

planned. Answer: "I do not share the bureaucratic point of view. Alternative forms of energy are still only at the discussion stage. Solid research is needed to replace even a very minor proportion of gas and oil. I am a realist: raw hydrocarbons are and will remain the 20th century's major form of energy for a long time, and they are cheap. However, alternative forms of energy should be used at small plants even today. For instance, when I was in Australia, I did not see a single farm without a wind turbine. I support a variety of energy forms being supplied to a given region. If oil and gas can be partially replaced today by wind, solar, tidal, or geothermal water energy, why not do it? We would be able to economize on oil. Moreover, I believe we should search for other forms of energy, for instance, hot gases dissolved in subterranean water, and we need to establish alternative forms of transportation like dirigibles. Some Japanese visitors once made me blush by asking why we use airplanes and helicopters, rather than dirigibles for large freight deliveries. How could I answer them? Tsiolkovsky, who was always correct - even in the most complicated cosmic calculations - said the dirigible was the only economically sound form of transportation to deliver large freight shipments over long distances. Why do we believe Tsiolkovsky about everything else, but not about this? There are many opponents to the idea of building dirigibles - above all, those in the aviation industry who do not want any competition which would prevent them from shipping freight at very high cost. In order to understand how expensive freight shipments are, let me tell you that the cost of shipping drilling equipment 70-100 kilometres is equal to its value.

However, dirigibles are another subject altogether. What strikes me in this story is our tendency to create monopolies."