

'Allocating burdens, orchestrating sacrifice, eliminating constituencies'

GOVERNMENT

Under the heading How an Independent Can Govern, the Anderson-Lucey program bluntly states its view that the primary function of government is to force austerity on the population. The two major parties, they claim, are incapable of doing this because they are still subject to constituency pressure:

We believe that at this critical juncture, America needs an independent President, and we believe that such a President can work successfully with a Congress organized along party lines to govern this nation.

We now need an independent President, for two reasons:

The major parties have proved unequal to the task of formulating a realistic post-New Deal public philosophy. The Democratic Party is committed to extending the New Deal without providing the means to pay for it. The Republican Party has been captured by forces that offer a curious combination of consumption-oriented economics and pre-New Deal social policies. The Anderson-Lucey National Unity Campaign is based on a centrist philosophy that ties its program of social policies to those measures needed to rebuild the economic base upon which they can rest.

The traditional parties were reasonably effective mechanisms for distributing the dividends of economic growth. But during a period in which the central task of government is to allocate burdens and orchestrate sacrifice, these parties have proved incapable of making the necessary hard choices. We are prepared to tell the American people what we must do, and allocate the burdens in a manner sensitive to both economic efficiency and social equity. . . .

The Anderson National Unity Campaign . . . transcends the irrelevant quarrels between an old liberalism and an even older conservatism, and it offers effective, coordinate means to achieve goals that enjoy overwhelming public support.

We believe, further, that an independent President can be effective. We must, of course, acknowledge that the context within which presidents must act has become more complicated and restrictive during the past two decades. Sober observers have pointed to the decentralization of Congress, the fragmentation of political parties, the risk of single-issue constituencies, and the atomization of the electorate as major elements of this new situation. But we contend that in 1980 an independent Anderson administration can deal with it more effectively than can a major party administration.

We now have four reasons for this contention.

An Anderson victory—in the teeth of the enormous institutional bias against independents—would be a dramatic signal to Congress that the nation wants and expects action, based on the new consensus the campaign has articulated.

Unlike other post-war independent candidacies, the Anderson campaign represents neither a region nor a dissident fringe, but rather a coalition of the center—the traditional basis for governing the American polity.

In the absence of Congressional cohesion and party discipline, the President's effectiveness rests largely on his ability to persuade significant numbers of legislators that his proposals are sensible and fair. John Anderson and Patrick Lucey are superbly equipped to do this. . . .

Congress will work productively with any president who enjoyed the trust and confidence of the American people. A key determinant of this in modern politics is the President's ability to communicate with them, face-to-face and through the media. This ability does not depend upon the party application [sic] of the President, but upon the ability of the President to advocate and persuade. . . .

As President, an Anderson administration will strive to appoint talented individuals, without regard to party affiliation. They will be drawn from a broad range of backgrounds—government, business, labor, academia. Ideally, each will blend general intellectual or theoretical competence and practical experience—both in Washington and elsewhere.

A President must tell the truth to the American

people, even when it is unpalatable and unpopular. In current circumstances, only an individual prepared to be a one-term President, if necessary, can faithfully and conscientiously discharge his Constitutional responsibilities.

ENERGY

One of Anderson's major campaign themes has been the energy crisis. He has been praised by the New York Times for his "courageous" proposal that the United States add to its economic difficulties by imposing energy price hikes on itself. The Anderson-Lucey platform details the measures their administration would implement to effect sharp decreases in energy consumption, including: a 50-cent-a-gallon-tax on gasoline; a shift to coal consumption without necessary improvements in extraction methods; a phase-out of nuclear power; and a move to "soft" and very expensive technologies such as solar, biomass and wind power. The basic assumption of the Anderson-Lucey energy plank, that conservation and high-cost energy is the key to dealing with the energy crisis, shows the fraudulent nature of their call for a national "reindustrialization" effort, for cheap and abundant energy sources are the foundation of a real industrialization policy.

Conservation

The availability and cost of energy have been among the most important structural factors in the American economy during the decade of the 1970s. Our increased dependence upon overseas oil has been responsible for a massive capital outflow. . . . It is not an overstatement to say that our ability to rebuild America will depend in large part upon our ability to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

A healthy economy and a high standard of living for all citizens are not dependent on a given quantity of energy but on maximizing the services or benefits derived from consumption. . . .

To create an economic environment which enhances competition, energy supplies must be priced to reflect their real economic value. The incentive provided by correct energy pricing will hasten the transition away from scarce and expensive energy sources to economical renewable resources and more efficient ways of using finite supplies. Because these technologies have been at a competitive disadvantage in the past (due to price controls on oil and gas) they lack the capital investment needed to exploit their full potential. The Anderson energy program encourages economic investments in conservation technologies, new sources of oil and gas supplies, coal consumption technologies, and solar applications. . . .

