

With friends like AIF, nuclear needs no enemy

"I was in the small minority who wanted a limited moratorium on nuclear plants just after Three Mile Island to dampen the public backlash. But then I didn't support the Kennedy six-month moratorium because there already was a de facto moratorium and I didn't see the need for anything else."

The words of a moderate environmentalist? An energy aide to Governor Brown of California? Perhaps an underling of James Schlesinger or a think-tanker from Brookings?

The comment came this week from Roger Sherman, chairman of the board of Ebasco Services, a top nuclear contractor, and prime contractor at the Princeton Large

CORPORATE STRATEGY

Torus fusion energy facility. Sherman is also chairman of the Atomic Industrial Forum, a worldwide trade association for the nuclear industry. The quiet but penetrating scandal the candid Sherman remarks will occasion goes beyond the remarks themselves. For many of the contractors, manufacturers, law firms, engineers, nuclear power operators and other nuclear users who make up the 600 worldwide members of the AIF and its \$4 million annual budget, the conclusion cannot be avoided: the trade association for the nuclear industry is antinuclear.

Consider the following record:

1. The AIF never objected to the October 1978 report on nuclear wastes by Acting Undersecretary of Energy John Deutch, whose false and alarmist conclusions about the hazards of nuclear wastes were an immediate danger not only to the industry that the AIF purports to represent but also to the future generation of power for the nation in which the great majority of its members live.

2. The AIF never objected to the June 18 appointment of Mitchell Rogovin as head of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Independent Investigation of Three Mile Island. Rogovin was the general counsel to the openly antinuclear Common Cause, and served as vice chairman of the Center for Law and Social Policy which develops "radical lawyers" who defend terrorists, and which filed three suits to prevent the export of nuclear fuel to India. He is a Fellow and General Counsel to the Institute for Policy Studies, which is known to be connected to the funding, training, and deployment of environmentalist-terrorist groups, in-

cluding the Weathermen, Black September, and the Baader Meinhof gang; and is currently a member of the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations, whose Project 1980s documents demand a "controlled disintegration of the global economy." Nevertheless, an AIF spokesman was quoted in the June 18 *Washington Post* as approving Rogovin's appointment because "he doesn't seem to have an ax to grind."

3. Roger Sherman, AIF chairman, attempted to have members of the Fusion Energy Foundation arrested for holding a public rally in support of nuclear power near the offices of Ebasco. Sherman, in a separate conversation with the FEF, became so irate when an FEF official mentioned the "coincidence" between Jane Fonda's China Syndrome and Three Mile Island that he said that, if the FEF conducted an investigation of the movie, he "would consider them (FEF) irresponsible and cut off all relations."

4. Roger Sherman is supporting John Connally for the Republican Presidential nomination despite the fact that Connally told 15 million Americans on ABC's Issues and Answers, Sunday July 29, that he favored synthetic fuels but with regard to nuclear power, ignored direct questions on the subject.

5. An official AIF representative, Marie Dunkle, told the security director of the Pennsylvania American Legion that the FEF is a "terrorist organization," resulting in the cancellation of a major pre-scheduled FEF address to the Legion's July convention on the need for nuclear power in the world. Marie Dunkle is the AIF official to whom Milton Copulis, policy director of the antinuclear Heritage Foundation, a British intelligence front, directs callers on questions of "pro-nuclear" activity.

6. In a speech to the European Nuclear Congress in Hamburg, West Germany May 8, AIF's president Carl Walsky contributed to pessimism and hysteria by declaring that "we shall be considering the lessons from Three Mile Island and ... I am hopeful that we shall be through this period in one, two, or three years at most. I have anticipated two or three years of near zero orders for nuclear plants and coal plants as well. There will remain, as we now project the future, the small probability of accidents that can kill thousands."

7. The AIF has consistently refused to investigate the possibility of sabotage at Three Mile Island, despite their technical expertise which would confirm that the occurrences at that plant must have involved deliberate intervention. In fact, AIF's Roger Sherman fueled media hysteria by saying "at least the industry is no

longer referring to TMI as an incident, but is being honest about it by calling it a 'major accident.'"

