

labor-industry coalition.

This has been followed in recent weeks by participation and promises of participation by trade union leaders in a series of national energy policy forums sponsored by the Fusion Energy Foundation.

In this charged political environment, Kirkland's effort to establish a phony set of political priorities for the labor movement around the "right to organize" has met with little success. As one building trades leader told a spokesman for the U.S. Labor Party after last week's scuttling of the common situs legislation in Congress, "Common situs? Who cares about that. The real issue is energy."

#### *Kirkland and Carter Respond*

The potential for whole sections of the labor movement to bolt from under the Trilateral Commission's control around the energy question has prompted the Carter Administration and Kirkland to attempt a "counter-offensive."

Orders have gone out from Kirkland's office to member unions to stay away from the Labor Party and the FEF—or else. AFL-CIO contracted lawyers have advised labor leaders that "if you work with the Labor Party, you'll bring more trouble on yourselves." They have told leaders of the HIRE coalition to "back off from collaboration if you want to get nuclear power plants built."

Meanwhile, Kirkland has helped organize "discussion sessions" between representatives of the Carter Administration and union leaders to convince the wary union-

ists that Carter's program is not bad as it seems. Two weeks ago, the leadership of the mineworkers and other unions were brought to a meeting in West Virginia where they were addressed by Carter and energy czar James Schlesinger. They were told that the Carter program would have "something for everybody" and were promised increased coal projects, nuclear energy, solar power, and "more jobs through conservation programs." Less than a week later, the Ford Foundation released its energy report which contradicted much of what was promised.

Kirkland and Carter are ready and willing to use what "clubs" they have to get stubborn opposition to knuckle under." The current offensive against the Teamsters' leadership and the threat that it will expand into a far-reaching anti-rackets attack on other Carter enemies, as we exposed last week, has the short-term objective of bullying those forces opposed to the Carter-Schlesinger energy policy.

Trying to delay what in the end must come down to a policy confrontation, Kirkland and his allies have circulated the story that the union movement cannot comment on the Carter energy program until it is promulgated on April 20. By so doing he has in fact put his whole operation on a short fuse.

As one trade union leader told a USLP spokesman recently, "If what you say about Carter's program is true, there isn't one trade union leader in the country that can support it."

Except Lane Kirkland, that is.

## Regional Press Bucks Administration Energy Policy

While the national news media by and large continues to barrage Congress and the U.S. population with the myth that Jimmy Carter's "energy conservation" program enjoys widespread popular support, a few large circulation urban dailies are increasingly critical of the Administration's policy, and in many cases are calling for the expansion of energy resources, most notably nuclear power. A number of smaller regional papers have been equally outspoken.

This pro-growth press coverage serves as an accurate gauge of popular sentiments for elected officials. Moreover, it reflects regional institutional resistance to the Administration program.

The following is a brief summary of such coverage of energy policy in various regional press.

*The Seattle Times*, the daily serving the immediate locales of both the huge aerospace concern of Boeing and forest-product manufacturer Weyerhaeuser, demanded in an editorial March 21 that the "U.S. Must Keep Pace in the Technology Race." The editorial rapped Administration policy by stressing the absolute necessity of government funding to protect domestic R and D capacity. It concluded with a quote from Harry Truman: "We have come to know that our ability to survive and grow as a

nation depends to a very large degree upon our scientific progress."

Earlier in the month an article in Tacoma, Washington's main paper, the *News Tribune*, reported George Weyerhaeuser's declaration during a speech to local businessmen on the need to develop the port city, "And those who don't want to use more power or see more development — we'll be against them." In a follow-up, the same paper printed a letter to the editor from the USLP that stressed development of nuclear power, flanking it with two strongly anti-Carter editorials — one of which attacked the Administration's proposed cuts in the breeder and fusion programs.

In nearby Vancouver, British Columbia, the *Province* gave prominent coverage to Fusion Energy Foundation nuclear engineer, Jon Gilbertson's visit to the city. The article was accompanied by a report from a poll the *Province* had conducted among some of the major U.S. research laboratories, on fusion power. The report corroborated Gilbertson's work.

