that it is by no means a prescription for the small-scale, decentralized, soft-technology energy future which has been held out as an ideal. Denis Hayes, who 8 years ago as a recent Stanford University undergraduate was national coordinator of the original "Earth Day" movement, is now on the staff of the Worldwatch Institute in Washington where he is writing a book on energy policy. According to Hayes, if all elements in the Carter plan are accepted by the Congress (an unlikely eventuality, he concedes) and are strictly observed, conditions will be created in which an energy future of the kind envisioned by the environmentalists might begin coming about spontaneously.

First, Hayes thinks that the conservation elements in the plan—the combination of fuel taxes, tax credits (such as for home insulation), new energy efficiency standards, utility rate reforms, the proposals for "cogeneration" of electricity along with industrial-process steam, "district heating" (piping hot water from power plants to nearby dwellings), and the like—could be enough to reduce the annual rate of growth in energy demand to a point well below the 1.8 percent the Administration has set as its goal. Beyond that, Hayes believes that faithful observance of the plan's promise not to sacrifice environmental protection to energy development would mean fewer new nuclear and coal-fired electric generating plants. The plan specifically calls for stricter requirements for the siting of nuclear plants and the monitoring of safety violations. Furthermore, it is uncompromising in its insistence that coal-fired plants be operated in full compliance with the Clean Air Act.

A significant part of the research program included in the plan is aimed at achieving the clean burning of coal. But, as Hayes points out, even if this research effort should prove successful, there would still remain the question of whether limits must not be placed on the amount of carbon dioxide—an inevitable combustion product of coal and other hydrocarbons—released into the atmosphere. A $3-million study of the effects of CO_2 on the atmosphere and the global climate is called for in the plan.

(At a press briefing on the plan 21 April, Robert Fri of ERDA observed: "It is conceivable that the carbon dioxide problem could be to the fossil-fuel program [what] proliferation is to the nuclear program: a sort of show-stopper or limitation on the indefinite expansion of that program. . . . This is about a year's study. . . . Meanwhile, we are going to retain the mix of coal and nuclear in the system so that we have the opportunity to go the way that is best in the future.")

A commitment to the "soft" energy path clearly would bring, for better or worse, marked social and economic changes. Given the country's conservatism, no President and no Congress is ever likely to embrace such changes wholesale; if the soft path should be chosen, it is more likely to be through force of circumstances and gradual improvisation than by conscious policy. Even Pres-

Stanford Goes to Washington

It's well known that Harvard sent Henry Kissinger to handle foreign affairs for the Nixon-Ford Administrations and that Caltech dispatched Harold Brown to head the Defense Department for Jimmy Carter, thus putting men with academic backgrounds in some of the most sensitive government posts. But operating just outside the glare of the media spotlights, Stanford University has managed to infiltrate several faculty members into subcabinet posts, including some with major responsibilities for scientific matters. The trend is not pronounced enough to start talking of a "Stanford mafia" dominating Washington affairs, but it was enough to inspire the Stanford publicity office to issue a press release headlined "Stanford in Washington, Faculty Division."

The latest Sanford coup came on 21 April when the President announced that he would nominate Richard C. Atkinson, 48, as director of the National Science Foundation (NSF). Atkinson, an experimental psychologist on leave from Stanford since mid-1975, has already been serving as deputy director and then acting director of NSF. He is said to have been the National Science Board's top choice to become the next full-fledged director. (The board, the policy-making body for NSF, was the chief but not exclusive source of nominations for the post.)

If confirmed by the Senate as expected, Atkinson will become the first behavioral scientist to head NSF. That has led some observers to speculate that NSF's social and behavioral sciences programs, long relatively neglected, may be due for invigoration. Atkinson is known to feel that the social and behavioral sciences deserve some "special attention," but he is not a disciplinary chauvinist. He had strong backing for the job from physicists, chemists, and other "hard" scientists, both on the National Science Board and elsewhere. His top priorities, if he becomes director, are said to include, among other things, the strengthening of basic research, a reevaluation of how NSF can best carry out its role in applied research, measures to ensure the flow of young scientists into basic research when tenure pipelines are clogged, and evaluation of NSF activities by outside reviewers.

Atkinson joins these other Stanford faculty members in Washington:

▶ Donald Kennedy, on leave as professor of human biology while serving as director of the Food and Drug Administration.

▶ David A. Hamburg, on leave as professor of psychiatry while serving as president of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, which often advises the government.

▶ Norman Kretchmer, former medical professor, now director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

▶ Barbara Babcock, on leave as professor of law while heading the civil division of the Justice Department.

▶ Thomas Ehrlich, on leave as law school dean while serving as president of the Legal Services Corporation, a government-funded organization that provides financial support for legal services for the poor.

One jubilant Stanford publicist told *Science* that the invasion of government by his school was just one more bit of evidence that "we're in the same league as Harvard and Berkeley in lots of different dimensions." He boasted that Stanford ranked first in production of National Medal of Science winners in each of the past 3 years, third in the esteem of NSF fellowship winners, and fourth in grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, not to mention its successful fund-raising drive which is about to top $300 million, the largest such sum ever raised.

But one of the Stanford infiltrators put it this way: "I think its about time we got our chance in Washington after Harvard has practically destroyed the place."—P.M.B.