

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

1977

WARD GOODENOUGH	DONALD KENNEDY
CLIFFORD GROBSTEIN	NEAL E. MILLER
H. S. GUTOWSKY	RAYMOND H. THOMPSON
N. BRUCE HANNAY	

1978

RICHARD E. BALZHISER	FRANK W. PUTNAM
JAMES F. CROW	MAXINE SINGER
HANS LANDSBERG	PAUL E. WAGGONER
EDWARD NEY	F. CARL WILLENBROCK

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: RICHARD SEMIKLOSE

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, Editor; PHILIP M. BOFFEY, LUTHER J. CARTER, BARBARA J. CULLITON, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, NICHOLAS WADE. Editorial Assistant, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research News: ALLEN L. HAMMOND, Editor; GINA BARI KOLATA, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, WILLIAM D. METZ, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON. Editorial Assistant, FANNIE GROOM

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, JANET KEGG

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: JOHN BAKER, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DOREMAN, SYLVIA EBERHART, JUDITH GIVELBER, CAITILIN GORDON, CORRINE HARRIS, NANCY HARTNAGEL, OLIVER HEATWOLE, CHRISTINE KARLIK, RUTH KULSTAD, MARGARET LLOYD, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, YA LI SWIGART, ELEANOR WARNER

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD SOMMER

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE;

Subscription Records and Member Records: ANN RAGLAND

Advertising Representatives

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: 467-4443. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xi, *Science*, 26 March 1976. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Unfreezing the Future

Many proposed solutions to the energy dilemma—liquid metal fast breeder reactors, fusion reactors, or some form of solar energy—have about them a curiously static quality. Not only are they seen by their enthusiasts as total solutions, which is itself a presumptive notion, but also they seem to be advanced as if a decision could be made now or soon about the most economical, clean, and safe way to provide energy for the next 1000 years. After research, development, and demonstration, all that remained would be to put the requisite number of facilities in place and turn them over to caretakers to keep them running.

Except that the world doesn't work that way. Human beings do not work that way, either as individuals or as societies, and perhaps Americans in particular do not. On the contrary, we can expect that all kinds of unpredictable dynamic developments will occur during the next 25 years, let alone the next 1000. Do we really think that we are at the pinnacle of human evolution and development, that all the most important inventions are past or within our grasp? It is possible, but evidence weighs heavily on the side of skepticism.

Moreover, we are too ignorant to make even semipermanent choices and commitments. We have no more than educated guesses about the economics of energy sources now in prototype or planning stages, and the affordability of those that exist only in the imagination is purely conjectural. Nor do we know much about safety, or carcinogenicity, or climatic effects. The solutions of 1985 could look like dinosaurs before we got very far into the next millennium.

Within a very few decades (the exact date does not matter), oil and natural gas will have become minor energy sources, and the several new sources in sight threaten to be more expensive, or dirtier, or more dangerous, or some combination of these. There have been, of course, past transitions from old to new sources of energy, but they have been pleasant—always to cheaper sources and usually to cleaner, more convenient ones. Moreover, these transitions were not mandated. They occurred. This time the transition promises to be painful and imposed. We are going to have to pay for energy, both in treasure and in undesirable side effects, and the sooner we let prices reflect this fact the better off we will be in the long run. The trick is to find answers that minimize some combination of economic costs, dirt, and danger.

Unfortunately, this search turns up a conflict in values that threatens to be irresolvable. Growth-oriented people give by far the greatest weight to cost; they think economic growth, high incomes, and jobs are worth the environmental side effects of what now promise to be the cheapest sources—coal and nuclear. But some people are gravely offended by dirt and what it will do to health and climate, which rules out coal. And many are concerned mainly about safety: "What do dollars matter when human lives are at stake?" They would eliminate the dangerous options before choosing the most economical among the rest. A subset of these would accept "normal" risks, such as those of coal mining, but find intolerable any increased risk of catastrophic damage, such as a war resulting from nuclear proliferation. They want to rule out the nuclear option unless we can devise safeguards far superior to any now in prospect.

Faced with various and changing notions of unacceptability, with ignorance and the knowledge that tomorrow probably will not resemble yesterday, it is imperative that we not freeze our future options, either in our minds or in our machinery. We must have a plan that can, and it probably will, be adjusted frequently as we learn. Our single clear criterion for the future is flexibility.—CHARLES J. HITCH, *Resources for the Future*, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036