Report to the Association

William D. Carey

At the close of 1975, the state of the AAAS was good. In large measure this is because the members of the Association continue to do so much on a voluntary basis. As Board members, councillors, committee members, reviewers, symposium arrangers and participants, contributors to the journal, section and division officers, and donors, the members give thousands of days each year to the work of the AAAS, cheerfully and productively. This is what makes the difference.

The year 1975 was one of transition: from a budget deficit to a surplus, from a fragmented staff structure to a more unified one, and from an uncertain enterprise to one which shows strong signs of confidence and vitality. We begin a new year with optimism balanced by an awareness of much that remains to be done to put the AAAS on a firm and lively course for the years to come. That course must be mapped by all of us, not just by a few.

Finances

Despite the poor condition of the national economy in 1975, with continued inflation and high unemployment, the budget of the AAAS recovered from a 1974 operating deficit of $118,056 and ended the year in the black with an estimated surplus approaching $500,000. This turnabout is explained by several factors: (i) austerities introduced during 1974; (ii) negotiation at midyear of a new printing contract for *Science* with William Byrd Press that resulted in a 1975 saving of about $160,000 and a future estimated annual saving of some $300,000; (iii) increased income resulting from higher member and nonmember dues; (iv) higher advertising revenue than had been estimated; (v) improved income from investments; and (vi) various administrative economies.

Looking to 1976, we again anticipate a balanced budget although with a considerably smaller margin because of built-in cost increases to meet inflation and nominal pay adjustments. This forecast cannot be taken for granted, however, and strict expenditure control will be necessary. With continued progress in our systems for financial control and timely reporting, the Association now has an early warning system to alert us to trouble. Indeed, trouble may arrive as soon as 1977 when, if built-in cost increases continue and substantial further economies do not materialize, we could again begin to outrun our income. It would be unrealistic to suppose that two consecutive budget surpluses somehow guarantee a steady-state fiscal position.

As past experience has demonstrated, the only rapid recourse available when our finances go into a tailspin is to cut back on *Science*, a strategy that would surely be counterproductive in the long run. The alternatives, separately or in combination, are to raise dues another notch, solicit contributions from generous members, and increase our membership. We have reason to believe that the dues are about as high as our members can reasonably afford at this time and that our recent membership loss correlates closely with incremental dues increases. The Board has therefore approved an experiment in 1976 to bill members for an optional $10 contribution in addition to the current $25 member dues. If this approach succeeds in bringing in enough new income, we may be able to get by without a further dues increase. At the same time, we are looking into other ways to increase revenue, including new publishing ventures, new approaches to augment advertising income, and efforts to build an endowment from corporate and foundation sources. However, the primary solution to our future economic viability is to be found in beginning a new cycle of membership growth.

Membership

The 5-year trend in membership is shown in the following tabulation:

	Average member total for year	Change from previous year
1971	131,829	+2,556
1972	126,505	−5,324
1973	126,278	− 227
1974	122,300	−3,978
1975	118,949	−3,351

During the same 5-year period, member dues rose from $12 to $25 and nonmember subscription rates increased from $20 to $50. Rates charged for advertising have remained stable at $1640 per page. While the impact of these changes on membership suggests that we are pricing ourselves out of the market, another view of the problem is that our member recruitment methods may not be adequate. This question will be examined intensively in 1976. Historically, the Association has depended heavily upon mail campaigns as a membership strategy, and in a typical year about 750,000 pieces of mail have been sent out to affiliate and commercial mailing lists. For a time, we experienced a 2 percent return which produced 15,000 new members. The rate of return is now beginning to edge below 2 percent. In 1975, 12,161 new members were recruited, compared with a loss of 15,512 members, for a net of −3,351. The bright spot in 1975 was the response to a nominating campaign addressed to AAAS members. The appeal brought in 21,000 nominations and an 8.27 percent conversion to membership.

The message in these lines is that while the AAAS headquarters must investigate and test new recruitment strategies, *the members of the Association must become active recruiters*. The incentive is twofold: to replenish and increase the membership and to restrain future dues increases. In particular, we must seek younger members who are likely to emulate the long-term attachment to the AAAS which is so characteristic of the present core of our members.

