

# Capitol Beat

Economist Gar Alperovitz of the Exploratory Project for Economic Alternatives.



## Carter declines to appoint alternative economist to CEA

In his first fireside chat, President Carter underlined several themes that will supposedly guide his new administration: citizen participation in evaluating government programs, reorganization of the federal bureaucracy and a new spirit "to plan ahead, work together and use common sense." He also promised an "open administration" with frequent opportunities for people to "criticize, make suggestions and ask questions."

A few days later, Carter passed up an opportunity that might have begun to turn this vague commitment into programmatic reality: he declined to appoint

*Alperovitz would be ideal for the job, since he has focused his work on alternative economic forms*

Gar Alperovitz, an economist specializing in alternative economic models, to the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA).

The Council, headed by Charles L. Schultze, will play an expanded role in the Carter administration. Replacing several White House economic bodies, this Cabinet-level working group will administer and coordinate Carter's domestic economic programs and link them with foreign policy considerations.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin was among those who suggested that one of these posts be given to Gar Alperovitz, a 40-year-old economist who directs the Exploratory Project on Economic Alternatives. Alperovitz would, he thought, serve as a "channel of communication" to the President for the views of "consumer, minority and other groups." Alperovitz combines impressive academic credentials—as a Ph.D. from the University of Cambridge in England and a Guest Scholar at the Brookings Institute—with extensive government experience since the mid-1960s, Nelson wrote to Carter.

When word of Alperovitz's consideration got around Washington, a coalition of Democratic leaders (including Sen. Edward Kennedy and Sen. Hubert Humphrey), labor leaders, citizens' groups and environmental organizations formed to press for the appointment. The coalition also advocated broader conception for the Council, urging that Alperovitz be assigned the "dual responsibilities of fostering public citizen participation in de-

veloping overall economic policy and of seeking out new economic alternatives and helping to create an informed national dialogue on options for future policy considerations."

Alperovitz would be ideal for the job, coalition members said, since he has focused his work on alternative economic forms involving long-range economic planning, citizen participation, and decentralized decision-making. In his *Notes Toward a Pluralist Commonwealth*, (Beacon Press, 1973) Alperovitz analyzes existing socialist systems and proposes an economic system that would integrate decision-making on a local, community level with national planning on the basis of social need.

"In place of the streamlined socialist planning state," Alperovitz writes, "...I would substitute an organic diversified vision—a vision of thousands of small communities, each organized cooperatively, each working out its own priorities and methods, each generating broader economic criteria and placing political demands on the larger system out of this experience."

With views like this, it's no surprise that the possibility of his appointment was controversial. Ralph Nader called it a "very potent litmus test of the whole Carter administration's horizons."

Carter apparently flunked the test last week, when he appointed Lyle E. Gramley, senior economist for the Federal Reserve Board and William D. Nordhaus, an economics professor at Yale University, to fill the remaining slots on the Council of Economic Advisors. The appointees are "fairly progressive economists in the traditional sense," one observer remarked, who favor vigorous governmental intervention in the economy and will work well on Schultze's economic team.

Most coalition members did not realistically expect Alperovitz to get the job, one person close to the scene told *In These Times*. But the fact that a diverse coalition of groups and individuals spontaneously organized to press his appointment suggests that coalition efforts around alternative economic proposals are possible. "Many of these groups—environmentalists, trade unionists, and citizens' organizations—are beginning to understand the connection between their particular issues and the very structure of the economic system," he says.

—Dan Marshall

## Carter backs Paul Warnke in arms control skirmish

By Tim Frasca  
Washington Bureau

A few balloons went up last week to see if Paul C. Warnke's nomination as American delegate to the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT) could be directed to the same graveyard where the Sorensen CIA nomination is resting quietly. The answer was a resounding "No," demonstrating at least that Congress and the Carter administration are more serious about reigning in the arms race than bucking the discredited but potent "intelligence community."

Warnke, a law partner of former Defense Secretary (under L.B.J.) Clark Clifford, was also nominated to head the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), charged with presenting disarmament policy options to the White House. Warnke is well known for his strong advocacy of arms control as a prudent national security policy, which excited enough dismay to generate a modest buzz-buzz campaign reminiscent of the Sorensen treatment.