A continuing series of editorials in the Conservative Republican *St. Louis Globe Democrat* have explicitly opposed President Carter's undermining of the necessary development of fission and fusion. "Fusion power is the energy of the future. It is foolish and costly

to try and sit on it...." the editorial stated unequivocally. "It is projected that fusion power will supply the United States with nearly all of its electricity in the 21st century. It will, that is if President Carter doesn't stop it," the editorial concluded.

Another defense of nuclear power came from the key Arizona daily *Phoenix Gazette* which editorially pointed out, "Without nuclear generated electricity vast areas of the nation would have been devastated during the extreme cold spell this winter."

In Virginia, where the Nuclear Regulatory Commission objections have halted the plans for construction of a major nuclear generating facility and restricted port development plans, *Lynchburg News* interview with USLP gubernatorial candidate Alan Ogden was followed by an editorial urging "any program proposed by the

President would have to consider Ogden's proposal for fusion development."

Boston, the heart of the Northeast electronics industry covered a March 25 FEF conference there. Following several radio spots and a well-attended press conference an article in the *Herald-American* entitled "Expert Prods U.S. on Nuclear Development," appeared. Quoting FEF Executive Director Dr. Morris Levitt, the article said "Without a rigorous nuclear power industry you won't develop the manpower or technology needed for fusion."

Upstate New York conservative and industrial interests have joined their counterparts elsewhere in opposing Administration policy. The Gannet chain's Rochester *Democrat and Chronicle* carried an editorial by New York State Senator McFarland stating, "Equating the word 'nuclear' with 'bomb' is like thinking 'chair' everytime you hear the world 'electric'."

## Rinaldo To Flowers: Save Fusion

*Representative Matthew Rinaldo (D-NJ) is circulating the following letter in Congress to Rep. Flowers (D-Ala), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Nuclear and Fossil Fuels of the House Science and Technology Committee. So far Rinaldo has secured 13 co-signers.*

Dear Mr. Chairman,

As Chairman of the Subcommittee having jurisdiction over federal funding of fusion power research, you play a special role in determining the thrust and pace of fusion power development. We therefore urge you to support an increase in fusion power funding levels over the amount which the President has recommended.

If President Carter's budget recommendations are allowed to stand, fusion power research funding will fall \$80 million below the levels recommended by President Ford. This would be a cut in funding of nearly 25 percent.

Furthermore, the \$80 million cut—\$60 million from magnetic fusion programs, \$20 million from laser fusion programs — is focussed upon construction expenditures. The practical impact of this cut will be a serious delay in the development of pilot fusion power plants, some of which are already under construction.

Ironically, this massive budget cut has been recommended at a time when the prospects for fusion power have never been more promising. For the first time, scientists at Los Alamos have initiated a controlled fusion reaction with the use of a comparatively inexpensive carbon dioxide laser.

According to the *Washington Post*, "A laboratory spokesman called the achievement a breakthrough in

fusion research that could cut 10 to 20 years from the time needed to develop a fusion reactor." According to the *San Diego Evening Tribune*, "Dr. Peter L. Auer of Cornell University told an American Association for the Advancement of Science audience that recent advances indicate a practical demonstration of fusion power could come within about 5 years. Dr. Edward A. Frieman, assistant director of Princeton University's Plasma Physics Lab, agreed."

Now is the time to maintain a strong federal commitment to fusion power development. It is not the time to reduce that commitment.

We urge you to bear in mind the tremendous benefits of fusion power if this energy source can be tamed.

First, the energy yield from fusion power plants could put all other centralized power sources to shame; according to one estimate, a single large fusion power plant could generate electricity for the entire Atlantic Seaboard.

Secondly, the fuel utilized by fusion power plants would be abundant: deuterium, a form of hydrogen derived from common seawater.

Third, the commercial advantages accruing to the first nation to develop fusion power plants could be enormous.

Fourth, fusion power plants would generate no radioactive wastes and would therefore represent an immense improvement over nuclear power plants from an environmental standpoint.

In light of the many considerations that we have mentioned we hope that you will strongly support an upward revision of the President's budget recommendations for fusion power research.