

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: Richard S. Nicholson

Editor: Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

News Editor: Ellis Rubinstein

Managing Editor: Patricia A. Morgan

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

EDITORIAL STAFF

Assistant Managing Editor: Monica M. Bradford

Senior Editors: Eleanore Butz, Martha Coleman, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Phillip D. Szurmi, David F. Voss
Associate Editors: Keith W. Brocklehurst, R. Brooks Hanson, Pamela J. Hines, Linda J. Miller

Letters Editor: Christine Gilbert

Book Reviews: Katherine Livingston, *editor*

Contributing Editor: Lawrence I. Grossman

Chief Production Editor: Ellen E. Murphy

Editing Department: Lois Schmitt, *head*; Mary McDaniel,

Patricia L. Moe, Barbara P. Ordway

Copy Desk: Joi S. Granger, Margaret E. Gray, MaryBeth Shartle, Beverly Shields

Production Manager: James Landry

Assistant Production Manager: Kathleen C. Fishback

Art Director: Yolanda M. Rook

Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, Julie Cherry,

Catherine S. Siskos

Systems Analyst: William Carter

NEWS STAFF

Correspondent-at-Large: Barbara J. Culliton

Deputy News Editors: John M. Benditt, Jean Marx, Colin Norman

News and Comment/Research News: Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Richard A. Kerr, Elliot Marshall, Joseph Palca, Robert Pool, Leslie Roberts, Marjorie Sun, M. Mitchell Waldrop

European Correspondent: Jeremy Cherfas

West Coast Correspondent: Marcia Barinaga

BUSINESS STAFF

Circulation Director: John G. Colson

Fulfillment Manager: Marlene Zendell

Business Staff Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

Classified Advertising Supervisor: Amie Charlene King

ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

Director: Earl J. Scherago

Traffic Manager: Donna Rivera

Traffic Manager (Recruitment): Gwen Canter

Advertising Sales Manager: Richard L. Charles

Marketing Manager: Herbert L. Burklund

Employment Sales Manager: Edward C. Keller

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 60914: Jack Ryan, 525 W. Higgins Rd. (312-885-8675); San Jose, CA 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16th St. (408-998-4690); Dorset, VT 05251: Fred W. Diefenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581); Damascus, MD 20872: Rick Sommer, 11318 Kings Valley Dr. (301-972-9270); U.K., Europe: Nick Jones, +44(0647)52918; Telex 42513; FAX (0647) 52053.

Information for contributors appears on page XI of the 22 December 1989 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, New York, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO, or FAX 212-382-3725.

Priority One: Rescue the Environment

President Bush has recommended that the Environmental Protection Agency be elevated to cabinet status and Congress is likely to approve. As a symbolic move to increase the visibility of our environmental crisis, the change is most welcome. However, unless a slipshod and emotional approach to environmental policy is replaced by a well-planned and scientific one, the EPA hero galloping to rescue the environmental damsel in distress is likely to fall off his horse.

In fact, EPA's change in status should be approved only on condition that improvements in its procedures be made. A major hurdle in protecting the environment is the cost of even partial solutions. Implementing provisions of the Clean Air Act will cost billions, as will disposal of toxic wastes and protection of the water supply. Our environmental dilemma calls for extraordinary thoughtfulness, good research, and careful choices based on cost-effectiveness. At present, priorities often seem to reflect random publicity, and research analysis is an unwanted guest hustled out the back door.

How can we change to a more rational policy? We can start by ensuring that the cost of each object includes the cost of an environmentally protective disposal. Like in mining, manufacturing of a beer bottle or a plastic toy should be subject to laws relating to incineration or recycling which would be supported by the cost of the object. In such circumstances, the manufacturers would have an incentive to devise more environmentally appropriate products, and consumers would have a voice in the cost-effective solutions.

The need to think through the entire cost of a product requires an element of overall planning currently lacking in environmental policy. If, for example, car emissions are reduced by 50 percent to obtain the minimal acceptable level for health, urban communities cannot allow more cars to enter their cities, thus nullifying the effect of the required technological changes. A farmer in Iowa might rightly say, "I shouldn't have to spend more for my car until the urban centers have a plan that makes my sacrifice worthwhile."

Part of a more rational approach to confronting environmental problems is to rely more on facts and be willing to modify policies as new facts are uncovered. Asbestos provides one good example. When asbestos was discovered it was hailed as a marvelous insulator and building material. As the industry grew, disturbing signs of adverse health effects on asbestos workers were swept under the rug, with tragic effects on health and life. The banning of asbestos then seemed logical, but recently, evidence has appeared to indicate that different forms of asbestos may have different pathological effects—one form is dangerous, the other relatively harmless at usual concentrations (see B. T. Mossman *et al.*, *Science*, 19 Jan., p. 294). If this is so, we may be spending between \$50 billion and \$150 billion needlessly. The dollars might be better spent to improve our water supplies and to provide prenatal care to underprivileged mothers.

Is there a way to institutionalize rational and informed environmental decisions? There is, and the time is now. A large and effective research arm should be put in place in the EPA at the same time that the organization is raised to cabinet level. EPA now does some research (approximately \$424 million worth annually), and to give credit where it is due, some EPA officials are already aware that they need more long-range planning. But present research by the agency is almost always directed toward immediate remedies, such as cleaning a specific dump site; as a result we are wasting billions on poorly devised general policy. To provide an effective recycling policy, for example, research in the chemistry of glasses is needed. To develop a policy for effective clean air requires transportation research among other things. Before many plastics can be recycled safely, polymer and combustion research are needed.

A basic research budget for environmental problems at least four times bigger than the present one could provide the kind of information needed to set priorities, stimulate novel ideas, and ensure mutually consistent overall policies. This plan would engage such diverse disciplines as engineering, geophysics, biology, epidemiology, and economics, and would include both Washington-based and university-based research, with the National Institutes of Health as a model. A cabinet-level EPA could then base environmental policy on facts and rational goals, rather than on sloganeering and lobbying. Such a comprehensive approach could provide for environmental research the same kind of stature and competence that we now have in our work in biomedicine and might make giant strides toward the rescue and rehabilitation of our beleaguered planet.—DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.