Science

The journal remains the backbone of the Association, and is the primary inducement to membership. Its continued quality and vitality are our first concern. Perhaps too much of the burden of assuring the viability of the AAAS rests on *Science*. Diminishing that burden will not be easy, but a beginning is being made to initiate new developments which may help. Of this, more later.

In 1975 the weekly average circulation of *Science* was 146,300 copies, including 17,176 mailed abroad. The average number of text pages was 77, down from 80 pages in 1974 in order to scrape by within a deficit budget. In the 1976 budget, if all goes well, the journal will recover much of the lost ground and average close to 80 text pages per week.

The number of manuscripts received and reviewed by *Science* in 1975 was

5017 compared with 5610 in 1974. Only 24 percent of the manuscripts reviewed were published. Space and budget limitations explain the high turndown rate. While the better papers declined by *Science* usually appeared in other prestigious journals, the high rate of turndown could become a deterrent to some authors, particularly younger scientists. If this should happen it would be damaging, and it is another reason for finding the resources to increase the text content of the journal.

Despite budgetary pressures, the journal has more than held its own. Its editor, Dr. Philip H. Abelson, is a man with lively ideas and an addiction to adventure, and in the past 2 years he has brought out a stream of special issues of the journal which deal with critical problems of science, technology, and society. The first was the special issue on energy. The series has continued with a special issue on food, a compendium on population, and currently a special issue on materials resources. Earlier, Allen L. Hammond, Thomas H. Maugh II, and William D. Metz developed a book entitled *Energy and the Future* based on Research News articles published in *Science* which has sold more than 36,000 copies and generated $165,000 in gross receipts, not counting royalties on the Japanese, Portuguese, Hebrew, and Arabic editions.

We intend to continue to turn out special issues. The concept and the editorial planning are the responsibilities of the editorial staff of *Science*, but none of these special issues would see the light of day but for the willingness of authors of the first rank to go to work and meet the deadlines with no compensation other than the satisfaction of doing something important, useful, and timely. The special issues themselves become durable landmark compendia of the state of our present knowledge in critical areas, presented in a concert of disciplines. They represent a new dimension of our journal and contribute to other program initiatives of the AAAS in science and public policy, the advancement of public understanding of science, the arrangement of annual and special meetings, joint undertakings with affiliates, and communication across national boundaries. Thus, the journal becomes a stimulating and integrating influence on the whole Association.

As publisher of *Science* as well as chief operating officer of the AAAS, my mail frequently reminds me of our imperfections. Along with occasional bouquets, there comes a stream of criticism of the journal. Some of it is from authors who feel victimized by the treatment they have received at the hands of peer reviewers. In other cases, the target is the News and Comment section whose writers seem to strike home and occasionally hit a nerve. Its reporters have been accused, at times, of sensationalism and bias. I have made it a practice to take up each complaint of this nature with the editors and to reply personally to every letter that is not mere invective. As I see it, the problem of News and Comment—if there *is* a problem—is inevitable when a single journal undertakes to combine straightforward communication in science with journalistic reporting and news analysis. Toes are bound to be stepped on if the reporters not only tell the news but also comment on it, and I have not thought it my function as publisher to manage the news or alter its analysis. Each news story is signed by the reporter who writes it, and there is accountability. As to the accusation of bias, it is a very difficult thing to prove or disprove. The writers for News and Comment are expected to have open minds, but their job is both to report and analyze what is going on, to remember that they are working for a respected journal which is the communications voice of the Association, and to be very sure of their ground. In my judgment, the News and Comment section of *Science* holds an unrivaled position in American journalism, and it has earned it.

As for the peer review procedure as it is practiced by *Science* for refereeing manuscripts, one is hard put to imagine a workable substitute. The journal would be hopelessly mired without it. Some 8000 people serve as peer reviewers, generously and without compensation. Although the peer review system has no guarantee of infallibility nor immunity to human error and occasional injustice, it gets the job done, year in and year out. Perhaps we can improve our version of peer review. It may be that we give peer rankings more conclusive weight than we should. Perhaps we should turn over the list of reviewers more often. In the coming months we will look into these and other aspects of the referee system and welcome constructive suggestions. But there is no likelihood that we will alter its fundamentals.

Science continues to be a primary news source for science writers throughout the country. In 1975 hundreds of clippings were received from other publications based on articles in *Science*. While most of these were based on the Reports, a growing number came from the News and Comment section.

