

no convincing evidence that he is Brzezinski's man. But neither has Carter developed a system for saving himself from the mistakes to which he and Brzezinski are both prone. The safety man on foreign policy in the Carter administration is whoever happens to come along.

Usually the task devolves on Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. He, for instance, saw the confusion building in Sino-Soviet relations and prompted the president's speech on the subject at the Annapolis commencement. But though Vance usually wins on the showdowns, he is loath to challenge Brzezinski, an old friend. Even when he does win, he does not control the final outcome — witness the Annapolis speech, which ended up as a muddle requiring further explanation to determine where the president really stands.

Black Caucus: "No Diversion From The Development Issue"

The Congressional Black Caucus issued this statement on the Administration's foreign policy on June 6:

(Our concern is over the Carter Administration's attempt) to reintroduce an East-West confrontation over the invasion of the Shaba Province of Zaire despite an initial commitment to end a Cold War-oriented policy on the African continent. We hope that the Administration will not overreact in this particular instance, since knowledgeable observers of the region have long recognized the multitude of causes to which the Katangan rebels have lent their support as well as the diverse sources of assistance for their grievances.

It is our firm conviction that as long as local political solutions are not found conditions in that region will lend themselves to the intervention of outside forces. The crisis in Zaire should not permit the Administration to divert its attention from two issues of paramount importance to Africa — first, the search for a rapid and just solution to the problem of white minority rule in Zimbabwe, and Namibia and South Africa, and second, the quest for economic development and national integration.

National Energy Forum: Carter Energy Policy Is No Policy

With remarkably little mention in the media, scores of the world's leading energy experts, engineers, industry leaders, and political spokesmen from Democratic and Republican ranks met in Washington, D.C. on May 18 for the National Energy Forum of the World Energy Conference. The theme that was consistently struck throughout the proceedings was that the Carter Administration's current energy policy and related international nuclear nonproliferation policy were wrongheaded and disastrous.

and General Electric; leading European and Japanese energy policy spokesmen, scientists, energy consultants, and electric utility representatives, were represented.

The one surprising thing about the conference — besides the press blackout of it — was that the participants confined themselves to criticism of the Administration without outlining measures to get at the source of White House misperception: the handful of well-financed and well-placed no-growth advocates. For instance, every major labor group, corporation, or utility that opposes the present anti-growth policy is under some form of attack by this environmentalist clique, ranging from allegations of anti-trust violations, Securities and Exchange violations to environmentalist legal challenge. Despite these attacks, not one speaker at the conference openly addressed this problem.

ENERGY

The World Energy Conference, founded half a century ago as the World Power Conference, ought to be one of the most credible and authoritative bodies in the world on all aspects of energy. Among the participants at this meeting were:

Robert Georgine — President of the Building Trades union;

J.C. Turner — President of the Union of Operating Engineers;

Gerard C. Smith — U.S. Ambassador for Non-Proliferation Affairs;

John D. Dingell — Democratic Congressman from Michigan;

James McClure — Republican Senator from Idaho.

In addition, leading members of the nation's major oil and coal companies, including Texaco, Gulf, and Island Creek Coal Co.; the major nuclear construction firms, including Bechtel Power Corp., Combustion Engineering,

NEF Man: Nuclear Energy is Real Issue

The following is an interview with William O. Doub, a former commissioner of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and current chairman of the U.S. National Committee of the World Energy Conference.

Q: The Carter Administration's national energy policy has been assailed from various quarters as a no-growth tax policy, not an energy policy. What is your evaluation?

A: These are the non-issues — when we run out of oil and gas — these are not the real issues. We are not about to run out of energy. The real issue is how to maximize utilization of all energy sources, and nuclear energy must play a major part in that. Developing nations, with no indigenous energy resources, do not have the luxury to

sit back and debate these issues. They are turning more and more to nuclear energy sources.

Q: Why do you think the Carter Administration is pursuing such radical policy departures on the nuclear issue?

A: Carter is the only one of the last seven Presidents to make nuclear power a political issue; no President before Carter has made this a political issue....He is not providing the nation with leadership such as Eisenhower did with the "Atoms for Peace" policy. Under the Carter Administration, we are pulling back into a shell and the rest of the world is dumbfounded...and rightly so.

