

this kind of approach. Whether it is for a specific individual discipline or whether it is merely a way of looking at problems which spread through several disciplines, it needs to be encouraged and I think it should be. Getting back to ecology for a moment, it raises a question in my mind of whether or not you can draw any lines between looking at the problems with pollution and waste management for example, and the certain broader problems which you inevitably seem to lead into, for example, conservation. Where do you draw a line between the management of a river basin, for example, in order to prevent the buildup of sedimentation, the forests being cut down, the mountains washing into the river and the problem of waste or pollution management control?

Is there a dividing line or do you have to look at the total picture?

Dr. TUKEY. Well, I think it would be a mistake to have a sharp dividing line. I think you can put some differential emphasis on one thing rather than the other.

Mr. BROWN. You also have a host of political problems that you run into; for example, 3 or 4 years ago one of the big questions for political discussion was the matter of atmospheric tests and nuclear weapons. You could have looked at this pollution problem if you had wanted to, but at the same time you had a very large national defense element involved. Both of these incidentally, were not capable of being measured by the market appraisal approach.

How you weigh these sorts of problems becomes rather important.

Another interesting aspect of the trend of the testimony offered here by both of you is the degree to which it runs counter to the direction of our culture. For example, we are a consuming culture. The consumption per capita in this country is increasing on almost a logarithmic basis. This is the reason why we have waste. If we look at every process from the standpoint of how much can be recycled, it still flies in the face of the type of culture and the type of economy we have. It means, for example, that we won't produce as much because we will reuse certain products. We would also cut down on the amount of profit that certain enterprises would make because we would decrease volume. Has this type of analysis been considered by your panel?

Mr. MOSHER. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BROWN. Surely.

Mr. MOSHER. Getting back to the experimental city, wouldn't one of the considerations be whether the participating industries would be expected to operate on a normal profit basis or whether they would have to be subsidized?

Dr. SPILHAUS. May I answer that question?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes.

Dr. SPILHAUS. No, I don't think you need to cut down the volume of what people "consume." People consume nothing. They consume nothing now and they will consume nothing in the foreseeable future. They just use it and transform it into something and then throw it away. The only difference in my system of recycling is that it would be collected up and reprocessed. They could use much more stuff and there would be much more reprocessing done, and this could be on a perfectly good profitmaking basis. But it does require more