

suggested several institutional innovations. For example, the idea of vesting responsibility for all water resource planning in a single State agency and in giving urban communities in that State representation in the agency.

Another innovation was the establishment of areawide sewer and water authority for metropolitan areas. A third was legislation to provide for State regulation of individual wells and septic tanks in urbanizing areas. The Commission came to the conclusion that this latter was a very important source of pollution as the suburbs expanded faster than municipal water and sewage systems did.

The Commission also recommended that there should be an evaluation of Federal regulatory authority and incentives for reducing industrial pollution. On the basis of this recommendation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did contract with the Institute for Public Administration to do a report in industrial incentives for water pollution abatement, which report was issued in February of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, the work of this Commission seems to me to exemplify but not to exhaust, the contribution that social scientists can make in this area. I simply cite these activities as a concrete instance of how the procedural and institutional framework for regulating pollution can be improved.

A fourth way in which I think social scientists may contribute is to devise new and improved techniques of popular education on problems of pollution and ways for reconciling opposed views or disagreements, ways of reducing tensions and promoting community harmony as well as the will to work at the task of abatement.

Mr. Chairman, these will not be easy things to accomplish. I do not wish to forecast trouble unduly, but I'm struck by the similarities between the techniques for reducing certain kinds of pollution and some of the problems encountered in public health practice, specifically and especially in adding fluorides to drinking water. This is a matter which public health officers and social scientists together have had considerable experience in the late 1940's and in the 1950's. This committee may be well aware that fluoridation encountered sharp, vigorous and effective resistance in many communities. Fluoridation was often defeated the first time it was brought up and is still not used in some communities.

Resistance to it was not always well informed, but the advocates of fluoridation sometimes made a serious mistake when they assumed that everybody who resisted fluoridation was ignorant, superstitious, reactionary, or just plain crazy. Now, that was far from true. There were some, and there still are some, people who simply are prudent and curious about the long-term effects of fluoridation. Still others were resistant because they resented the air of superiority assumed by some engineers, scientists, and public health workers. Other people objected to being experimented on.

Still others were genuinely ignorant (not stupid) about fluoridation and they wanted to know how the process worked and whether there were safeguards against error in it.

I think it is the job of applied social scientists to devise better ways of explaining innovations to the affected communities; to help to recon-