Clearly, the AAAS has a very strong asset in *Science*. Our responsibility is to preserve and enhance it, and to be certain that its credibility and editorial standards are not diminished in any way. Within those ground rules, the journal can continue its record of innovation and self-improvement to the benefit of the Association, its readers, and advertisers.

AAAS Staff and Organization

At the close of 1975, the AAAS had a staff complement of 151. Some 55 positions were allocated to *Science*, 64 were in business and management operations, and 32 were financed from grants and contracts.

Except for *Science*, it has been characteristic of the AAAS to start desirable new activities in the expectation that outside funds will gravitate to them and provide the resources for growth and service. This has led to the initiation of programs on a financial shoestring and to a situation where activities which are now regarded as basic are supported by meager AAAS funds and predominantly by grants and contracts. It is an unreliable way to live although it has enabled the Association to do some remarkable things which it could not have done from its own resources, such as the Congressional Fellows program and initiatives in science education. At the present time, roughly one-seventh of the operating funds of the Association come from grants and contracts. The danger in this pattern is that program choices may be influenced unwisely by grantsmanship factors. Procedures installed during 1975 include a Proposal Review Group to examine and coordinate all grant and contract proposals from the standpoint of costs and benefits to the AAAS.

Operating practices also led to fragmentation and imbalance in organization and personnel arrangements. Accordingly, the staff structure was reorganized in 1975 to consolidate lines of responsibility and eliminate overlapping. The present principal divisions and program heads are:

Executive Officer: William D. Carey

Editorial Division: Philip H. Abelson

Special Programs: Richard A. Scribner

Meetings and Publications: Arthur Herschman

Developing Programs: Jeannette Wedel

Science Education: Arthur H. Livermore

Opportunities in Science: Janet W. Brown

International Science: Irene Tinker

Public Sector Programs: William A. Blanpied

Administration: William R. Engelman

Comptroller: William A. Chapman

New Initiatives

In 1975 the Board of Directors created an Ad Hoc Committee on New Directions. Chaired by former president Leonard Rieser, the committee is making a fundamental examination of the expectations and capacities of the Association for effective service in the next decade. Unlike similar exercises in the past, the committee is not asked to write a report but will interact from time to time with the Board, the Council, and the staff in a direct and probably argumentative way. Lively papers are coming from individual members, and some may find their way into the pages of *Science* to trigger reactions and responses. The members of the Committee on New Directions are: Leonard M. Rieser (chairman), Vice President and Dean of Faculty, Dartmouth College; Carl Bennett, Staff Scientist, Battelle-Human Affairs Research Center; Ruth M. Davis, Director, Institute for Computer Science and Technology, National Bureau of Standards; Brewster C. Denny, Dean, Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Washington; Ezra Glaser, Falls Church, Virginia; Clifford Grobstein, Vice Chancellor, University of California, San Diego; Jacquelyne J. Jackson, Department of Sociology, Duke University; Carl Sagan, Laboratory for Planetary Studies, Cornell University; N. Richard Werthamer, Corporate Planning, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; William D. Carey (ex officio), Executive Officer, AAAS; and Richard A. Scribner (staff director), Special Programs Manager, AAAS.

With a planning grant from the Sloan Foundation, work is actively under way to shape the key elements of a workable AAAS program in the field of science, technology, and public policy. Premised on the expectation that the Association must take a responsible and effective part in the negotiation of public policy choices involving science and technology, this planning process is engaged in defining a mix of scholarly and public service activities which can involve the membership, the sections and divisions, affiliated societies, and staff elements of the AAAS. Policy research, published reports and analyses, national and regional meetings, congressional fellowships, service to governments, and the stimulation of science policy scholarship are some of the program elements being examined.

Through its Committee on Science and Public Policy, the AAAS is undertaking preparation of an exploratory report on "Federal Budgeting for Research and Development." This report is intended to inform the scientific and engineering communities with regard to the decision-making process which leads to governmental decisions on funding research and development and to illuminate significant issues and trends reflected in the federal budget for fiscal year 1977. The report will be published and preliminary planning is under way for a special symposium to be held in Washington in the spring of 1976 to amplify the more significant issues revealed by the study. If all goes as expected, this trial run will set the stage for an annual R & D budget analysis by the AAAS.

