

## American Association for the Advancement of Science

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Paul M. Gross, *Retiring President, Chairman*  
 Alan T. Waterman, *President*  
 Laurence M. Gould, *President Elect*  
 Henry Eyring  
 H. Bentley Glass  
 Don K. Price  
 Mina Rees  
 Walter Orr Roberts  
 Alfred S. Romer  
 William W. Rubey  
 Paul E. Klopsteg  
*Treasurer*  
 Dael Wolfe  
*Executive Officer*

### SECTION VICE PRESIDENTS AND SECRETARIES

MATHEMATICS (A)  
 Magnus R. Hestenes      Wallace Givens  
 PHYSICS (B)  
 Elmer Hutchisson      Stanley S. Ballard  
 CHEMISTRY (C)  
 Milton Orchin      S. L. Meisel  
 ASTRONOMY (D)  
 Paul Herget      Frank Bradshaw Wood  
 GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY (E)  
 John C. Reed      Richard H. Mahard  
 ZOOLOGICAL SCIENCES (F)  
 Dietrich Bodenstein      David W. Bishop  
 BOTANICAL SCIENCES (G)  
 Aaron J. Sharp      Harriet B. Creighton  
 ANTHROPOLOGY (H)  
 David A. Baerreis      Eleanor Leacock  
 PSYCHOLOGY (I)  
 Lloyd G. Humphreys      Frank W. Finger  
 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES (K)  
 Kingsley Davis      Ithiel de Sola Pool  
 HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE (L)  
 Adolph Grünbaum      N. Russell Hanson  
 ENGINEERING (M)  
 Clarence E. Davies      Leroy K. Wheelock  
 MEDICAL SCIENCES (N)  
 Francis D. Moore      Oscar Touster  
 DENTISTRY (Nd)  
 Paul E. Boyle      S. J. Kreshover  
 PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES (Np)  
 Don E. Francke  
 AGRICULTURE (O)  
 A. H. Moseman      Howard B. Sprague  
 INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE (P)  
 Alfred T. Waidelich      Allen T. Bonnell  
 EDUCATION (Q)  
 H. E. Wise      Herbert A. Smith  
 INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION (T)  
 Foster E. Mohrhardt      Phyllis V. Parkins  
 STATISTICS (U)  
 Harold Hotelling      Morris B. Ullman

### PACIFIC DIVISION

John P. Tully      Robert C. Miller  
*President*      *Secretary*

### SOUTHWESTERN AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN DIVISION

Anton H. Berkman      Marlowe G. Anderson  
*President*      *Executive Secretary*

### ALASKA DIVISION

Allan H. Mick      George Dahlgren  
*President*      *Executive Secretary*

The American Association for the Advancement of Science was founded in 1848 and incorporated in 1874. Its objects are to further the work of scientists, to facilitate cooperation among them, to improve the effectiveness of science in the promotion of human welfare, and to increase public understanding and appreciation of the importance and promise of the methods of science in human progress.

## How Guard Our Diversity in Science?

Recently Jerome Wiesner testified before the House Committee on Government Appropriations that the government plans to allocate for the coming fiscal year the sum of \$12.3 billion for support of research and development in the nation. Although this sum represents only about 15 percent of the overall federal budget, it amounts to well over one-third that portion not formally committed.

These are awesome figures. Their positive impact is clear enough. But there are cautionary aspects that cannot be stressed too often. They were introduced by the President when he observed that federally financed activities in defense, space, and atomic energy absorb roughly two-thirds of our total supply of physical scientists and engineers. They are further emphasized by a committee headed by J. Herbert Holloman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. Such is the stress created by this drain that we are actually falling behind Western Europe, England, and Japan in our resources of scientific talent available to industrial production.

Throughout our national history we have depended on a demand mechanism to distribute human effort and resources in a pattern which, if sometimes wasteful in the short term, in the long term provided proven benefits. This approach has served us well. But it assumed two fundamental premises, among others: that available resources of trained human talent would continue to be great enough to fill all demands, and that their commitments would continue to be highly plural in nature and, moreover, flexible. What do we do when so large a fraction of the reserve is being inflexibly committed to specific enterprises that the bottom of the barrel is visible? What do we do when—as is not yet universally recognized—it is not dollars but unbuyable human gifts that will set the limit?

But there is another dimension to this matter of plural commitment of scientific and engineering talent. In the past, we have owed some of the greatest advances in our understanding of nature—not to mention the greatest leaps in technical exploitation—to the work of individual genius ill-fitted to the kind of specific scientific commitment that faces us on such a colossal scale today. It would be strange if the potential of such individuals in the years to come were less than it has been in the past. Indeed, it ought to be yet greater. For the substrate of scientific knowledge with which it works today is enormously larger. And again, the absolute numbers of such exceptionally gifted individuals among us should increase in the future, provided that conditions for their discovery and development do not deteriorate.

But what part of this priceless resource is annually swept irrevocably into the maw of activities organized about sharply committed goals? What part is annually consigned, at a formative age, to an environment which, while it may produce worthy scientific citizens, may also extinguish the full reach of their potential? These are very serious questions indeed. They ought to be argued and thought about deeply at every level by those concerned for our future scientific welfare and progress.—CARRYL P. HASKINS, *Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, D.C.*