

4-22 — Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, by Henry W. Pierce, "Nuclear Energy's Full Push Urged"

A New York physicist yesterday called for full development of nuclear energy, including the controversial breeder reactor and the more glamorous but technologically uncertain, fusion reactor. "We have a beautiful spectrum ahead of us of ever more efficient nuclear processes," declared Morris Levitt, executive director of the Fusion Energy Foundation. Levitt, here to

announce an energy conference to held next Friday at the William Penn Hotel, said failure to develop nuclear energy and other forms of power represents "the first step toward deindustrialization of the United States..."

4-22 Pittsburgh Press, *Pro-Nuclear Group Hits Carter Plan*":

Dr. Morris Levitt, National Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, termed the Carter policy "the first step toward de-industrialization of the United States."

European Press:

U.S. Won't Accept An Energy Diet

West Germany

Die Welt, April 20, editorial by Heinz Heck "A Report on the Plague of the Nation":

... since 1973, the words "energy conservation" have been spreading throughout the world... except in the U.S., where the search for new energy resources was systematically blocked by an incorrect energy policy. Conservation can be used, pedagogically, to convince the critical environmentalists that the government's energy program is fine, so that they will agree to extending energy production. But otherwise, even with conservation, — you will not get zero growth. Whoever is demanding that it be implemented in this way either does not know anything or is lying...

Take that meeting of the SPD leftists in Erkenschwick. If they want what they voted for, then they should also tell the population what this means: more unemployment, fewer industrial jobs... There is no realistic alternative to nuclear energy.

... the Federal Republic of Germany, as an export-oriented, highly industrialized country, needs more energy... the Third World, especially those nations which are just at the threshold of industrialization, need abundant and cheap energy... conservative estimates say that the Third World alone will need 400,000 MW in the next twenty years... which can only be supplied by the industrial nations... otherwise, we can tell our highly skilled workers to go home.

I hope this is not what those leftists who met at Erkenschwick really want... but we will get the same bad results if we bow down to Carter's energy program. This will not be accepted by the U.S. and the reactions from the U.S. Congress and the BRD too in this connection will be very interesting..."

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, April 20, by New York correspondent Sabina Lietzmann:

The U.S. population really does not believe that there is a "real" energy crisis, they think it has been artificially created by the multinationals to raise prices... As an industrialist from Texas said: "America didn't come about as a nation by conservation, but by expansion"...

Henry Ford says: "I don't see any reason to build small cars for this country"... A representative of an oil company says: "It's not an energy crisis, it's a political crisis"... Another oil firm representative says: "The environmentalists are the main evil." Already, 20,000 letters have gone to the White House that reject Carter's energy policy.

Die Welt, April 20, by Kurt Leissler, Washington correspondent:

...The only way to get rid of dependency on oil is through fission... Europe wants it, Carter does not. Until something better is available, (solar and fusion energy are still far away), Europe needs fission too... Neither Europe nor Japan can drop plutonium, for then they would become more dependent on oil than they were before 1973. Carter should remember that this was what was behind the BRD government's rejection of transporting U.S. weapons to Israel in 1973... Viewed in terms of foreign policy and strategy, Carter has to ask himself if he can go on like this if he really wants the tripartite alliance between Europe, the United States and Japan. When two of these three still depend on resources whose transportation is endangered, this is a strategic question.

Die Welt, April 21, front page article by Heinz Heck, "The German economy is protecting itself against Carter's Atomic Reprimand. It is too late to reject the use of Nuclear Power":

The German nuclear industry has rejected Carter's nuclear energy policy. Yesterday, the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Industrial Association was established in Bonn...

Guenter Scheuten, chairman of the board of the German Society for the Reprocessing of Nuclear Fuel, said: "The USA can afford to reject uranium, but it is not possible for Europe and the Third World to do this, because of limited raw material supplies. There is no other solution if people do not want to be dependent on oil..."

State Secretary Schmid-Kuester from the Federal Research Ministry: "No sovereign state can be prevented from introducing nuclear energy. One cannot reject its peaceful use... We could not and we cannot

prevent its military use. The FRG will not reject sending technology to other nations, for otherwise this would mean a violation of Article 4 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which would mean the dissolution of the treaty..."

Kieler Nachrichten, April 22, by Washington correspondent Marlene Mathey "Carter is Hitting Up Against Tough Opposition":

There isn't the slightest chance that more than ten percent of Carter's program will be accepted by Congress... the opposition ranges far beyond Congress... people are laughing at the CIA study, recalling that the crude oil czars in Washington have been predicting for decades that the oil would dry up... Is Carter trying to produce an energy psychosis, and if so, then why?... Washington has recognized somewhat late in the last quarter of the twentieth century that a state's position of power depends more on its ability to mobilize energy and raw materials for itself than on always developing new missile systems. However, for some years, certain American publications have proposed that America occupy the Arab oil fields, and that this would get them out of the grip of the Soviets. Many observers in Washington precisely fear that the indication in the so-called CIA report which Carter made the basis of his energy conservation program — i.e., that the Soviets would need Middle East oil in a few years, — sprang from similar motivations.