While conservation is often thought of as simply

doing without, conservation policies included in this program emphasize increasing the energy efficiency of housing, transportation, and industrial equipment that is needed to sustain our economy. Since the goods and services required by society can be produced by using various combinations of energy, capital, and labor, a least-cost strategy can be followed by encouraging technologies which require less energy to supply the same level of services. Application of economic conservation technologies to improve energy productivity now costs less than developing new energy supplies and so reduces the total cost of providing energy services to consumers. . . .

Energy conservation deserves the highest priority in U.S. energy planning because it is the least expensive way to provide energy services for homes, transportation, and industry. Conservation must be viewed as an additional option for providing energy benefits in the same way oil, gas, coal, and other technologies do. The energy services provided by conservation have distinct advantages over those provided for conventional fuels: they are cleaner, they are safe, they do not rely on foreign sources, and most important, they are less costly. . . . Conservation can be the most important method of providing the energy benefits we need over the next decade. The problem is that investments of major proportions are needed in conservation. Several studies indicate that \$400 to \$500 billion in capital could be invested. . . . We need to shift capital into energy-efficient improvements, remove institutional barriers to such investments, and provide technical assistance and educational programs to motivate consumers to adopt energy-savings measures. To realize these goals we should:

Firmly support continued decontrol of domestic oil and gas prices. Letting prices rise is the most efficient way to exploit our conservation potential. When consumers face the full economic value of the energy they use (prices which reflect more expensive domestic production costs, the insecurity of import dependence, and environmental risks), they will respond by substituting conservation technology to provide the energy services required.

Urge further reform of utility pricing to better reflect the varying costs of providing electricity service, thereby giving accurate cost signals to consumers. . . .

Use local community action groups to educate consumers on energy conservation opportunities and their costs and benefits. Since effective conservation is the result of many individual decisions, we must establish information and technical assistance programs directed to the individual consumer. Community block grant programs should expand funding for home audits, direct retrofit assistance, promotion of "life cycle" costing and other measures to help consumers make

more economical choices and reduce their energy consumption. . . .

Substantially increase the federal tax on motor fuels and use the proceeds to lower payroll taxes and increase Social Security benefits. A 50 cent per gallon tax would achieve a reduction in gas consumption of as much as 700,000 barrels per day in the short-run. . . .

Synfuels

In addition to conservation, the Anderson-Lucey program proposes a series of measures for reducing oil imports, including heavy government investment in synthetic fuels, solar power and other "soft" energy technologies, petroleum stockpiling, and the exploitation—for export—of U.S. coal reserves. Specific proposals include:

- Continue federal support for research and development programs on enhanced oil recovery from existing reserves, production from oil shale, tar sands, and heavy oil deposits. . . .

- Diversify the sources of foreign [oil] supply by establishing a supply development function—an Agency for International Energy Development—within the International Energy Agency, by providing additional financial assistance to existing World Bank and Agency for International Development programs, and by increasing technical assistance to developing countries that are not currently net oil exporters.

- Continue start-up funding for projects to develop synthetic gas and oil supplies using coal feedstocks. . . .

- Complete and fill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. At least 1 billion barrels should be in storage in order to provide significant protection from possible supply disruptions. A regional reserve for the Northeast, an area particularly dependent on imported oil, should be constructed. . . .

- Prepare several stand-by emergency conservation plans to promote fuel switching, electric power transfers, and reduced gasoline consumption in the event of an oil embargo.

- Revise the present emergency rationing plan to reduce the length of time needed to put it into operation. A plan that takes longer than three months to be implemented has limited usefulness.

- Continue the phasing out of price controls on oil and gas under the schedules provided in current legislation. The Windfall Profits Tax is necessary to meet national standards of equity. . . .

Coal

This nation has the resources for coal to assume a much larger share of our energy supply mix. . . . Coal can also serve to improve substantially our balance of payments through exports to other industrialized countries. . . .

To improve the competitiveness of coal while limit-

ing adverse environmental impacts, we should:

- Expedite the conversion of oil-fired electric power plants to coal beginning with the 80 plants targeted in the Senate oil blackout bill. . . .

- Encourage industrial use of coal by offering tax incentives to firms that convert from oil. . . .

- Facilitate the movement of coal to domestic markets by reducing railroad regulation while providing protection for "captive" coal shippers. . . .

- Propose the establishment of a Coal Export Authority to review the need for expanded port facilities to accommodate coal for export. . . .

- Resume the leasing of federal land for coal production. . . .