Critics of Warnke surfaced predictably among traditional hawks in Congress such as Senators Henry Jackson, Sam Nunn of Georgia, and John Tower of Texas. Additionally, emphatic and embarrassing frequent calls from Sen. John Danforth (R-Mo.) for a cameo appearance by Paul Nitze indicated the weighty presence of the ubiquitous Committee on the Present Danger constellation.

Nitze, a former Deputy Secretary of Defense, represents the extreme hardliners of the Pentagon and defense industries, now assembled in the C.P.D. and anxious to keep the defense dollars flowing into their respective domains. Presumably, they fear arms control in general and Warnke in particular will mean fewer contracts.

### ► No backdown.

An ill-advised unsigned memo purportedly outlining the specific contours of Warnke's softness on arms issues was circulated around Capitol Hill. It did little to alarm senators but provided an excellent opportunity for Warnke's supporters to pontificate on the "very unfortunate and

highly improper" choice of tactics, in Sen. Frank Church's words.

The crucial point, however, at Warnke's debut before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was made by Sen. Hubert Humphrey who promised that the White House had the resources to put the nomination over and would mobilize

*The hardliners of the Pentagon and defense industries, now assembled in the Committee on the Present Danger, are anxious to keep the defense dollars flowing into their respective domains.*

them. "This is no backdown," he said, obviously sensitive to recent history. "This is, if need be, showdown."

The rapid isolation of opposition to Warnke suggests the administration's eagerness for arms agreements has broad appeal in ruling circles. With Warnke sailing, Carter held his first official press conference and floated several possible areas of U.S. initiative in striking for arms records.

Although Warnke said he rejected "any concept of unilateral disarmament on the part of the United States," as he has been accused, he pointed to a long tradition of first moves by every President since Eisenhower. In the well-known American University speech of 1963, President Kennedy agreed to stop atmospheric nuclear testing, he said. Nixon unilaterally renounced the use of chemical and biological weapons in 1969, leading to the treaty in 1972.

By the time he was done, Warnke had members of the committee, either convinced or resigned to polite opposition in low tones, and the administration had won a skirmish in the hard-fought "national security" war. Others will follow.

But the proportions of the victory made it look almost too easy. At least the appearance of restraint in nuclear arms issues must be the consensus of the guardians of the corporate state. ■

## Wilmington Ten case Sounds Bell on frameup

The new Attorney General, Griffin Bell, who drew such heat for his segregationist past, has been presented with a relatively cheap opportunity to demonstrate that he is not, in fact, a racist.

Representatives of the so-called Wilmington 10 called on Bell in his office Feb. 2 to press for his support in freeing the civil rights activists from lengthy jail terms. The supporters claim that the one white and nine black prisoners were framed on charges of arson, conspiracy, and rioting.

Bell told the group that the Civil Rights Division had opened the case at his direction and would investigate whether there was a conspiracy by law enforcement officers to railroad the 10. The announcement elated black rights organizations and others who had pressed for action for years. A Justice Department representative said Bell moved because he had "received so many requests" on the case.

Convictions of the Wilmington 10 grew out of a bitter desegregation campaign in the city of Wilmington, N.C. On a winter night in 1971, a white grocery store was firebombed, and the church that was the center of black political activity was shot at.

The ten defendants, all prominent organizers, were arrested. They have maintained consistently that the arrests and prosecutions were frame-ups designed to crush the agitation by blacks.

All ten were convicted and sentenced to extremely long prison terms, amounting to a total of 282 years.

In the last six months two witnesses, including star prosecution witness Allen

Hall, have retracted their testimony, saying they were bribed and coerced into false statements. Hall even charged that a Treasury Department employee taught him how to make a Molotov cocktail so that Hall could claim Rev. Ben Chavis, a

*In the last six months, two witnesses have retracted their testimony, saying they were bribed and coerced into false statements.*

defendant, had showed him. The Treasury official has denied doing so.

Since the retractions, lawyers for the 10 have asked for their freedom on bond pending disposition of the case. The North Carolina courts have denied appeal bond.

The U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the Wilmington 10's appeal.

Black Congressional Caucus staff aide Bill Kirk said the Justice Department could have a report ready in a month. Kirk said the case had a high "symbolic impact" among blacks.

