for dear life. There is nothing usual about this politics. In the annals of the presidency, it is one of the most original declarations of candidacy ever devised...

Having found much merit in the ideas and works of the Carter administration over the past 30 months, we are not quite sure what to make of Jimmy Carter's sudden assault upon it. ...

From the European press

Europe has traditionally viewed the U.S. as an "energy hog," a misconception which reflects many Europeans' severe underestimation of the role of high energy consumption in a high-technology economy. The idea of America's overconsumption of energy was prevalent in most European coverage of President Carter's energy program.

Les Echos, July 18: "... I think that it is first of all a plan of expansion for the American economy. It is not on energy savings, but on growth that Carter blares the trumpet to rally Americans. ... There are logically two ways of reducing energy dependency. The first one is to save energy, the second is to produce more energy. In Carter's speech the second by far takes precedence over the first ... But those unprecedented expenses in investments, whom will they benefit? ... We are very far from an austerity program! On the contrary it should represent for the American economy guaranteed prosperity for at least a decade. ... Nowhere in this speech is there any call to resignation [as we so often hear in France] to low growth and moderate ambitions.

Verdens Gang, Norwegian daily July 18: It is a balancing act without a safety net. Hamilton Jordan is the circus director ... The danger is that the newly awakened lion will fall flat.

Journal de Genève, Geneva, July 7: [The President] indeed announced relatively ambitious objectives—massive development of alternative energy, ceilings on oil imports, etc., but all these measures are long-term, 1990 or 2000. The man in the street has nothing to bite on right away. ... In fact, the only measure which undoubtedly would have given Americans the feeling that the energy war was truly engaged would, we believe, have been the immediate freeing of gasoline prices.

Frankfurter Allgemeine

July 17: Baron von Muenchhausen, according to his

own report, succeeded in escaping from a swamp by pulling himself out by his own hair. President Carter's energy program has something of the credibility of this tale. ...

In truth, however, his proposals move in the direction that in a world becoming more impoverished, America will become poorer, too. It is true one can say that a part of the money one sacrificed to the rising OPEC prices now can flow to jobs creation and to strategic economic growth.

The technological and financial development of the gigantic experiment, the exploitation of the Canadian Athabasca project, shows what the production of synthetic energy will demand from America in capital but also in time. Muenchhausen's trick cannot be imitated; rather the Carter policy means that the American budget would reflect more severe belt-tightening than anyone now estimates. Is the American President aware of this? One doubts it, for his claim that 20 percent of the energy can be won from the sun's rays, and his temporary silence on the unavoidable use of nuclear energy shows a lack of realism.

Also, the fact that his thoughts run to gasoline rationing rather than the possibility of unleashing America's own sources of energy by decontrolling the gasoline price raises the question whether the peanut farmer ever was a 100 percent entrepreneur.

The Guardian, London, July 17: If, to a European eye, the mood of last week was mostly hysterical rubbish, then the instant adoration of Monday morning was probably pretty unsubstantial too. ... Politicians may fairly claim a little time to think and assess. Mr. Carter did not depart on a holiday to a tropical island; he went away to think damned hard. ... Instead of delivering some string of instantly forgettable platitudes he has, after 10 days, produced a strategy. The real question is whether that strategy carries conviction.

... Whilst America still cruises down freeways in gas guzzlers, consuming gasoline at something near half the price the rest of the world pays, then a giant unreality infects the entire exercise. That is the key challenge being ducked. ... So America will "never" import more oil than it did in 1977. Well, that was a flush and a comfortable stockpiling year; add Alaska oil on full flow and the constraint ... is hardly rigorous. Did someone mention conservation? Mr. Carter did, but not with the air of a man who sees it as the central, immediate, painful way of jerking America to its senses.

... Does America yet understand the vicious progression of the last few years: that fast growth begets oil imports, that these imports beget shortages and price rises which in turn beget inflation and recession?

...