

industry they have largely ignored it to date. True, some utilities have actually supported fusion work and EPRI has an active program in this area, but what is needed is industrywide recognition that fusion is a must sometime in the next century, perhaps earlier than it is now possible to achieve, even with an all-out effort. Fusion requires both the support and the direction of utilities as it enters the technology phases. User input is essential to the physics community if user criteria are to properly influence the continued research and the emerging development and power reactor phases.

Fusion is not without its potential Achilles' heel, just like each of the other alternatives, but its potential problems are fundamentally different from those that could constrain coal, LWR, and breeders. Most importantly, fusion problems are susceptible to technical resolution. Resolution will not be simple, cheap, or even assured, but the risk of not sustaining an aggressive program is simply unacceptable, given the future as I see it. To rely *solely* on the breeder as our long-term option, or to naively assume that solar can meet the nation's electricity needs, is playing Russian roulette with our children's future.

Correction

A private nuclear industry study on the effects of the Administration's policy against nuclear technology exports predicted that the cost to the American economy was the loss of more than \$20 billion in export dollar earnings over the next five years on the projected world demand for roughly 83 gigawatts of nuclear electrical power capacity. In the *Executive Intelligence Review's* last issue (Vol. IV, No. 52), typographical errors in the *Energy* report erroneously rendered these figures as \$20 million and 83 megawatts, respectively.

The same study projected that the Administration's policy meant the loss of roughly 2,180,000 man-years of jobs over the same five-year period — not man-hours, as the article incorrectly states.