

(Continued from page 388)

so we're concerned about the effectiveness of any future operation where they are supposed to work together in concert."

These fears may be a bit overstated. The new center or even the intergovernmental committee will not directly oversee the \$250 million fund, so that staff conflicts, should they develop, will not necessarily affect the funding process. It is the United Nations Development Program, a totally independent organization within the UN, that will disburse the \$250 million "interim fund" which the Vienna conference agreed should be set up prior to the establishment of a long-term financing system. The center is strictly advisory.

Officials at State nonetheless say they are keeping a close watch on who will be appointed head of the new center. "If it is a person who has been on the political

side of it rather than a person with established credentials," said one, "that will be hard for us to accept."

Though an epidemic of second thoughts seems to have broken out among U.S. officials, the Administration stance is to back the UNCSTD accords, and the Office of Management and Budget is said to have recently been persuaded to back the financial aspects as well. Just how this will translate into numbers is unclear, however. Officials at State are quick to point to President Carter's recent decision to raise the defense budget by more than 25 percent over inflation in the next 5 years. There may not be room in the overall budget, they suggest, for more support of Third World science and technology.

Another problem is Congress. Even if the Administration comes through at the UN pledging conference in March, the contribution must be ratified on Capitol

Hill, and the mood there has been anything but responsive. Administration officials are still trying to salvage plans for a U.S. Institute for Scientific and Technical Cooperation (ISTC) that had been a centerpiece of U.S. presentations at the Vienna conference. The Senate had refused funds for the institute in June (*Science*, 6 July 1979). The House has now agreed that funds for the institute should be provided, but so far a Senate-House conference committee has failed to come to an agreement. The battle over the Vienna accords may be even tougher. While a handful of U.S. congressmen were present at the conference, few have even heard of UNCSTD or what it proposes to do.

Even UN officials share in the gloom. They note that with the tense situations in Iran and Afghanistan, the world climate for international cooperation has considerably eroded since August. At

Religious Groups Unite Behind Banner of

Wasting energy is definitely contrary to God's will, but this country is sorely in need of a "new theology" that promotes the values of conservation and renewable energy sources. That was the message of an unusual meeting held in Washington on 10 January on "Religion and Energy in the '80s." Inaugurated at a White House breakfast featuring President Carter and Energy Secretary Charles Duncan, the meeting was attended by about 150 representatives of the Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Jewish faiths.

No major politician, with the possible exception of California Governor Jerry Brown, has tried seriously to confront the citizenry with the notion that finite resources inevitably mean changes in life-styles. So now it seems religious groups are preparing to assume the responsibility. And while they do not have the television networks at their command, there is a not inconsiderable audience out there in the churches and synagogues.

According to a spokesman for the National Council of Churches (NCC), the main sponsor, the meeting had its genesis last July when Jimmy Carter summoned a stream of people from all walks of life up to the mountaintop at Camp David to figure out what to do about the national malaise.

This month's meeting had the blessings of Carter, who was reportedly very eloquent at the breakfast, describing how conservation might improve the quality of life by fostering a new sense of community. Duncan, too, encouraged the clerics—sounding "more outspoken on conservation than Schlesinger ever was," according to one participant.

The rest of the meeting ranged from lofty moralizing about the "theological imperatives" of energy to homely talk about weatherizing churches in Connecticut.

Although energy policy has caused furious debate among various Protestant denominations, it appeared at the meeting that all three major religious groups had finally coa-

lesced around an energy ethic that features conservation as the number one concern. Closely following is emphasis on development of renewable resources and on choices that will enhance employment opportunities and not penalize the poor.

All that is needed now, according to the main speakers, is a new theology that promotes these objectives. "We operate with a theology that makes it difficult for us to confront" the energy problem, said Elizabeth Bettenhausen, associate professor at Boston University School of Theology. She said one of the difficulties is that many Christians still regard this earth as unimportant since it is only a temporary stop on the way to heaven. Another negative factor she cited was the idea that America is made up of God's chosen people—that "God loves America in a peculiar way . . . so God will take care of everything including the limitations on natural resources." The notion that God sets limits, she noted, contradicts 250 years in which the consciousness of Americans was molded by the limitless frontier.

Rabbi Walter Wurzburger quite agreed that we need to "create the kind of theology that makes us responsible custodians of limited resources" and suggested that Judaism, with its emphasis on living in the here and now and prohibitions on waste, offered appropriate guidance. The Catholic representative, William Miller, S.J., added that if we are seeking energy modes that fill human needs, conservation and renewable energy are desirable because they provide more employment than capital-intensive energy sources. Harold Bennett of the Southern Baptist Convention weighed in with a call for "an ethic of parsimony." The theme predominating in these talks was that when God gave man "dominion" over the earth, He did not mean man was supposed to "dominate"

the conference in Vienna, it was hoped that the oil-producing developing countries would make a significant contribution to the fund. No one now seems to be sure where they stand. UN officials say they are optimistic that voluntary contributions from all countries will at least total \$100 million for the years 1980 and 1981, but this figure includes a large donation from the United States, which now seems anything but certain.

