

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

1975

HERBERT S. GUTOWSKY DONALD LINDSLEY
N. BRUCE HANNAY RUTH PATRICK
DONALD KENNEDY RAYMOND H. THOMPSON
DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.

1976

ALFRED BROWN FRANK PRESS
JAMES F. CROW FRANK W. PUTNAM
HANS LANDSBERG MAXINE F. SINGER
EDWARD NEY ARTHUR M. SQUIRES

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editors: PATRICIA ROWE

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, LUTHER J. CARTER, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, ROBERT GILLETTE, NICHOLAS WADE, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, BARBARA J. CULLITON, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research News: ALLEN L. HAMMOND, WILLIAM D. METZ, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, JEAN L. MARK, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, GINA BARI KOLATA, FANNIE GROOM

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, LYNN MANFIELD, JANET KEGG

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: MARGARET ALLEN, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, SYLVIA EEBERHART, JUDITH GIVELBER, CORRINE HARRIS, NANCY HARTNAGEL, OLIVER HEATWOLE, CHRISTINE KARLIK, MARGARET LLOYD, ERIC POGGENPOHL, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, RICHARD SEMIKLOSE, YA LI SWIGART, ELEANOR WARNER

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD SOMMER

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE; Subscription Records and Member Records: ANN RAGLAND

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

MARGARET STERLING

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burklund, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581)

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phones: (Area code 202) Central Office: 467-4350; Book Reviews: 467-4367; Business Office: 467-4411; Circulation: 467-4417; Guide to Scientific Instruments: 467-4480; News and Comment: 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions: 467-4483; Research News: 467-4321; Reviewing: 467-4440. Cable: Advancesci. Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xv, *Science*, 28 June 1974. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Delays in Tapping Energy Sources

The public continues to enjoy adequate supplies of energy, but severe shortages lie ahead. Consumption of energy goes on unabated in spite of a recession, higher prices, and presidential appeals. But domestic reserves of hydrocarbons are being depleted rapidly and the stage is being set for empty gasoline pumps, cold homes, and large-scale unemployment unless there is a drastic change in attitudes soon. A major factor is the long time span involved in creating new sources of energy.

This country's experience with nuclear energy is an example of the time necessary to develop a major new source. The first reactor went critical in December 1942. In 1973, nuclear energy accounted for only 1 percent of the nation's energy consumption. Ten years from now, nuclear energy will meet at most 7 percent of the nation's needs. Moreover, the energy will be made available as electricity and not in forms that will be in short supply. Prospects for quick, large-scale utilization of geothermal energy, fusion, and solar energy are even dimmer than those for nuclear energy.

Thus, for at least the next decade, energy horizons will be limited by oil, natural gas, and coal. But available domestic supplies of oil and gas are diminishing, at the rate of 4 to 6 percent per year for oil and about 7 to 8 percent per year for natural gas,* and barriers have been erected to obtaining more oil or gas and to the use of coal.

Perhaps the most serious and certainly the least recognized problems lie in the supplies of natural gas. It heats 55 percent of the nation's homes, is widely used as a feedstock for petrochemicals, including fertilizer, and is by far the largest source of energy for industry. The energy content of the natural gas used daily by industry is equivalent to that of about 5 million barrels of oil. National policy accords priority to residential demand for natural gas, taking it away from industry. Already, shortages have caused layoffs. During the period August 1974 to August 1975, industry will use 400 million additional barrels of oil because of gas curtailments.† The rate of decay of supplies is such that by 1980, with a few exceptions, industry will be prevented from using natural gas. This would have enormous effects on the economy.

In large measure, although not entirely, future natural gas supplies will be tied to those of petroleum. There are good reasons to believe that onshore and undiscovered gas reserves of the 48 contiguous states are comparatively small.‡ New supplies could come from the outer continental shelves and from Alaska. At best, 4 to 6 years will elapse before these can be made available. However, at the present pace of resolving environmental disputes, supplies will be much longer in arriving.

An important aspect of the decaying position is that the kind of conservation that was achieved in 1973 and 1974 would make only a small dent in the problem. Then the public cut its use of natural gas by 6 to 8 percent, that is, 3 to 4 percent of total consumption. If the public spent many billions of dollars on storm windows and added insulation, 1 year's decay in the supplies of natural gas might be compensated for.

Conservation is not enough. To make good the energy deficit due to decay of natural gas alone, a doubling of coal production during the next 6 years would be required. But to open a new underground mine requires about 5 years. The quickest path toward relief is expansion of surface mining of low-sulfur coal in the Rocky Mountain States. But with various delays connected with changeovers from gas or oil to coal and with environmental controversies, heaven only knows when this country will emerge from the years of travail and discontent that it is now entering.—PHILIP H. ABELSON

* *Oil and Gas Journal*, 4 November 1974.

† *Oil and Gas Journal*, 25 November 1974.

‡ R. Gillette, *Science* 185, 127 (1974).