

this constant acceleration so that we could be catapulted into the atomic age over night. Look at our second appendix, the one that I had prepared by the BDM Corporation...What I do see is the possibility of maverick groups, the sort of group that we had with the Japanese Red Army a few years ago taking this up...

Q: The Christian Science Monitor laid out in detail many of the recent movements of terrorists. If intelligence agencies have that kind of reading, how can the public be made to understand that it is difficult to stop acts before they occur?

A: I am a very strong proponent of intelligence. I was the consultant for the National Wiretap Commission. I produced the international report on this, and I very strongly advocate improved intelligence services...There's an old Russian saying that if there are three men plotting a revolution, two are secret policemen and one is a fool. This is the situation as far as organized groups are concerned, but some groups are extremely difficult to penetrate by conventional intelligence methods, and the really frightening thing is that the type of group likely to break what I call the "high-technology barrier" is most likely to be a lone psychopath, and intelligence, however good, is not going to pick him up. Unfortunately, most of our responses to terrorism up to now have been reactive, but we can't afford to react when somebody puts a nuclear device in the World Trade Center. We have to know as much as we can about what is going on up to now. Unfortunately, there's a great deal of jealousy among the host of agencies. There is a marked lack of cooperation internationally, and one of the biggest problems is that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter...

Q: How can this be changed so that other countries would be brought more into this kind of work?

A: Well, I think we've got to forget about international cooperation. We've got to develop regional agreements. For example, cooperation with the RCMP is excellent. Cooperations with the RCMP is done on the basis of mutual interest with United States counterparts. If we can develop this with enough interested nations: for example, some nations now have tremendous sophistication in their response capability. Nations like West Germany for example, and we will just have to work to exchange information, ironing out some of the problems that arise out of lack of forethought...

By the way, the question of identity cards, for example, people say, "wouldn't it be a good thing if we had a single identity card in this country." Well, you'll never get it because the sentiment is against it, but nobody objects to carrying around a whole pocketful of interrelated credit cards, nobody objects to having a driving license with his picture, perhaps even his fingerprints on it, but this sort of sentiment is something we have to take into account.

Q: It's a pretty broad sentiment.

A: Francis what's her name of the Passport office has been pleading for years how much it would save, how cheap it would be to have a small, almost credit-size passport, but people are afraid of this, however much you try to convince people with rational arguments...

Q: I think the Nazi experience scared the hell out of a lot of people...

A: Well, it did, and yet it was badly misunderstood. It's the same as gun control. People have terrible misconceptions about that. Yet, these sentiments are so strong you might say they are atavistic. You can't get 'round them at all. I think it's useless to try. We have to work the best we can within the framework that the public sentiment will allow.

The Battle For Fusion Energy In Congress

The Intelligence Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee will shortly vote to expand the laser fusion budget, a spokesman for the subcommittee announced today. Not only will the subcommittee — charged with jurisdiction over laser fusion because of its military applicability — reportedly vote to completely restore the \$20 million axed by Jimmy Carter from the President Ford-proposed budget but it will also recommend a token \$2.5 million (2 percent) increase. "We will take the bull by the horn and fight Carter," stated an aide to the subcommittee, chaired by long-time nuclear energy proponent Rep. Melvin Price (D-Ill).

While members of the Intelligence subcommittee threatened to "break ties with Carter" over nuclear energy policy, their colleagues on the House Science and Technology Committee have begun to waver — afraid of

a political confrontation with the Carter Administration. Fossil Fuels and Nuclear Energy subcommittee chairman Rep. Walter Flowers (D-Ala) announced that his subcommittee's mark-up (appropriation recommendations to the full House) will be postponed "at least until Tuesday" and perhaps until after President Carter announces his "comprehensive energy policy" on April 20. Flowers and others have justified this delay by nonsensically demanding a "clarification from the Administration on its nuclear stance" before taking a committee vote.