The report of the Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, prepared by Dr. John Edsall, was issued during 1975. It was disseminated widely through the affiliated societies as well as to the Congress and the media. The report raises important questions as to the roles which the AAAS and affiliated societies should undertake in dealing with issues of scientific freedom and responsibility. A workshop was convened by then President-Elect William D. McElroy in December to explore these questions and prepare for the symposium at the Boston Annual Meeting in February. The results of the symposium will be fed back to the AAAS Board as the basis for decisions on future initiatives by the AAAS in concert with its affiliates.

Opportunities in Science

New ground was broken by the Office of Opportunities in Science during 1975. Assisted by government and private funds, the AAAS staff undertook a systematic fact-finding study to identify handicapped scientists and to describe the barriers that they encounter. Special arrangements were planned to facilitate participation by handicapped scientists at the Boston Annual Meeting. Something of genuine importance and value has been begun with this work, which will be continued in cooperation with affiliated societies. In a similar way, the Office of Opportunities in Science has established a strong and productive role for the AAAS with respect to opportunities for women and minorities in science education.

The Association, concerned that minority women scientists might have special experience and needs that are not being met in other programs, organized the first conference of minority women in science in December. The conference resulted in greater understanding of the needs of these scientists, increased visibility for them, made numerous specific program proposals, and created a network of Black, Native American, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican women scientists. During the process, the AAAS has identified and is in contact with half of the Ph.D. minority women scientists in the United States, and we can expect the effect of this exploratory effort to be widely felt.

At the Annual Meeting in Boston there was a high level of participation by women scientists and a major "conference within a conference" on minorities in science whose proceedings will be published under sponsorship by the National Institutes of Health. The wide dissemination of the 1975 Council resolution on "Contributions of Native Americans" has drawn significant attention and, among other results, helped to bring a grant from the Educational Foundation of America to fund a full-time Native American on the AAAS staff to initiate programs to improve science education opportunities.

International Programs

During 1975 excellent progress was made in forming an American hemispheric consortium for the advancement of science. The Interciencia Association came into existence as an important outgrowth of the AAAS-CONACYT meeting in Mexico in 1973. The AAAS, led by Roger Revelle, Leonard Rieser, and Philip Abelson, did much to assist our Latin American colleagues in planning the new association which has been chartered in Venezuela. A trilingual journal, *Interciencia*, will begin publication in 1976 under the editorship of Marcel Roche of Venezuela. Panels were organized through the Interciencia Association for the Boston Annual Meeting and for a subsequent meeting in Brazil. Through efforts of Interciencia, a Peruvian association has been reactivated and is expected to join the consortium in 1976.

The Office of International Science arranged a key symposium in Mexico City for the International Women's Year, from which two books appeared in February published by the Overseas Development Council. A symposium on habitat at the Boston Annual Meeting will result in a report on policy implications of

current research which will be circulated at the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements to be held in Vancouver in May. The Office continued its ongoing work under contract to the Agency for International Development for studies of the ethnography of reproduction. It also began new initiatives to advise the Department of State and the National Science Foundation on the coordination of international cooperative activities in science. Dr. Gerald Holton was appointed as AAAS representative to the U.S. Commission for Unesco.

AAAS–ABA Conference

The AAAS–American Bar Association National Conference on Science, Technology, and the Law met several times during 1975 and examined a range of candidate areas for joint study. The Conference chose the field of weather modification as one which illustrates the problems of reconciling science and technology with legal issues and processes. In March 1976, a workshop/conference on "Improving Communication Between Law and Science: The Case of Weather Modification" was held at Duke University. The American Meteorological Society participated in the symposium.

Congressional Fellows

Six AAAS Congressional Science Fellows were selected in 1975 and began their assignments in the offices of Senators John Glenn (D–Ohio), Gary Hart (D–Colo.), and Dale Bumpers (D–Ark.) and with the Office of Technology Assessment. As of January 1976, a total of 14 fellows were involved in the program, eight of whom were sponsored by affiliated societies: American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, American Physical Society, American Psychological Association, Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, and Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.

The Congressional Science Fellows program has been one of the strongest initiatives of the AAAS in the area of public service. The quality of the candidates and the richness of their experiences with the Congress speak well for the program. The future, however, is unclear. Seed money advanced by the Ford Foundation is no longer available and, unless new sources of support are found soon, the AAAS part of the program will regrettably wind down.

