

## 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

1977: WARD GOODENOUGH, CLIFFORD GROBSTEIN, H. S. GUTOWSKY, N. BRUCE HANNAY, DONALD KENNEDY, NEAL E. MILLER, RAYMOND H. THOMPSON  
1978: RICHARD E. BALZHISER, JAMES F. CROW, HANS LANDSBERG, EDWARD NEY, FRANK W. PUTNAM, MAXINE SINGER, PAUL E. WAGGONER, F. KARL WILLENBROCK

### Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY

### Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

### Editorial Staff

*Managing Editor* ROBERT V. ORMES  
*Business Manager* HANS NUSSBAUM  
*Assistant Managing Editor* JOHN E. RINGLE  
*Production Editor* ELLEN E. MURPHY

*News and Comment:* BARBARA J. CULLITON, *Editor*; LUTHER J. CARTER, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, R. JEFFREY SMITH, NICHOLAS WADE, JOHN WALSH, *Editorial Assistant*, SCHERRAINE MACK

*Research News:* ALLEN L. HAMMOND, *Editor*; RICHARD A. KERR, GINA BARI KOLATA, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, WILLIAM D. METZ, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, *Editorial Assistant*, FANNIE GROOM

*Associate Editors:* ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, SYLVIA EBERHART, JUDITH GOTTLIEB

*Assistant Editors:* CAITLIN GORDON, RUTH KULSTAD, LOIS SCHMITT

*Book Reviews:* KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, *Editor*; LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG

*Letters:* CHRISTINE KARLIK

*Copy Editors:* ISABELLA BOULDIN, OLIVER HEATWOLE

*Production:* NANCY HARTNAGEL, JOHN BAKER; YA LI SWIGART, ELEANOR WARNER; JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, SHARON RYAN

*Covers, Reprints, and Permissions:* GRAYCE FINGER, *Editor*; CORRINE HARRIS, MARGARET LLOYD

*Guide to Scientific Instruments:* RICHARD SOMMER

*Assistant to the Editors:* RICHARD SEMIKLOSE

*Membership Recruitment:* GWENDOLYN HUDDLE

*Member and Subscription Records:* ANN RAGLAND

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321; Cable: Advancements, Washington. For "Instructions for Contributors," write the editorial office or see page xv, *Science*, 30 September 1977.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Business Office, 467-4411; Circulation, 467-4417.

### Advertising Representatives

*Director:* EARL J. SCHERAGO

*Production Manager:* MARGARET STERLING

*Advertising Sales Manager:* RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burkland, 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, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581)

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

## Environmental Assessment: A Pragmatic View

Population growth and supporting technology create the potential for tremendous environmental problems. The major question is how to control human activities so as to maximize societal and individual well-being while minimizing harmful effects on health and the environment. Two kinds of effort are required as a basis for decision-making. One is estimation of the actual risks or effects associated with technological options: this is difficult because of the diversity of potentially harmful anthropogenic agents, the large number of organisms and ecosystems that may be affected, and the complexity of exposure pathways and action mechanisms. The other effort is equally difficult because it involves a value judgment: namely, the judgment of what level of risk is acceptable.

The required action is obvious if gross effects are produced (such as those from thalidomide) or if an agent or process that is of very little real benefit (for instance, cyclamates in soft drinks) is even suspect. A dilemma arises when a highly beneficial activity results in low levels of pollutant exposure which, theoretically, could produce harmful effects that are not detectable epidemiologically or cannot be attributed to the pollutant should they occur in individuals. Exposure to ionizing radiation from diagnostic X-rays or nuclear power is one example; use of saccharin is another. A dilemma also arises if the activity is intertwined with societal habits or the economy. Obvious examples are the health effects that can be related to smoking and to the use of automobiles.

In such dilemmas, the course of action must fall between two extremes. One is to take immediate action when a potentially harmful agent is recognized, disregarding any benefits from its use, the availability of substitutes, or the socioeconomic effects of the action. But such precipitous action often does more harm than good. The other is to defer action until its net effect has been determined. Such deferred action often would not be in time to protect the public.

There are other difficulties, many largely unappreciated by researchers, policy-makers, or the public. One major problem is that the present research effort is inadequate. For example, although \$2 billion and 30 years have been spent studying the biological effects of ionizing radiation, acceptable exposure levels are still debated. Chemical pollutants are much more complex and many carry the same potential hazards, such as persistence and delayed carcinogenic effects. Another problem is that once a pollutant has been identified and publicized there is a tendency to reduce its risk to zero before acquiring biological and biomedical knowledge; this can lead to increased or prohibitive costs without commensurate benefits. And there is the problem of deciding which pollutants should receive attention first. To clarify decision-making and deepen public understanding, the following principles are proposed:

1) In every environmental and health assessment, the risk or effect (biological and economic) of a given action should be weighed against the risk or effect of not taking that action.

2) All risks or effects should be expressed in terms of the changes that would be produced in our existing state of well-being.

3) In all estimates of risks or effects, there should be a clear statement of the uncertainties that pertain to the assessment to be used in decision-making.

If these principles are adopted, it should be easier to effectively allocate our national research and engineering resources, to avoid making small risks even smaller while larger risks remain unattended, and to give society time for whatever planned and orderly socioeconomic changes are necessary to meet future conditions.—CYRIL COMAR, *Professor Emeritus, Cornell University, and Director, Environmental Assessment Department, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, California 94303*