Bell's move could also strike fear among the prosecutors and others involved in the case. For Bell himself, freedom for the Wilmington 10 could pay handsome political dividends, considering the present deep suspicion of him among black people.

—Tim Frasca



# Environment Front

A consortium of American, Japanese and Iranian companies are moving to construct a billion dollar super-port on Palau, an 80-mile-long chain of mostly small islands in the Western Pacific. Specific plans for the port, which would become the major transshipment center for petroleum in the Pacific basin, have been kept hush-hush in the last two years. But the issue is now gaining public attention, as islanders debate the project's economic and ecological impact and U.S. environmentalists gear up for another battle with multinational oil interests.

Since World War II, Palau has been an American colony as part of a United Nations Trust Territory. The islands are typical Pacific "paradises": tropical fruits, plentiful fish, colorful coral reefs, and a quiet, laid-back life style. The U.S. now pours \$6 million per year into the islands, money that will stop in 1981 when the Trust Territory dissolves.

Local businessmen on Palau—the few that exist—say that the port will bring jobs and unparalleled prosperity to its residents, creating a veritable Kuwait in the Pacific. The islanders are split. Some agree that the port is their only hope for entry into the industrialized world. Others are concerned that the facility would disrupt the islands' environment and traditional way of life.

Robert Panero, the super-port's principle architect, claims it would have "zero leak" technology, but scientists believe that it would cause massive destruction of the reef systems and widespread pollution of local waters. In 1975, the Pacific Science Association urged that the project be abandoned because it would harm reefs that are "unequaled in Oceania." Environmentalists also point out that Palau's frequent typhoons could easily split oil tankers in two. Official environmental impact studies have yet to be done.

Fitzhugh Green of the Environmental Protection Agency studied the project and concluded that "this agency can imagine few situations more rife with the dangers of serious and irresponsible environmental harm than the construction and operation of a major oil transshipment facility on Palau."

Members of the Save Palau Organization are showing films of major oil spills to villagers. Whatever the islanders and the multinational oil consortium decide about the project, the controversy has aroused anger and resentment towards Americans.

## Carter faces test on environmental commitments

Trouble is brewing between President Carter and the environmentalists among his supporters. Bert Lance, Carter's director of the Office of Management and Budget, informed the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on Feb. 2 that Carter is not likely to restore the sharp cut in the agency's budget made by the Ford administration.

Lance's statement caused concern that Carter may not come through on campaign promises on a wide range of environmental reforms. "Without additional funds, EPA will be unable to meet its current responsibilities, much less insure that environmental protection is given the high priority you endorsed during your campaign," leaders of 16 national environmental groups wrote to Carter. They urge "substantial changes" in the agency's budget.

Environmental groups have not yet accused the President of reneging on campaign promises, but see the EPA as an important test of his commitment. "It's very disconcerting to think that the Agency's budget may be frozen under this administration," Arlie Schardt of the Environmental Defense Fund recently told the *New York Times*. ■



Photo by Lionell/CWI

Tim McCoy, county supervisor, receiving petitions.

# Seabrook: self determination at stake

*Nuclear plant on New Hampshire coast endangered by militant citizen resistance*

By Dan Marshall  
Staff Writer

In the small fishing town of Seabrook, New Hampshire, a local controversy over construction of a nuclear power plant has escalated into a heavy-weight boxing match between the full-speed-ahead advocates of nuclear power and environmentally-minded citizens.

In one corner is New Hampshire's Public Service Company, the largest utility in the state, which began buying up land and water rights for the plant in 1969. In the other corner are the people of Seabrook, who rejected the plant last March in a non-binding referendum and the Clamshell Alliance, a loose coalition of New England anti-nuclear groups.

The Seabrook fight attracted nationwide publicity last August when the Clamshell Alliance organized two non-violent sit-ins at the plant site. The demonstrations, where a total of 200 people were dragged off by the police, were the first time the tactics of civil disobedience had been used by "anti-nuke" groups in the U.S. More demonstrations are to come.

"There's a heavy cloud hanging over Seabrook," says Guy Chichester, an Alliance spokesperson from Rye, N.H. "Those plant site occupations were the kind of demonstrations that cannot be ignored—an indication of the commitment and conviction of people. If the Public Service Company wants to make Seabrook a watershed for the future of nuclear power, they can do it."