8. The AIF has no program for nuclear power development to which they are committed, a fact that was put to them strongly by, ironically, not their own members but by the heads of the building trades union in a Washington meeting two weeks ago. (See interview.)

—Leif Johnson

AIF head supports nuclear moratorium

Roger J. Sherman, chairman of the Board of Ebasco Services and chairman of the Atomic Industrial Forum—the nuclear industry trade association—candidly explains his antinuclear position in an interview provided by a Washington, D.C. source:

Q: *What do you think about the cabinet shakeups—specifically Schlesinger's ouster?*

Sherman: Schlesinger was a good man, a brilliant kind of guy...but sometimes abrasive. You know, he had a hell of a job to do pulling together all those disparate groups into the DOE.

Q: *But he was known as antinuclear.*

Sherman: Oh no, he was pronuclear, very much. I really don't know how he stood on fusion. I don't think an unproven and new concept like fusion needed all the funds the government originally asked for. I think what we have is enough. You can't put a lot of money into something that may not pay out. ...

Q: *Nuclear export policy is a big item in Washington now. ...*

Sherman: We have to probably go with the fast breeder. France is going hell bent for this. I think that France blew up the Iraqi deliveries. Every one is worried about proliferation, the French too, and one possible solution is regional reprocessing plants under broad supervision.

Q: *Why would the French blow up the Iraq nuclear parts?*

Sherman: It gives them a couple of years to replace them. ...

Q: *What is shaping up after Three Mile Island?*

Sherman: I was in the small minority who wanted a "limited moratorium" just after Three Mile Island, to dampen the public backlash. I didn't support the Kennedy moratorium because by that time the public opinion polls were swinging back to nuclear—you know crises have only a certain half life—and there was a de facto moratorium anyway, which was sufficient. In fact, the NRC can't process any application right now be-

cause they have their top hundred people on the Three Mile Island case and there's just no supervision for the intricate process of guiding an application through.

The Hart amendment was—I suppose is, I don't know where it is—really crazy. More people would get hurt in evacuations than in any accident. I'm glad, by the way, that the industry is no longer calling Three Mile Island an incident but is being honest about its being a major accident.

Q: *Who's organizing the Rocky Flats demonstration? I hear Haig is speaking.*

Sherman: Yes, I know about that, but I don't know who is doing it. Rockwell I think, but I was delighted to hear that Haig will be there. He's one hell of a good speaker. I heard him in Washington just after Erlichman and Haldeman were out and he gave a hell of a good speech. As far as being a presidential candidate, I don't know where his base would come from. Personally, I think a Connally-Anderson ticket would be just right. Connally would pick up the conservative Texas millionaire and oil support—he's got a lot of money—and Anderson would pick up the liberals. Haig could be the man above politics, that's the military image, and I think Reagan would be a bloody disaster.

But Connally is very impressive. I know him personally, have been with him in small meetings like a dozen to 14 persons in executive situations and he is just brilliant, quick, incisive, and decisive. I knew him when Ebasco was a subsidiary of Halliburton. He was on the Halliburton board. He wouldn't alienate the liberal and he is very handsome on television. The ladies would go for him.

Q: *But what about his attempts to eliminate Davis-Bacon? The unions wouldn't go for that.*

Sherman: Well Connally is very astute. You know, if it came to that, I think he would just count up the votes and make up his mind. Ebasco isn't that affected and I'm personally not against Davis-Bacon as long as it's reasonably administered....

Just last week I had a meeting with the building trades leaders in Washington. I felt that I had to attend—otherwise the meeting would have been handled by Paul Turner, who set it up—because the union presidents felt the industry had slackened off from nuclear support. I tried to assure them there was no erosion of industry support.

Q: *Did anything concrete come from the meeting?*

Sherman: I didn't want to say anything too concrete. You know these guys are consummate politicians. They sit on every word and make more of what you say than what you meant. ...I know the minds of these guys. I was one of the four industry people on the Nuclear Construction Stabilization Agreement. ...