

**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.

**Publisher:** William D. Carey

**Editor:** Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

**Deputy Editors:** Philip H. Abelson (*Engineering and Applied Sciences*); John I. Brauman (*Physical Sciences*); Gardner Lindzey (*Social Sciences*)

## EDITORIAL STAFF

**Managing Editor:** Patricia A. Morgan

**Assistant Managing Editors:** Nancy J. Hartnagel, John E. Ringle

**Senior Editors:** Eleanore Butz, Ruth Kulstad

**Associate Editors:** Martha Collins, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kerner, Edith Meyers, Phillip D. Szuromi, David F. Voss

**Letters Editor:** Christine Gilbert

**Book Reviews:** Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Deborah F. Washburn

**This Week in Science:** Ruth Levy Guyer

**Chief Production Editor:** Ellen E. Murphy

**Editing Department:** Lois Schmitt, *head*; Caitilin Gordon, Mary McDaniel, Barbara E. Patterson

**Copy Desk:** Lyle L. Green, Sharon Ryan, Beverly Shields, Anna Victoreen

**Production Manager:** Karen Schools

**Graphics and Production:** John Baker, *assistant manager*; Holly Bishop, Kathleen Cosimano, Eleanor Warner

**Covers Editor:** Grayce Finger

**Manuscript Systems Analyst:** William Carter

## NEWS STAFF

**News Editor:** Barbara J. Culliton

**News and Comment:** Colin Norman, *deputy editor*; Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Eliot Marshall, Marjorie Sun, John Walsh

**Research News:** Roger Lewin, *deputy editor*; Deborah M. Barnes, Richard A. Kerr, Gina Kolata, Jean L. Marx, Arthur L. Robinson, M. Mitchell Waldrop

**European Correspondent:** David Dickson

## BUSINESS STAFF

**Associate Publisher:** William M. Miller, III

**Business Staff Manager:** Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

**Classified Advertising:** Leo Lewis

**Membership Recruitment:** Gwendolyn Huddle

**Member and Subscription Records:** Ann Ragland

**Guide to Biotechnology Products and Instruments:** Shauna S. Roberts

## ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

**Director:** Earl J. Scherago

**Production Manager:** Donna Rivera

**Advertising Sales Manager:** Richard L. Charles

**Marketing Manager:** Herbert L. Burklund

**Sales:** New York, NY 10036: J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); Scotch Plains, NJ 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Chicago, IL 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); San Jose, CA 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16 St. (408-998-4690); Dorset, VT 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581).

Instructions for contributors appears on page xi of the 26 September 1986 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Telephone: 202-326-6500.

Advertising correspondence should be sent to Tenth Floor, 1515 Broadway, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050.

## Spanking, Reason, and the Environment

A n exceedingly logical friend of mine told me that when he was 10 years old and playing peacefully with his siblings, his father suddenly picked him up and spanked him. He turned in bewilderment to ask, "What did I do to deserve that?" "Nothing," his father replied. "Then why was I spanked?" "To teach you that this is not a rational world," was the answer. Even scientists without perceptive and theatrical fathers eventually learn that this is not a rational world. It should be part of our responsibility, however, to make it more so.

A sizable expansion of research by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) should be encouraged in the years ahead. Emotion runs high on environmental issues and the EPA has been marred by political factionalism. Yet it deals with our most precious and increasingly threatened resources: the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the soil that nourishes our food sources. Environmentalists argue that we are doing too little to protect our resources; industry argues that excessive regulation stifles progress. The reality is that we live in a world that becomes more densely populated each year and that population depends on chemicals for its food and its standard of living. So the problems will only become more serious, and they cannot be solved by headlines, law cases, or political posturing.

In the past when faced with problems in health, fuel resources, defense, and food supplies, we responded with programs of basic research that paved the way for vast improvements. The environmental problems may be even more difficult. First, their solutions are bound to be costly and therefore opposed by both special interests and taxpayers. Second, the research is complex, requiring risk assessment analyses that strain current theories and are not easy to explain to lay audiences. Third, many of the solutions require international as well as national cooperation. Acquisition of convincing data is even more important when nonprofessionals must be persuaded of a course of action involving complex science. Time is of the essence. Governments delay action, claiming "lack of facts," as the clock ticks against a background of a deteriorating environment.

The current EPA research budget is approximately \$300 million, but it is almost all devoted to specific problems: a selenium contamination of water in California, an acid rain problem in the Great Lakes, a toxic waste dump in New York. The specific problems must be pursued, but basic knowledge is needed to develop broad strategies as well as innovative solutions. The Superfund costs are in the billions; asbestos cleanup costs are staggering; the science of risk assessment itself is in a primitive state; the EPA is entering the recombinant DNA field, when most of the expertise is found in the National Institutes of Health. All of these areas are candidates for a basic research approach.

Furthermore, the type of research and its spatial requirements are unconventional. One model may be found in the recent opening by the Department of Energy of the gaseous fuels test site in Mercury, Nevada. Far away from any populated area, the facility is constructed to test the spread of toxic gases such as the methyl isocyanate released at Bhopal or hydrofluoric acid, a corrosive but widely used chemical. Tests are planned on protective measures such as vapor fences and detoxication techniques. A rational policy for toxic waste disposal requires facts, and this experimental approach is laudable.

A tripling of the EPA research budget is not unreasonable in view of the need. This could be achieved over the next couple of years mainly through a greatly expanded extramural program. EPA would be well advised to model its research program on the successful NIH example, with most of its research in a peer-reviewed extramural program but with a sizable intramural program as well. Because most of its research is inevitably controversial, it will gain by the outside component, both in terms of expertise and credibility.

There will be those who believe that these issues have become so politicized that they can only be solved by the media and publicity, others who say that they require lawyers and litigation, and still others who say that they devolve on politics and money. I would like to believe reason and data can be used to make decisions, but then I was never spanked at an appropriately impressionable age.—DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.