Great Britain

The Financial Times, April 22:

Carter's proposals, it must be remembered, are only proposals. They will be widely unpopular and will be fought hard in Congress for that reason, let alone by the various business interests apt to be upset by them... For all that, the rest of the world has good reason for being grateful to him. The more his program is accepted and potential U.S. demand for imported oil brought down, the less daunting will be the prospect — for both supplies and price — facing other countries... The resumption of

Giscard Out On Limb For Carter

Following President Carter's April 18 televised speech representing the initial outlines of his energy program, French President Giscard's spokesman Jean-Philippe Lecat issued a statement endorsing the program: "It is of great importance for the French economy and the European economy for the United States to examine the problems of their own energy consumption. The French government has in fact been in contact with Washington on this problem."

Last weekend, Giscard declared a "National Day of the Tree" and announced that "France must take the lead of the world ecology movement."

enriched uranium supplies may lead the way to an agreed solution of the nuclear reaction question, while the U.S. example may now lead the European Community to work out an energy program of its own.

The Times, April 22:

Few statements that President Carter is likely to make during his term of office will have the fundamental importance of the energy program which he unveiled on Wednesday night... President Carter's comprehensive and radical approach to the whole problem must be generally welcomed... The central weakness of the Carter program, however, seems to lie on the side of production... Combined with the lack of clarity about where the sources of capital are to be found for the development of the alternative energy sources, this appears to be the major gap in what purports to be a comprehensive policy. It is virtually certain that the policy as a whole will fall short of its objectives unless that gap is filled.

The Economist, April 23:

President Carter's energy plan is weaker than it looks, and certain to be made still weaker in Congress. But it is America's first attempt to tackle politically-created problems with political weapons, and is welcome as such... Mr. Carter on energy is, as in his relations with Russia, saying and trying to do the right thing in his own quite dangerous way. He is extending his practice of treating economic issues in moralizing terms, his habit of restling his politics on the puritan streak in America. He is saying "Thou shalt not guzzle" and adding that offenders against this moral rule will have to pay... nothing now, you understand, but five cents some time maybe... To any non-American Mr. Carter's energy policy is rather feeble than its eschatological sales patter has implied. To Americans it proposes a revolution in thinking, if not immediately in the motor cars that Americans drive... He is meeting the political problems of energy head-on with political weapons — publicity, congressional arm-twisting, the authority of the presidency... He is right to want, however hesitantly, to discourage demand, and needs to do far more to encourage supply.

Italy

Corriere della Sera, April 20, front-page article by Ferrante Pierantoni, professor at the University of Bologna, and expert on nuclear power plants (Pierantoni directs himself to the Carter policy banning nuclear reprocessing plants and banning uranium sales to Europe, ostensibly because of the danger of nuclear terrorism):

The USA... has thousands of persons who in one way or another have learned to construct atomic devices and who today work disseminated in the most disparate sectors... It is easy, not to say inevitable that they would be contacted by countries intent on a short cut to owning an atomic arsenal... To construct atomic devices... with plutonium produced in electrical power plants... presents enormous difficulties due to the high radioactivity. Working with highly enriched uranium, the difficulties

one finds in production of atomic devices are such that they must be confronted by a group of skilled workers under the guidance of two or three specialists.

Already today, energy consumption per unit of national production is greatly inferior in France, Germany, Japan and Italy compared to the U.S., which has placed as its own objective the attainment in the year 2000 of consumption levels equal to the current Italian level.

Why doesn't the U.S. note well that Carter's proposal to

ban peaceful uses of plutonium sounds to European ears as a proposal to ban carbohydrates from their diet would to famished nations of the 4th world?

France

Le Matin de Paris, April 20:

The Carter plan for reducing energy and oil consumption in the U.S. will incite business men to reduce

Il Fiorino Asks:

Are Oil Multinationals Behind The Attempts To Stop Nuclear Progress?

The Rome financial newspaper Il Fiorino 4-19 reported on "The European Crusade of Dr. Steven Bardwell for Plasma Physics and Nuclear Fusion" in a prominent feature article, excerpted in translation below. Italia Nostra is the leading Naderite environmentalist organization in Italy; the self-styled Indians are left-fascist drugged youth who have been pitted in riots against the Communist Party and unions. Frascati, near Rome, is the site of Italy's major nuclear fission and fusion research projects.