If the conference in Vienna accomplished little else, it pounded home the fact that three-fourths of the world's people conduct only 3 percent of the world's research and development. In what many regard as a politically naïve attempt at cure, the Group of 77 called for a \$2 to \$4 billion fund to help heal the rift between developed and developing countries. After two weeks of debate, an interim fund of \$250 million was proposed.

That the North might be tempted to further compromise the financial side of the Vienna agreements should come as no surprise. After all, what does it have to gain? In the most basic terms of the North-South dialogue, it stands only to have its pockets picked, since it is cast in the role of donor rather than receiver. And with domestic economic ills taking an ever-greater toll, developed nations are reluctant to provide funds for Third World development.

But in an indirect way, the North, and especially the United States, stands to gain much. The industrialized nations need access to the markets and raw materials of developing countries. Of the total U.S. imports, more than 45 percent come from the Third World. "Power today," says Wilkowski, "does not necessarily come from traditional sources, such as armies, navies, and military weapons. Rather it can come from valu-

able resources, petroleum being the most obvious." And the United States sells more manufactured goods to the Third World than to the entire European community, Eastern Europe, and Soviet Union combined. The Third World is a \$42 billion market the United States can ill afford to lose or ignore.

And following events in Iran, Nicaragua, and elsewhere, developed countries are realizing anew that they need to keep some handle on the forms of development followed by Third World countries, and not just for access to markets and raw materials.

That science and technology are high cards in the new international political economy can no longer be in doubt, given the clamor for it at Vienna. It seems in the best interest of the North to look at the issue less as one of foreign aid and more as one of foreign policy.

—WILLIAM J. BROAD

Conservation, Renewable Energy Sources

and gobble everything up. He meant it was man's responsibility to exercise careful stewardship over resources.

There are probably few public officials whose outlook so closely conforms to God's as Denis Hayes. Hayes, organizer of the 1970 Earth Day and now director of the Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI) in Golden, Colorado, buoyantly expressed the hope that SERI "will become for energy policy what NASA has become for space." Pricing determines what energy choices are made but the "biases in the market are staggering," he said. Federal, state, and local governments, for example, subsidize nonrenewable energy sources to the tune of \$13.5 billion a year, leaving \$0.5 billion for renewable ones. Yet if the government ceased treating energy technologies as "neutral and interchangeable" and instead eyed them for nonmonetary "values" such as safety, accessibility, and benign social and environmental effects, it would see that it is backing the wrong horses.

The talk of values that always accompanies talk of soft, or alternative, or nonrenewable energy is symptomatic of the fact that ethical considerations have only recently penetrated some areas of national discussion. The civil rights and war movements awoke Americans to reassessing their moral and ethical assumptions. Many a university stock portfolio was reshuffled as a result of pressures to have investment policies conform with goals of humanitarianism and social justice. Now these righteous preoccupations have spread to energy under the heading of "ecological justice"—defined in an NCC pamphlet as "equity for all members of the community of life within the sustainable boundaries of the biosphere."

A stockholder action for ecological justice is being supported by the Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility, a group sponsored by the NCC. According to director

Timothy Smith, 12 utility companies across the land are to be petitioned by religious groups that are also shareholders to add three items to the ballot at the annual shareholders meeting: people will vote on whether to have the company look harder for alternative (that is, renewable) energy sources, to put greater emphasis on energy conservation, and to stop all development on nuclear plants.

Energy has been a focus of the NCC's moral concern since 1976, when it issued a resolution calling for a ban on plutonium reprocessing and its use for energy production. Last May it issued its own energy policy, proconservation and antinuclear, which failed to pass the board in 1978 but which was jolted through following the trauma of Three Mile Island. The NCC has long been at odds with the Atomic Industrial Forum, with which it had what Carl Goldstein of the AIF calls a "long arduous debate" last year. Goldstein says the debates staged by the NCC have been "badly skewed" against all the conventional nonrenewable energy sources, and he feels members of the organization are "turning their backs on energy needs."

Church groups have made it clear that ecological justice, whether or not a "new theology" is developed, is now to be regarded as part of their mission. With the resurgence of religion in this country, that old-fashioned term "sin," which has been drowned in the currents of moral relativism, is making a comeback. A phrase in the NCC booklet on energy and ethics proclaims that humanity's "perversion of dominion into domination [of nature] is a sin and it is one of the underlying causes of the energy crisis." The new religious movements of the past decade have stressed exploration of the inner person. But as human dependence on the fragile biosphere becomes ever more apparent, movements of the 1980's may look more like neo-Pantheism.—CONSTANCE HOLDEN