## ►Ideal location.

Seabrook is an ideal site for a nuclear plant because of its favorable location on the Great Bay of New Hampshire, an ideal source of water needed for the plant's cooling system. It was also chosen, Chichester explains, because of its "favorable political climate" and its "chronic unemployment." (The town's main industries are fishing and tourism, which only operate during the summer.)

"So the company went around wheeling and dealing in property," says Chichester, "making a lot of enemies in the town in the process." They eventually bought the town's water rights and the dump. In exchange Seabrook received a new well and the promise of economic prosperity and the company began building its plant on a rock outcropping overlooking a marsh that leads into the bay.

The utility first planned to dig two canals right through the marsh for the plant's cooling system. "It was a horrendous plan," Chichester remarks. "All kinds of established citizens came out and said it was a foolish plan. In 1970, the Seacoast Anti-Pollution league got the ball rolling by hiring a lawyer to develop a case."

Based in Rye, N.H., SAPL intervened in the federal hearing process to protect wildlife in the marsh. It is not an anti-nuclear organization, though some of its members later organized the Clamshell Alliance.

## ►Onassis tries to build refinery.

The fight to stop the Seabrook plant gathered additional momentum when Aristotle Onassis came to town in the fall of 1973. The Greek shipping tycoon wanted to construct a 450,000 barrel per day refinery on the Great Bay, an area readily accessible to oil tankers. He planned to run 10 pipelines from the refinery to a man-made docking facility in the ocean that could handle six supertankers at a time.

"The opposition to Onassis' plan really got everyone involved," Chichester remembers. "In a short, swift campaign, we appealed to town meetings and zoning boards, got laws passed and they left town within six months."

"This set the stage for the Seabrook battle because Governor Mildrim Thompson, who sees himself as the Energy Czar of the Northeast, switched all of his efforts into Seabrook. It also gave people on the seacoast a consciousness about protecting the natural resources they have here," Chichester continues.

In 1974, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) rejected the utility's canal plan. The company then proposed to extend two mile-long pipes into the ocean to carry 1.2 billion gallons of water per day into the plant and then return it to the ocean some 40 degrees hotter.

SAPL brought in marine biology experts to testify on the environmental damage this cooling system would cause, but the EPA ruled construction could begin. SAPL appealed and produced additional evidence about the plant's impact.

On Nov. 9, 1976, the EPA reversed its earlier decision and ruled that the cooling system was "unacceptable." "All marine life in that water, including eggs, young and adults of hundreds of species, will be killed," EPA Regional Adminis-

trator John McGlennon wrote to the *Wall Street Journal* recently.

The Public Service Co. calls the EPA decision "arbitrary, capricious and fickle" and claims that a redesigned cooling system would cost \$250 million. Russel Train, outgoing head of the EPA, has accepted a review of the Seabrook ruling, placing the issue squarely in the lap of whoever President Carter appoints to administer the Agency.

The company was struck by another blow on Jan. 21 when the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) temporarily suspended their construction permit. The NRC will decide this week whether construction can continue until a final determination is made on the merits of the Seabrook project.

The Seabrook controversy has already influenced the construction of other nuclear plants and the tactics of anti-nuclear groups. The Central Maine Power Co. recently postponed a similar power station and several utility executives expect other cancellations to follow. "The effect of this confusion will seriously jeopardize any new power plant construction because of the massive uncertainties over financing," Rep. James Cleveland (R-N.H.), whose district includes Seabrook, told *Business Week*. Several investors in the Seabrook project have delayed further spending until the EPA decision is appealed.

Like other groups in France and West Germany, nuclear opponents in this country are adopting the sit-in tactic. In Plattsburg, N.Y., 12 people have been arrested over the last two months for trying to stop a network of power lines that they believe will be followed by a nuclear plant. In California, a coalition of organizations is planning an occupation of the Diablo Canyon plant in San Luis Obispo.

And in Seabrook, the Clamshell Alliance has called for another mass sit-in for April 30th, one they say will bring people from all over the country.

## ►Critical place for self-determination.

Seabrook is a "critical place for self-determination," says Guy Chichester. "Nuclear power is clearly being forced on us by the lords of the established power. A democratic society depends on informed people, but people have not had a chance to be informed about nuclear power. If we're successful here, I think it will give great heart to people everywhere who want to give shape to their own lives." ■