Public Sector Programs

In other public policy initiatives, the AAAS held six Congressional Science Seminars in 1975, cosponsored with the Brookings Institution. All but one were repeated for the scientific attachés of foreign embassies in Washington. Work continued with AISLE, an interprofessional council seeking to develop better communication and working relationships among scientists, engineers, and other professionals, and state legislators. Plans are under way for an AISLE working conference in 1976 with the Massachusetts legislature. On a different front, six regional seminars on critical issues were held in Atlanta ("The World Food Crisis," coorganized with the Fernbank Science Center), Montgomery ("Energy Conservation and Solid Waste Disposal," with the Alabama Environmental Quality Association), Minneapolis ("End-Use Regulation," with the Minnesota Energy Agency), Albuquerque ("Energy, Water, and the West," with the National Conference of State Legislatures), Boston ("The Food Dilemma," with the Boston Science Museum and Boston Public Library), and Cleveland ("Energy Alternatives for Ohio," coorganized with Case Western Reserve University). These seminars were financed primarily by grants from the National Science Foundation with supplementary funding from the Ford Foundation to promote the public understanding of science, and represent a major commitment of the AAAS to public communication in science. The seminars received extensive local media coverage.

A significant AAAS initiative in public policy occurred early in 1975 with the submission to the White House of a "AAAS White Paper" on the issues to be considered in reestablishing a presidential science advisory system. A memorandum was also submitted to the House Committee on Science and Technology on technical aspects of government reporting of R & D programs and funds. Officers of the AAAS testified in both the Senate and the House on a range of issues including peer review procedures of federal agencies, the organization of scientific and technical advice, and budget policy. The News and Comment department of *Science* continued to cover developments in the public sector extensively and in depth, and many editorials dealt with matters of opinion on trends and problems in the relations between science, technology, and government. The involvement of the Association in public policy issues is also reflected in the symposia that were organized in concert with the U.N.-sponsored Conference on Population and Women in Development.

The Association cooperated with the Boston Public Library in arranging ten weekly lectures on "The Best of NOVA" in 1975, with a highly encouraging public response. A joint venture was carried out with the Junior Academy of the New York Academy of Science and the New York City Board of Education to serve 400 high school students and teachers with a special symposium around the theme "The Search for Life on Other Worlds." The AAAS expects to develop similar programs for students and teachers as a follow on to AAAS annual meetings.

The Association also completed the first year of a 3-year experimental Mass Media Intern program, funded by matching grants from the Russell Sage Foundation and the National Science Foundation. The program permitted ten outstanding advanced graduate students in the social and natural sciences to spend the summer of 1975 as working members of specific newspapers and broadcast media organizations in several parts of the country. A primary objective is to provide opportunities for young scientists to increase their understanding of editorial decision-making processes. However, the participating media organizations also benefit from the presence of people with training in scientific process.

An interdisciplinary workshop on the relationships between science, technology, ethics, and values was held in April 1975, funded by the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Some 50 scholars from a wide spectrum of disciplines in the humanities, the social and natural sciences, and engineering met to explore approaches to interdisciplinary research; the proceedings have been published. A full day's symposium was scheduled at the Boston Annual Meeting. As a follow-up, a research design project is being organized for the summer of 1976. It will bring together 12 scholars to develop a research agenda on American Values and Human Habitation.

Science Education

During 1975, the AAAS continued to stimulate more effective communications between school counselors and science and social studies teachers. Working with the American School Counselors Association, a conference of 70 participants from three states was held in

Madison, Wisconsin, to plan career guidance activities. The teaching of science in elementary and secondary schools was the subject of an April conference of science curriculum developers, publishers, and users at which a consensus emerged as to the need for implementing and improving new curricula and strengthening communication among lay and professional groups concerned with the quality of science education. As evidence of declining SAT scores and lowered achievement in science testing appeared in 1975, the AAAS registered its readiness to assist the new Advisory Panel for Score Decline, and an open forum for discussion of score decline took place at the Boston Annual Meeting.

The program to assist schools in implementing the elementary school program, *Science—A Process Approach*, which was begun in the summer of 1974, was completed in 1975. Under a new grant from the National Science Foundation, AAAS began work with 12 school systems with large minority populations to develop in-service teacher training programs.