Nuclear Power

Next to conservation, the Anderson program is most blatant in its commitment to insupportably high energy prices in its treatment of nuclear power. Although Anderson has been castigated by environmentalists for being pronuclear, he is in fact an advocate of the strategy for killing nuclear power by drowning it in a sea of regulations:

Escalating problems with the cost and safety of nuclear power have raised serious questions regarding its role in America's energy future. . . . If the safety and nuclear waste questions cannot be satisfactorily resolved, we must halt the further expansion of nuclear power and phase out existing plants. . . .

The Kemeny and Rogovin reports found major deficiencies in the management and practices of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the industry itself. . . . Prudence requires that we respond fully to their recommendations. . . .

We propose a moratorium on new construction permits, beyond those now being built, until work has commenced on a permanent geologic disposal site. We have postponed the nuclear waste question for too long. . . .

Our commitment to nuclear power must be no greater than our commitment to the safety of nuclear reactors and the safe disposal of nuclear wastes. For twenty years now we have allowed our thirst for a cheap and reliable source of energy to outstrip the safeguards that should have accompanied the development of nuclear power. . . .

"Soft" energies

In the meantime, we must begin in earnest to reduce our demand for electricity through conservation and enhanced energy efficiency, and to speed the development of renewable energy sources, and other alternatives to nuclear power. . . .

Harnessing the sun's energy in active and passive solar applications should be one of our most important

energy sources. . . . The federal government should undertake a much larger effort to promote research and development, improve consumer confidence in solar technologies, remove institutional barriers, and make a substantial commitment in solar energy for its own use. [We should] attain the goal of meeting 20 percent of our energy needs from renewable resources by the year 2000. . . .

There are several technologies, including wind and biomass energy systems, which require no major technical breakthroughs for their introduction. In the longer run, large quantities of energy from ocean power, geothermal resources, and nuclear fusion may be forthcoming, providing technical and economic hurdles can be overcome.

While greater reliance on these alternatives will occur eventually, critical decisions should be made now to speed the timing and reduce the costs of this transition. . . .

FOREIGN POLICY

The Anderson program demands "human rights" in the Soviet bloc, calls for Europe to shoulder a greater share of the allied defense burden; encourages provocative Israeli actions, and approves an enhanced role for the International Monetary Fund.

Europe: We must recognize that the Alliance must be a union of equal partners. . . . Each must be prepared to share fairly in the burdens of our joint endeavors, and to justify these sacrifices to its own people.

Soviet Union: We must attend the second Helsinki review conference in Madrid, and we must insist upon a complete assessment of the degree to which the Soviet Union and the Eastern European nations have complied with the Helsinki Accords.

Middle East: An Anderson administration will not label Israeli settlements as "illegal" and as "obstacles to peace". . . . At the conclusion of the peacemaking process, the Anderson Administration will recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and move the U.S. embassy there.

International Economy: We pledge: . . . the full use of facilities provided by the International Monetary Fund and the OECD; continued efforts to enhance the effectiveness of IMF exchange rate surveillance; . . . further refinement and extension of the Special Drawing Rights, rather than reverting to an anachronistic and rigid gold standard. ■

Abscam's purge of U.S. leadership

by Vin Berg

At the end of August, Congressman Michael "Ozzie" Myers was convicted on Federal "corruption" charges in a Brooklyn court.

In the same trial, Camden, N.J. Mayor Angelo Errichetti, also a state legislator, was convicted of "bribe-taking."

On Sept. 5, opening statements were made in a corruption case against Congressman John W. Jenrette of South Carolina, accused of receiving a \$10,000 "bribe" from an FBI undercover operative.

On Sept. 8, the trial of Texas House speaker Billy Clayton commenced in Houston, and a Federal Appeals Court virtually destroyed his defense by suppressing testimonial evidence from an indicted labor leader that would reportedly have proven Clayton innocent of taking a "bribe" in the name of a campaign contribution.

On Sept. 15, Philadelphia City Council President George X. Schwartz and Councilman Harry P. Jannotti were convicted of accepting a pay-off, despite the judge's statement that nothing had been clearly proven.

The list goes on. Week by week, important and influential leaders at every level of the American political system are being removed from positions of influence. Week by week, political leaders, labor leaders and business leaders responsible for the welfare of tens of thousands of Americans are being tried and convicted, in the courts or in the press. Week by week, constituency-based political machines throughout the United States, in the middle of the worst economic and social conditions they have ever faced, suddenly find themselves leaderless, or with a leadership compromised by accusations or pending "corruption trials."

In the press, it is called "Abscam" or "Brilab," or more generally, "the battle against white-collar crime," in which attorney general Benjamin Civiletti's Abscam/Brilab "sting" operations are only the latest. What it adds up to is the largest *political purge* in the history of any nation in recent times.

Prior to 1975-76, "white-collar crime" convictions were at most a few hundred a year. Since the Carter administration has come into office, it has averaged