...A young American scientist, Dr. Bardwell, came to visit our editorial offices... He is touring Europe to combat President Carter's theories tending to abruptly cut off the development of peaceful applications of the atom. Two weeks ago he was in Stockholm for a conference organized by the Fusion Energy Foundation where he spoke to about 30 industrialists and 40 researchers from the Royal Swedish Institute and to trade unionists...

The FEF in Stockholm is supported by Bo Lehnert, a physics professor engaged in polemics with his colleague Hannes Alfvén, the scientific advisor of ex-Premier Olof Palme who, in line with the more recent ecological fashions, upholds the development of solar energy...

Now Bardwell has set up relations with a group of young researchers at Frascati. In Frascati, too, in the past few years there has been a considerable struggle carried out by the researchers to be able to further their studies, against blocking tendencies which amount to nuclear self-castration. (The research) gets stopped at one point with the excuse of disarmament, at another point waving the banners of preserving the landscape and the ecology craze.

In the USA Dr. Bardwell and his friends support the small U.S. Labor Party, and they have relations with the Soviets and also some links to the Republicans which go as far as the extreme right of Barry Goldwater. Above all, they are in a fight with

the anti-development forces of Ralph Nader, Barry Commoner, Forrester, Meadow and the various Zero Growth groups etc. "These circles are fostered by the CIA" and they follow "the directives of the Trilateral Commission" inspired by the Rockefeller brothers, and even Carter with his energy line would express the line of the Trilateral Commission and not that of the Democratic Party.

They see everything in an extreme way as a conspiracy, a conspiracy which goes so far as to make President Carter, in addition to being an enemy of nuclear development, a sort of incendiary already disposed to unleash World War III to save the tottering banks of Manhattan from the disaster which threatens them... (In effect) Carter's policy is assuming gravely provocative points, above all in relation to Germany and France...

Even in Italy

Even in Italy, the ever-more organized and aggressive movement is causing the loss of precious and irreplaceable years to the country's nuclear progress, from the phony salon progressivism of Italia Nostra and the World Wildlife Fund to the provocations of the urban Indians, the exploitation of disinformation and collective hysteria appears in effect ever more massive and less genuine...

How much are we to believe researchers like Steve Bardwell, Jon Gilbertson and Moe Levitt, who go around denouncing as a well-articulated plot which is exploited by various rich foundations — Ford Foundation, Kaplan Foundation, and Rockefeller Brothers Fund — what might be only the spread of misoneism, the hatred of the new?... We are obviously not willing to swear on their revelations, just as we have never been convinced by the suicidal theories of zero growth, but the hypothesis that certain delaying battles might be fed by the oil multinationals themselves... and hence by the Manhattan banking establishment, of which the Rockefeller family is the major expression, must at least be reported from the standpoint of curiosity and journalism...

their investments, according to the Democratic Senator from Wisconsin, William Proxmire... This is also the opinion of Bill Brock, President of the Republican National Committee, who fears an increase in inflation without a relaunching of energy production... The obvious unpopularity of these measures, which will be accompanied by heavy taxes on consumption, will only make the debate which is beginning in Congress more tempestuous... So, following the suppression of credit for the development of the (nuclear) reactors of the future, American atomic scientists charge: "Under the fallacious pretext of preserving the independence of the United States and preventing nuclear proliferation, Carter is compromising any possibility for the industrial and economic development of the United States, Europe and the Third World." This is the declaration of Professor Bardwell, director of the American Fusion Energy Foundation. He deplors the elimination of investments for the development of fast breeder reactors, plutonium recycling and controlled thermonuclear fusion. And he affirms: "The only real motivation of the Carter plan is the necessity for the Wall Street banks and international financial institutions to direct each available dollar to finance the enormous debt burden of the developing countries, Europe, American industries at

the expense of all long term productive industrial investment." Professor Bardwell adds: "All the speeches about the will to conserve resources are aimed at forcing the acceptance of the policy of deindustrialization defended by the Trilateral Commission, creation of banker David Rockefeller, and of which 16 members sit in the Carter Cabinet.

Le Monde, April 20, editorial:

He (Carter) brandished the spectre of a "National catastrophe" as if the United States had lived until now in a dream — the ancestral dream of inexhaustible resources accorded by Providence to its chosen people... But the positions taken by Mr. Carter are based on studies accumulated for months by different groups of experts... which leave no other option for a responsible President but to come out for a policy, if not of austerity — the word is un-American — at least of serious adjustment... But we also have to think — it is too early to weigh them — of the international consequences of Mr. Carter's 'cure'... How will the U.S.'s oil suppliers take a brutal drop in order they are given? How will world exchanges develop if the American economy, more or less willingly, puts itself on an economic diet?