Indications are that if a vote is taken today in either the House Science and Technology Committee or the Senate Energy Committee — the two committees with overall jurisdiction for the nuclear energy budget — the outcome at best would be a "compromise" somewhere between

the disastrous Carter budget and the inadequate Ford-proposed budget. Neither budget, and certainly no "in-between" one, would permit the fusion power to be realized — as numerous experts have testified before the relevant congressional committees.

Most House Science and Technology subcommittee members are privately committed to at least full restoration of the nuclear energy budget cuts. While Rep. Flowers and others are publicly pushing compromise plans amounting to only one-third to one-half restoration, an aide to the subcommittee explained. Such compromise follow intensive Administration harassment particularly aimed at the Flowers subcommittee.

After wining and dining subcommittee members at the White House last week, Carter's "energy czar" James Schlesinger began calling up every Democrat on the subcommittee demanding that support for the nuclear energy cuts, a subcommittee source revealed. Schlesinger then followed this hard line with a sop telling each member not to worry since "come April 20 (when Carter's energy policy will be announced) the Administration's position will finally be clarified" with a "pro-nuclear program." Simultaneously, Carter sent each subcommittee member a "Dear Colleague" letter reiterating this.

The Carter Administration has also deployed personnel from the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) to Congress claiming that

ERDA had earlier "put fat" into its budget recommendation which President Ford had accepted. (ERDA has become increasingly anti-nuclear energy since the forced ouster a few weeks ago of ERDA Advanced Systems division head Dr. Robert Hirsch, a strong proponent of nuclear power.) Already Rep. Gary Myers (R-Pa), a Science and Technology Committee member who during hearings had supported nuclear power development as a necessary complement of a U.S. peace policy towards Third World countries, has backed down to propose about a 50 percent restoration in contrast to his previous commitment to full restoration. Myers is currently citing "fat in the budget."

Finally, the Ford Foundation is about to release a Carter-commissioned study, concocted by the MITRE Corporation (best known for its nuclear terrorism scenarios) with help from Trilateral Commission member and Defense Secretary Harold Brown, which will "tear apart" the fast breeder reactor, which is an essential component of the transition to a fusion economy.

In contrast, a statement delivered to the U.S. Senate by Sen. Harrison Schmitt (R-NM) established the necessity for not only restoring the cuts but vastly expanding the nuclear energy, particularly fusion research and development budget. The developing world must "enter the 20th century, the technological and material 20th century," he stated (see complete text attached).

Senator Schmitt: Technology Transfer Powerful U.S. Weapon For Peace

Senator Harrison Schmitt (R-NM) made the following remarks Feb. 21 in the U.S. Senate, as reported March 10, 1977 in the Congressional Record under the heading, "The U.S. Defense Posture."

Mr. President, on two previous occasions during this session of the Senate, I have dealt with questions relating to our defensive balance in the world with respect to our national security picture. In addition, we have had considerable debate during the last few days concerning the nomination of Mr. Paul C. Warnke, which related to our defensive balance and in what respects we might undertake to improve that or change it over the next few years.

Mr. President, I would like to speak today about some opportunities this nation has for change over the long term, and the need for some of the defensive weapons systems we have talked about so long...

I think the vote on Mr. Warnke has clearly shown that a significant number of Senators and a large number of Americans are beginning to articulate and understand

this paradox. I hope Mr. Warnke and the President, in their discussions on the SALT talks, will take note of the vote which occurred yesterday in opposition to Mr. Warnke's nomination, but more so in opposition to the kinds of policies he has represented for so long.

Today let me discuss opportunities for change, for a removal in the long term of the balance of terror under which we live.

The source of the opportunity which is before us lies in the aspirations of peoples of the developing world to enter the 20th century, the technological and material 20th century. The technological revolution in which we live today and in which we participate as a nation and as a people provides unique, historically unique, opportunities for the peoples of the developing world to enter the 20th century.

One of the reasons this has become so paramount in their minds is the demonstration of what is possible, which has come from this Nation's activities in space and, in particular, our activities in the vicinity of the moon.