

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

1976

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

1977

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

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, ROBERT GILLETTE (on sabbatical), CONSTANCE HOLDEN, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, NICHOLAS WADE. *Editorial Assistant*, SCHERRAINE MACK

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

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, LYNN MANFIELD, JANET KEGG

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

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

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, 11 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 September 1975. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

A Global Rush Toward Nuclear Energy

Perhaps the most important sequel to the Arab oil embargo has been movement toward widespread adoption of nuclear energy. Some 38 countries outside the United States have a total of 260 power reactors either operating, under construction, or on order. Although the United States still has a major role in nuclear matters, it is rapidly losing its technological and political supremacy.

The situation is complex; one approach toward insight is to concentrate on a single country—France. This nation has little indigenous coal and oil. In 1950 its energy consumption was the equivalent of 87.5 million metric tons of coal (MTec), 65.3 million coming from coal and 15.5 million from oil. By 1973 energy use had tripled, but consumption of coal had fallen by a third while use of petroleum had increased more than 11-fold to 175.6 MTec. Thus, France had become dependent on oil imports for about two-thirds of its energy. In contrast, the United States obtains about 14 percent of its energy from foreign sources. If there is need for the United States to attain energy independence, there is desperate need for France to do so.

The French, who have abundant domestic reserves of uranium, have chosen to place emphasis on nuclear energy, in which they have developed considerable expertise. Their first research reactor went critical in 1948 and the first power reactor in 1958. (Later they obtained extensive know-how from Westinghouse and General Electric.) They have in operation a small gaseous diffusion plant for separation of uranium isotopes and nuclear fuel processing plants to produce plutonium, and they are well along with techniques for handling radioactive waste. They have now had nearly two years' successful experience with a 250 Mwe breeder reactor and in this respect are far ahead of their U.S. counterparts.

Before the embargo, France was obtaining 8.5 percent of its electricity from nuclear reactors. The plan for 1985 calls for 72 percent nuclear, 14 percent hydroelectric, and 14 percent thermal power, with almost all of the latter coming from domestic coal. France is likely to reach these goals. The time required for planning and constructing a power reactor there is about half that in the United States.

France is also a major participant in an international consortium which is building a very large isotope separation plant to produce enriched uranium for power reactors. The partners include groups from Belgium, Italy, Spain, and Iran. The plant is scheduled to begin operation in 1979 and reach full production in 1981. It will have an annual production capacity of 10.8 million separative work units (SWU), or 2670 metric tons of enriched uranium having an assay of 3.15 percent ²³⁵U. A second large plant is in the planning stages with construction dependent on obtaining orders for nuclear fuel. Present U.S. capacity, which is being upgraded, is 16.6 million SWU.

In addition to the consortium, others, including an English-Dutch-German combine and the Russians, are producing and selling enriched uranium for reactors. The virtual monopoly of the United States is about to end. There has been talk on Capitol Hill of shutting off exports of enriched uranium, but this would merely lead to expediting the construction of separation plants elsewhere and to a further loss of U.S. influence.

The oil embargo forcefully reminded many nations that oil reserves are limited and oil supplies are vulnerable to other interruptions. The quadrupling of the price of oil made nuclear energy look very attractive from the viewpoints of cost and balance of payments. The embargo also came at a time when a number of industrialized countries had accumulated some experience in the design, construction, and operation of nuclear power reactors.

A country possessing power reactors is a step along the way toward nuclear weapons. However, irradiated fuel that contains plutonium also contains tremendous quantities of fission-product radioactivity. To obtain weapons-grade plutonium requires a complex processing plant. The best hope for holding down weapons proliferation is to bring spent-fuel processing plants under international control. Attaining such an objective should be a major and urgent goal of U.S. foreign policy.—PHILIP H. ABELSON