The Short Courses for College Teachers has gone well. The program has grown from 101 to 113 classes, and nearly 2600 faculty members participated in the 1975 fall sessions.

A survey of teacher training institutions has been made to determine what influence our *Guidelines for the Preparation of Secondary School Teachers for Science and Mathematics* (published in 1971) has had on preservice teacher education. The findings will be presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association and the National Science Teachers Association later this year.

Meetings and Publications

The New York Annual Meeting was a stimulating one and had wide coverage by the national and regional media, but attendance was disappointing and a modest meeting deficit resulted. The deficit was tempered by an outstanding achievement by the Local Advisory Committee in raising funds. The reasons for the low attendance are obscure, but the combination of an economic recession and New York prices would appear to have had a decisive effect.

The theme for the 142nd Annual Meeting in Boston in February 1976 was "Science and Our Expectations: Bicentennial and Beyond." The program had ten public lectures, 180 symposia, and 240 symposia-half-days of activity during seven calendar days. Some 7000 people (including exhibitors, press, and speakers) attended the meeting.

The Boston Local Advisory Committee was chaired by Gerhard D. Bleicken, chairman of the Board, John Hancock Life Insurance Company, and Howard W. Johnson, chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. They did an excellent job of scheduling tours and special events.

Approximately 600 reporters attended the meeting; coverage was widespread and particularly heavy in Boston. Radio and television (CBS, ABC, and National Public Radio) covered many of the events.

The Board of Directors has given considerable thought to the growing uncertainties of the annual meetings, and to the matter of a proper balance in their content. At the Boston Meeting, for example, two-thirds of the symposia were concerned with scientific content. The Denver Meeting in 1977 will see the restoration of contributed papers, largely through the efforts of the Southwestern and Rocky Mountain Division. The timing of the Annual Meeting cannot be changed in the short term because of present contractual obligations and commitments, but the Board has decided that beginning in 1979 the meetings will be held during the first week of January. Consideration is also being given to holding a second but limited AAAS meeting each year in Washington, D.C., on interactions among science, technology, and public policy.

On the publishing side, in addition to *Science*, the AAAS publishes the quarterly journal *Science Books and Films* as well as a number of books, reports, and audiotapes. In 1975, AAAS published its *Science Film Catalog* which listed 4600 adult and 800 children's films. Two additional *Science* compendium volumes were published—*Population: Dynamics, Ethics, and Policy* (edited by Priscilla Reining and Irene Tinker with a preface by Margaret Mead) and *Food: Politics, Economics, Nutrition, and Research* (edited by Philip H. Abelson). The Association also published the special report *Scientific Freedom and Responsibility* (prepared by John T. Edsall for the AAAS Committee on this subject). AAAS has continued to provide tapes of selected symposia at the Annual Meeting. A special audiotape album *Cancer* (prepared by Barbara J. Culliton and Wallace K. Waterfall) has also been produced and is now available. As the year ended, the Board of Directors began to look intensively into other publishing possibilities that would enable the AAAS to reach general and special audiences.

Table 1. Summary budget for 1976.

Major category of revenue	1976 revenue budget	Office/Division	AAAS funds	Direct grant and contract funds	Total expense
Revenue (in thousands)			*Expense (in thousands)*		
Dues of annual members	$2,825	Executive Office	$ 435	$ 57	$ 492
Nonmember subscriptions	1,225	Contingency reserve	100		100
Advertising in *Science*	2,150	Division of Administration	1,094		1,094
Grant and contract funds	1,181	Office of Comptroller	284		284
Subscriptions to *Science Books and Films*	60	Editorial Division (*Science*)	4,217		4,217
		Meetings and Publications Division	567		567
Annual meeting registration and exposition	150	Developing Programs Division	209	839	1,048
		Public Sector Programs Division	124	175	299
Investment income	200				
Product sales	300	Total expense	7,030	1,071	8,101
Rent income	60	Unexpended operating balance	80		80
Contributions and other items	30	Total	$7,110	$1,071	$8,181
Total revenue	$8,181				

The Budget for 1976

Without repeating the general remarks which appear earlier in this report, suffice it to say that while the Association's budget is no longer in the red neither is it flush. Expenditure control is a necessity, and a portion of current income must be held aside to meet the contingencies that will inevitably arise. In the budget for 1976, payroll costs and inflation take a heavy toll, and they show every sign of doing so in the future as well. The budget shows an increase of 9 percent over the previous year, or a rise of $581,000 (of which two-thirds is to meet inflation and minimum increases in pay). That figure includes, however, a contingency of $100,000, which may not be spent. Beyond the contingency reserve is a planned operating margin of $80,000. The summary 1976 budget is shown in Table 1 and in Table 2 there is a preliminary look ahead to the following year when—with existing member and nonmember dues rates—a tighter situation appears to confront us.

