

was, he thought, an ill-conceived political payoff to the National Education Association.

Califano attributes most of the anonymous White House criticism to Carter aide Hamilton Jordan and press secretary Jody Powell. Both were interested in little except feathering Carter's political nest, he reports. Neither returned phone calls nor complained to Califano directly about the political consequences of his positions. "I'm not interested in the substance. I'm interested in the politics for the President," Jordan supposedly said during a discussion of national health insurance. It seems plausible that neither Jordan nor Powell ever really took to Califano, who was after all the

---

### Powell and Jordan complained that "Joe was going his own way."

---

sort of Washington insider that Carter and the Georgians had campaigned against. Califano enjoyed good relations only with Stuart Eizenstat and Jack Watson, more liberal White House aides.

Califano's firing occurred much as it was described at the time. Carter wanted to impose greater discipline on his Cabinet, and Powell and Jordan complained that "Joe was going his own way." Carter himself explained that Califano's problem was "you and some members of the staff—particularly Ham, Jody, and Frank Moore [the congressional liaison]—have not gotten along." Califano writes that this statement rang true, and all he could say in response was, "It's your decision, Mr. President." Carter, concerned about Califano's potential defection to the Kennedy campaign, then offered him the post of ambassador to Italy, Califano says.

By the end of the experience, Califano had learned several important lessons. One is that "governing America is not only a matter of ideology. . . . Open-minded pragmatism is required." Another is that many of the Great Society programs created constituency groups that now pursue narrow interests—a circumstance, he says elsewhere, that poses "the severest threat to governing for all the people." Califano seems to acknowledge that the social experiment he helped to craft in the 1960's has gone partly awry.—R. JEFFREY SMITH

---

### DOE Blocks Mailing of "Antinuclear" Publication

---

Energy secretary James Edwards has ordered a halt to distribution of a Department of Energy publication because of its allegedly antinuclear bias. The document is the January issue of *Energy Consumer*, a low-budget magazine launched in 1979, which is sent out to about 100,000 people.

The issue, which contains articles and reprints of articles by energy experts on the subject of "energy and the environment," was the last one to be compiled under Carter's energy secretary, Charles Duncan. Among articles on such subjects as solar energy and acid rain are two articles on nuclear energy. One, by a scientist with the Natural Resources Defense Council, discusses problems of radioactive waste and advocates "a cautious approach to the further development of commercial nuclear power." The other, an excerpt from writings of the Ford Foundation's Nuclear Energy Policy Study Group, is generally positive toward nuclear power, although it favors a more restrictive siting policy for plants.

This seems to be pretty moderate stuff—but not, apparently, to devotees of nuclear power, particularly constituents of Senator James McClure (R-Idaho) at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, who bombarded his office with letters and phone calls protesting the articles. McClure conveyed his concern to DOE that, according to an aide, the articles were "not in line with administration policy," and Edwards forthwith ordered a freeze on the copies of the magazine—about 12,000—that had not yet been sent out.

According to DOE public information officer William Greener, a "temporary hold" was put on the mailing pending a review by DOE's policy development people, who are also reviewing the contents of the next issue, on "energy and the elderly." Greener explains that it was decided in February that "things of a policy nature shouldn't come out without approval by the secretary." The DOE has also gotten angry mail, containing statements such as: "I cannot recall being so upset by anything sanctioned by the government," and "It's

quite clear that the Department of Energy continues to be used as a mouthpiece for environmental organizations." McClure, who is chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, wrote to the department that "my constituents characterize the issue as an anti-nuclear handbook containing technically incorrect information and negative reports about nuclear waste." An official in DOE's Office of Consumer Affairs says the public affairs office reviews every issue before it goes to print and as far as she knows the articles contain no inaccuracies. But the January issue was reviewed before the change of administrations.

Senator Mark Hatfield (R-Ore.), who had an article against nuclear war in the same issue, has expressed strong displeasure with Edwards' action. But future Idaho readers of *Energy Consumer*—if, indeed, the magazine continues at all—are unlikely to be offended as long as Edwards, an ardent supporter of nuclear power, remains in office.

—Constance Holden

---

### House Science Panel Throws Down Gauntlet

---

A House science subcommittee has challenged the Reagan Administration by voting a hefty portion of the funds that the Administration wants to cut from the National Science Foundation's budget. Most conspicuous is the inclusion of some \$65 million more than the \$9.9 million in science education funds that the Administration requested in its revised budget.

On a party-line vote decided by its Democratic majority, the subcommittee on science, research, and technology set a total of \$1160.6 million for NSF's fiscal year 1982 budget, some \$127.1 million more than the Administration asked. The bill contained almost \$293 million less than the Carter Administration requested in January.

Specific major additions in the bill reported out by the subcommittee, besides those for science education, were \$16.5 million for upgrading university instrumentation and laboratories and \$18.7 million above the \$37.7 million in the Reagan budget for