The problem is that Carter has institutionalized an antigrowth outlook in key policy making positions in his Administration.

Sen. McClure: Set Record Straight On National Energy Needs

In his May 18 keynote address to the National Energy Forum Sen. James McClure (R-Idaho) upbraided the Carter Administration's "no-growth" energy policy as "the equivalent of war." McClure's speech, excerpted below, is a strong defense of the need to approach national energy needs from the standpoint of the nation's historical commitment to technological advance. Despite his mislocation of the U.S. energy crisis as the result of "dependence on OPEC oil," McClure's remarks and his call last week to base U.S. Africa policy on a commitment to industrialize that continent offer a pointed lesson in "vote-getting" to those Republican leaders scrambling for "ethnic" votes.

The Congress and the President are today engaged in their own equivalent of war, the outcome of which will determine our Nation's energy policy for at least the next two years. And, this outcome will have a major impact on the energy policy decisions of our allies in Europe, the Middle East, Japan, and elsewhere

We realize that many of the opponents of nuclear energy genuinely believe that it is evil and must be stopped. But, we must not allow their fears to overshadow the facts regarding nuclear energy. Current nuclear technology represents a major hope that future generations may enjoy the standards of living available to all too few today. In addition, nuclear energy offers us assistance in increasing present day productivity, thereby improving the lives of people already living. We must not concede the moral issue to the opponents of nuclear energy.

The opponents of nuclear energy in the United States have finally found a powerful ally — the President. Before 1977, our nuclear programs had difficult problems and tense moments — such as during Senate floor votes on the Clinch River Breeder Reactor — but the Administration before 1977 provided the necessary continuing support for overcoming these difficulties. But, as of January, 1977, that has changed....

...with the advent of the Carter Administration, the

anti-nuclear movement finally discovered a winning combination: (1) stop the breeder program, using phony press releases concerning plutonium, (2) stop spent fuel reprocessing, while making vague threats about terrorists who somehow are immune to radiation, (3) create serious doubts as to the future availability of spent fuel storage facilities, and (4) cripple the opportunities for our domestic nuclear industry to survive through exports, using the threat of nuclear weapon proliferation while ignoring the reality that such prohibitions actually increase the threat of proliferation....

The proponents of nuclear energy have surrendered the moral issues involved. The opponents have wrapped themselves in the invisible Emperor's Cloak of righteousness and good

The battle lines have been clearly drawn by the Administration: Clinch River, Barnwell, nuclear exports, and spent fuel storage. There are those who support the nuclear program, but who still believe that you can negotiate with the opponents of nuclear energy, and that delusion must be stopped....

Clinch River and Barnwell (N.C.) are not, however, the real targets. The final solution to the nuclear energy problem is in their eyes the complete cessation of construction of new light water reactors (LWR), to be followed by the dismantling of the existing LWRs. The opponents of nuclear energy do not hide this goal. It is there for anyone who does not refuse to face reality. There is, for them, no compromise, short of total destruction of the nation's nuclear energy program....

These individuals (Amory Lovins, Ralph Nader — ed.) have one major advantage over the supporters of nuclear energy: They are embarked on a quasi-religious crusade to rid mankind of the horrors of the atom. This provides a strong moral position, which will easily override the factual arguments and logical presentations of a nuclear energy supporter *unless* he too believes that his position is morally correct. The supporter of nuclear energy must truly believe that nuclear energy is a moral necessity for mankind and that without it, future generations will sink ever deeper into poverty and, eventually dictatorship. Shortages of energy will result in shortages of jobs, housing, and food. And, shortages of necessities — even when caused by government action — always result in increased government controls. And, increased government controls will always lead to increased shortages. And the tragic culmination of such a chain of events is war, as those who are without seek to take from those who have!...

The advocates for a strong domestic energy policy, based on reduced dependence from OPEC oil production, are engaged in a crucial phase of our energy history. The issue is now that of a moral test of will. Our opponents know clearly where they stand. The National Council of Churches, for instance, has decided that plutonium should be excluded as a future energy source. They have made this decision based on their moral beliefs.

If you do not believe just as strongly that *exclusion* of plutonium as an energy source is immoral, then your arguments for breeder reactor development and commercialization of spent fuel reprocessing are lost at the onset