Table 2. Long-range budget situation for 1977 [(in thousands), AAAS funds only; receipts and expenditures of direct grant and contract funds are excluded].

1977 revenue estimate*		$7,340
1976 budget annualized (full cost)†	$7,030	
1977 incremental costs for *Science* to maintain 1976 position	190	
1977 built-in increases‡	210	
Total estimated costs		7,430
Estimated net surplus (deficit)		(90)

*Assumes no increases in member or subscriber rates. †Includes $100,000 contingency reserve. ‡Annual step increases in pay and inflation.

Looking Ahead

As we enter 1976 and plan for the next 5 years, we have no shortage of concerns. There is much to look forward to in terms of new directions and a lively agenda. But our capacity to move ahead cannot exceed our income potential nor our membership base. If these do not grow, the AAAS cannot grow. These are our priority concerns.

At the same time, we must offer more in order to attract both new members and income. The strong appeal of *Science* alone cannot be expected to bear the whole load. We must examine a wide array of new initiatives and services in the coming year. Among them are new kinds of publications to reach students, business, and the professions with which science and technology interface. We must build more meaningful relationships with our affiliates by joining with them in useful programs, and by giving them more opportunities to shape the roles of the AAAS. We must make the AAAS more interesting to our engineering affiliates, in particular, and bring technology into our priorities. While the AAAS cannot and should not attempt to do what the discipline-oriented societies can do better, we can and should provide the means for interdisciplinary communication and cooperation. There are opportunities to provide outreach to high school and college students with interests in science and technology, and we should respond to them. We can do a better job in advancing the causes of minorities, women, and the handicapped in science education and career growth. We can be a constructive voice in debates about national policy alternatives and in stimulating local and regional understanding of science and technology in the concerns of the people. We can evolve new arrangements to lead the scientific and technical communities in looking to the challenges to scientific freedom and responsibility. We can involve our own members, our strongest resource, in the development and issuance of thoughtful positions on contemporary and approaching issues which divide and puzzle our fellow citizens.

We may not be able to do all these things at once, nor equally well, nor to everybody's satisfaction. But if we can do a *few* things well, and make a difference, the future of the Association can be very bright.

AAAS Council Meeting, 1976

Catherine Borras

The AAAS Council held its 1976 meeting on 21 February in Boston, Massachusetts, in the Fairfax Room of the Sheraton-Boston Hotel, with 51 of its 74 members in attendance at the morning session and 47 at the afternoon session. President William D. McElroy presided.

The Executive Officer's report of 1975 activities, which had been distributed to Council members in advance of the meeting, is reproduced on page 272 of this issue, together with the budget for 1976 (page 276).

Roger Revelle, who had retired on 31 December as chairman of the Board of Directors, expressed appreciation for the opportunity of having served over the past 3 years as an officer of the AAAS. As noteworthy AAAS accomplishments during that period, he listed the following: (i) presentation of testimony before congressional committees on matters affecting the health and welfare of science and technology in the United States; (ii) work on the development of science and public policy as a scientific discipline; (iii) expansion of international activities; (iv) participation in the establishment of the Interciencia Association, an organization of hemispheric associations for the advancement of science, which will soon start publishing the trilingual journal *Interciencia*; and (v) development of the Office of Opportunities in Science.

Dr. Revelle commended William D. Carey for rapidly, vigorously, and imaginatively taking hold of the affairs of the Association; Philip H. Abelson for effectively performing the duties of Acting Executive Officer in addition to those of editor of *Science* during the second half of 1974; and William T. Golden, treasurer, and the staff for vigilantly monitoring the Association's financial operations during a difficult period. He expressed appreciation to the co-chairmen of the 1976 Annual Meeting, Gerhard D. Bleicken and Howard W. Johnson; to the vice chair-

The author is administrative assistant to the Executive Officer, American Association for the Advancement of Science.