

used by the Carter Administration ... and those developed by the agency?

According to American Gas Association spokesmen, referring to a briefing they gave Schlesinger earlier this month, their officials came away "bitterly disappointed" that the Administration "chose to ignore virtually all the facts laid out to them... We basically cannot understand how Schlesinger failed to grasp what we told him at that time," said one association official.

Seattle Post Intelligencer, April 24.

Front page editorial, "In the Open At Last," by William Randolph Hearst.

Except for passing and casual treatment, the President neglected the subject of development of nuclear energy, which is of course anathema to some vocal environmentalists. Many leading physicists say, however, that electric power generated by the atom is one of our greatest potential energy sources. Why leave it out of our planning at this time?

The Republican Party At The Crossroads

Republican National Committee Chairman Bill Brock told the party's National Committee conference meeting in Chicago April 29 that most of the Carter program on energy was the antithesis of the Republican philosophy. "For reasons no one has ever fully explained," Brock said, Carter's advisors have assumed that world supplies of energy are quickly running out, an assumption so pessimistic that it is not widely shared. Some people like the sound of the words 'no-growth,' but most Americans can't afford the economic stagnation that could follow adoption of the Carter energy program. In short, there is much in the President's proposals that is diametrically opposed to Republican traditions and Republican philosophy."

Brock went on to promise that Congressional Republicans would "vehemently oppose" any new taxes on gasoline, oil or automobiles, in what the Carter Administration's house organ, the *New York Times*, characterized as "a broad partisan attack on President Carter's energy program."

During the week prior to Brock's speech, leading Republicans continued to assault the Carter program; particularly noteworthy was a speech by former Treasury Secretary William Simon, who warned that the Carter policy would lead to a national energy police state, according to the *Chicago Tribune*.

However, the Senate Republican Policy Committee has so far been unable to agree on a comprehensive energy counterproposal to the Carter program, and other party leadership bodies are similarly split, according to Capitol Hill sources, between those who want to emphasize a program for increased energy production and those who want to tail the Administration on conservation.

The Administration is terrified of what the Republicans could do if they endorse a broad economic growth program. Congressional sources have revealed that when key Republicans attempted to have a strong energy development plank endorsed by the House Republican

Policy Committee, the Rockefeller Republicans allied with the Administration and threatened to "split apart the party." And when ex-President Gerald Ford made his strongest criticisms of the Carter Administration two weeks ago in California, both Vice-President Mondale and House Speaker O'Neill were quick to chastise Ford in the national media for "criticizing" the Administration so soon after leaving office.

The Rockefeller faction has also used some of its strongarm tactics to keep tabs on and stifle action by Republican leaders against the Carter program. James Cannon, former aide to New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, and his chief assistant on the Domestic Council, began work April 18 as the Administrative Assistant to Senate Minority leader Howard Baker. And Don Kellerman, a top aide to New York Senator Jacob Javits will shortly begin working for the joint Senate-House minority leadership. The Rockefeller agents are telling the rest of the party that because the Republicans are a "minority party" they must "appeal to blacks, to labor," and so forth with modified versions of the Carter policies.

A Republican-Labor Alliance?

"You can work with us, who are labelled 'anti-labor' but are 'pro-jobs'; or you can work with people like Frank Church, who is called pro-labor but is anti-jobs." With those remarks, a midwestern Republican Senator identified for a trade-union lobbyist last week of the real common interest between the Republican Party and labor. The choice presently facing the party is to back up such appeals with a comprehensive approach to expanded energy development, emphasizing that fusion power means a greatly increased standard of living for the U.S. population, or fall victim of the present "minority party" fear psychology with which the Rockefeller Republicans are attempting to beat down resistance to the Carter program, and undergo step-by-step disintegration.