tion. Progressive electrification of the economy, with combustion of fuel in electric power plants displacing direct combustion of fuel for illumination, mechanical work, and high-temperature heat, has been the major energy substitution since about 1940. Because electric power is more efficient than direct combustion for these applications, the energy/GNP ratio continued to drop nearly 1 percent annually through 1980.

Consideration of the full spectrum of energy inputs to the U.S. economy shows that the energy/GNP ratio was cut in two in the 60-year period from 1920 to 1980, a triumph of energy conversion technology.

JOHN C. FISHER

600 Arbol Verde
Carpinteria, California 93013

References and Notes

1. J. C. Fisher, *Energy Crises in Perspective* (Wiley, New York, 1974).
2. *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970* (Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 1983).
3. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1984* (Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 1983).
4. Energy/GNP is measured in 10^{13} Btu's per billion 1958 dollars. The energy consumption values include contributions from coal, petroleum, natural gas, fuel wood, work animal feed, direct wind and water power, hydroelectric power, and nuclear energy. Values for the years 1890 through 1970 are from (*1*). Values for 1975 and 1980 are from (*3*) incremented by 2 percent to adjust approximately for recent consumption of fuel wood. GNP values are taken from (*2*) and (*3*).

Chapman is correct in saying that our analysis of inflation is similar to a monetarist position, which emphasizes the money supply as a primary determinant of the price level (although we hasten to add that we do not necessarily advocate other "monetarist" positions or programs). What our approach does add to the analysis of inflation is that it contributes to an understanding of how the money supply and energy use (through its influence on GNP) combine to influence prices. Rising energy prices and increasing energy scarcity discouraged energy use in the 1970's. Economic growth declined, due in part to a decline in labor productivity brought about by lower fuel use per laborer. The money supply, however, continued to increase during the 1970's, while for various reasons both fuel use and output stagnated for the first sustained time in decades. Thus an increasing money supply, which formerly had been associated with increasing fuel use and output, now only increased inflation rather than increasing output. We agree with Chapman that our equation in note 35 could be better specified. We could replace P (price level) with the independent term IFEP (inflation from an energy perspective) in that equation. We then could compare the model-derived IFEP (lines) with the empirical CPI (dots), as shown in our original figure 5. Finally, there is nothing stated or implied in our analysis to suggest that subsidizing nuclear power or any other energy source would decrease inflation.

Fisher correctly notes the importance of solar inputs to our economy. Our inclusion of these solar energy sources raised some empirical problems, and we decided to omit them in our final article. Also, one of us addressed this issue in a previous article (*1*). When we did include fuel wood, it slightly, but not significantly, improved the results of the regression analyses. Essentially, biotic fuels were progressively more important before 1920 and after 1973. Including them "lifts" both ends of our original figure 3 (the energy/GNP ratio), making those lines relatively straighter and, in a sense, adding a bit more support to our first hypothesis.

That Fisher does not address one of our major points is reflected by the data in his table, which are not corrected for differences in fuel quality. The changes in ratios suggested by Fisher are exaggerated because they do not include a quality factor representing the relative efficiencies of different energy sources. A horse and a tractor both operate at about 20 percent efficiency when they are working, but a horse must be "fueled" for 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, even if it is used only 6 hours a day during the plowing season. Our analysis highlights the pitfalls of drawing conclusions from uncorrected energy/GNP sources.

We did emphasize the importance of the quality of electricity in our article, but pointed out that much of what is often attributed to "triumphs of technology" can be attributed equally to (i) increased fuel use, (ii) increased fuel quality, and (iii) shifts in relative fuel use between intermediate and final demand sectors. This was the point of our fuel efficiency section. Such concerns would be academic if it were not for the impending (we believe) sharp decline in the production rate of U.S. liquid and gaseous petroleum, probably necessitating a switch to lower quality coal or oil shale. Ceteris paribus, this could *raise* the uncorrected U.S. mean energy/GNP ratio again. Alternatively, should some large-scale, reasonably cheap source of electricity be developed, and the means to use its high quality implemented, the ratio might continue its downward trend. Meanwhile other components of energy efficiency might also change—for example, we expect to see continued declines in household fuel use, improvements in manufacturing efficiency, and continued declines in extraction efficiency as we exhaust our highest quality resources. These points are thoroughly covered in (*2*).

CUTLER J. CLEVELAND
Department of Geography, University of Illinois, Urbana 61801

ROBERT COSTANZA
Coastal Ecology Laboratory, Center for Wetland Resources, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge 70803

CHARLES A. S. HALL
Flathead Lake Biological Station, University of Montana, Bigfork 59911

ROBERT KAUFMANN
Complex Systems Research Center, University of New Hampshire, Durham 03824

References

1. R. Costanza, *Science* **210**, 1219 (1980).
2. C. A. S. Hall, C. J. Cleveland, R. Kaufmann, *Energy and Resource Quality: Ecology of the Economic Process* (Wiley, New York, in press).

Language

If the following lines are printed, some of my many friends in science will conclude that my long-predicted descent to crotchety triviality has been completed. Of that I am afraid; but altruistic concern for our journal has given me a robust (useful word, that) shield against the fear.

There is no such thing as a "quandry," except possibly as a neologism for a quantum laundry [where, presumably, WIMP's (Research News, 6 Sept., p. 955) may be cleaned up]. The word meant in Mitchell Waldrop's otherwise superb piece (Research News, 20 Sept., p. 1251) is surely "quandary."

Whether or not whatever spelling software now used in the editorial offices can be laundered, I plead for *Science* to try ever harder, in the face of declining language-consciousness everywhere else, to maintain its traditional high standards. This journal has been a strong point of defense against claims from the Other Culture that scientists care even less about language than those Others.

PAUL R. GROSS
Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543

Erratum: In the briefing "Plants can be patented now" by Marjorie Sun (News and Comment, 18 Oct., p. 303), it was incorrectly reported that the American Type Culture Collection does not have the facilities to accept plant genetic material. The depository did not have that capability when Molecular Genetics Research and Development Limited Partnership filed its patent application for a genetically engineered corn plant, but it has the facilities now.