

## ENERGY

### U.S., USSR reach tentative accord on energy cooperation

During the last week of April, negotiators from the Soviet Union, led by Academician Alexander Sheindlin, and the United States, led by Department of Energy Deputy Secretary John O'Leary, reached a tentative agreement to extend the terms of the five-year energy cooperation accords between the two countries.

The accords were first signed in 1974, and the extension is scheduled to be signed on June 13-14, when Soviet Minister for Power and Electrification P.S. Neporozhnyi visits Washington.

The agreement was only reached by repeatedly hurdling obstacles set up by Energy Secretary James Schlesinger, and the final signing of the accord is by no means assured.

First, the U.S. negotiators insisted that the agreements be extended for less than five years. The Soviet scientists have argued that an extension of less than five years would prevent cooperation on significant and scientifically interesting programs which would take more than a couple of years to complete. The U.S. proposal for a two-year extension will be finally decided on in June.

The second monkey wrench the Department of Energy threw into the negotiations was the "condition" that the Soviets agree to cooperate on "energy forecasting" for the rest of the 14 nonnuclear energy programs to continue. "Energy forecasting" has been a favorite tool in Schlesinger's energy war arsenal. By spinning out manipulated energy supply and consumption projections, particularly regarding oil, Schlesinger has tried to justify various energy

control schemes in Congress and before the American public.

This "negotiating" tactic in the U.S.-USSR energy agreements is exactly the same in intent as the U.S. "negotiating" position in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). The purpose is to prevent basic research in science and applications in technology, either in new weapons systems or energy development.

#### A Matter of National Policy

Over the past month, high-ranking Soviet scientists, who are also part of the political decision-making process in the Soviet Union, have clearly stated that cooperation in fusion and advanced nonnuclear energy development is an important part of the Soviets' war-avoidance policy. For that reason, the Soviet delegation here for the April talks, led by the head of the prestigious Institute for High Temperatures, insisted that all major issues be agreed upon before Minister Neporozhnyi's visit in June in order to avoid a high-level confrontation over the agreements.

The Soviet scientists recognized that if they could come to terms on an extension—even if it were not the most satisfactory agreement—channels of communication and some important joint work would continue. Therefore, when the "condition" of energy forecasting cooperation was raised by the DOE, the Soviets took advantage of a tactical opening.

The U.S. energy forecasting program is headed by Sara Jackson, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Affairs of

the DOE. Taking advantage of the fact that Jackson has *no* technical knowledge of the contents of the energy research, the Soviets proposed that cooperation in energy projections be based on studies like the American Energy Conservation Alternatives Study (ECAS) done in 1976.

This study was conducted by NASA, the National Science Foundation, and the Energy Research and Development Administration (predecessor to the DOE), to evaluate various proposed advanced fossil fuel technologies. The study concluded that commercial magnetohydrodynamics technology would be the most efficient and cost-effective means of future fossil energy conservation, in this case from coal, to electricity.

This proposal caused a bit of confusion, since Jackson had never heard of ECAS, and the Soviet suggestion was accepted. In addition, according to a U.S. negotiator, the Soviets have agreed to provide certain data on estimates of Soviet energy demand and supply, as well as their projections on world energy production to the end of the century.

The DOE negotiators are gloating that they pulled one over on the Soviets, in meeting the "condition" for forecasting cooperation. However, the Soviets understand that the postponement of the meeting of the joint forecasting group until October will give prodevelopment, anticongression forces in the United States some time to reverse the present U.S. energy program. When the U.S. has an energy program based on developing successively more advanced applications of technology, U.S.-Soviet energy and scientific cooperation will no longer be a tool of attempted U.S. confrontation and manipulation, but will be concentrated on the task of meeting the world's energy needs.

—Marsha Freeman