

businesses and consumers being projected to begin irreversibly by 1981 under present policy. All forms of energy production must be encouraged to develop, but with a clear emphasis on the primacy of nuclear power, especially with the level of commitment to broad-based research and development of nuclear fusion power, as delineated in the U.S. Labor Party's Fusion Energy Act of 1977, as the singular feasible comprehensive solution to the energy crisis. To be effective means tackling this incompetent Naderite drivel head on with educational initiatives on the sound engineering solutions protecting against conceivable accidents involving the fission process and on the feasibility of the near-term development of fusion, as experts such as Dr. Teller have recently acknowledged.

Natural Gas

Federal Power Commission regulations on the interstate flow of natural gas guarantee that California will face a severe shortage of this energy source very soon. While the U.S. Labor Party nationally will be challenging these regulations, all impediments to the proposed construction of a natural gas facility at the Port of Los Angeles must immediately be lifted to enable import of gas. The suspicious explosion of the tanker in the Los Angeles port that has spurred environmentalists to block the Liquefied Natural Gas facility must be further investigated for evidence of sabotage, given the extraordinary pattern of gas and oil-related spills, explosions, and disasters cohering with a Carter administration drive for increased regulation and reduction of

Author of NEPA: 'We Need to Have a Lot Fewer People'

The following interview with Professor Lynton K. Caldwell of Indiana University was provided to EIR by a New York law student. Caldwell was the author of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) in his role as a consultant to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He has a long history of involvement in "Public Administration" abroad, in particular in Thailand, Colombia, the Philippines, Turkey, Pakistan, and the Middle East.

Q: Where did the idea for NEPA come from?

A: There were a lot of people involved, but I really wrote the bill and the EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) section.

Q: Who were the early supporters of environmental concerns?

A: In the 1960s there weren't many people who foresaw the environmental movement. The Conservation Foundation was one group that did.

Q: Who provided the backing for them?

A: I think the Rockefeller family; perhaps also the Ford Foundation. I was at the University of Michigan in 1963, a lot of people there were helpful. Also a behavior sociologist named Abe Maslow was very important.

Q: Wasn't he associated with Kurt Lewin?

A: Oh, yes, I found Lewin's ideas most helpful in formulating my own ideas about ecological sociology.

Q: You indicated in an article that Congress didn't realize the implications of NEPA in terms of its disruptive effects on the economy...

A: Not many people did. There was a good deal of political dynamite in it. It would have been just a nice piece of rhetoric without the EIS, but that really blew off the lid. There were about 35 bills that

session on the environment, but they were all rhetoric. The Jackson Bill (NEPA) was the only one with any teeth in it. We set it up so the public could blow the whistle on the federal agencies.

Q: There wasn't much debate, was there?

A: It might have had a rougher time if people knew what was in it. In the Senate it was passed on the Consent Calendar; there was some debate in the House. I can't think of a more important piece of legislation that had less publicity.

Q: NEPA seems to have had quite an effect on the rate of growth.

A: Growth is an omnibus term. This country could do with a lot fewer people. In the long run, we need to have a lot fewer people. We should encourage a sub-zero rate of growth.

In fact, I agree with Paul Ehrlich when he says that we could do better with half the number of people in this country. I happen to agree with Ehrlich that 100 million people would be a lot better than 200 million.

This is the only answer to problems like poverty and the environment. This is just plain humanitarian realism.

Q: Would you accomplish this through reducing energy consumption?

A: It will be hard to do. We have only a limited capacity to reduce energy consumption.

Q: What about the underdeveloped countries? Isn't there a real conflict between environmental concerns and the need for economic development?

A: There's no real conflict. Many of the developing countries' problems are environmental problems. The developing countries are wildly overpopulated; this can't be remedied by technology or economic development. Things are just going to get worse; there will be severe social conflicts.