

the research establishment. We need to look around, establish what the pressing needs are—solar technology is one, the development of a solar cooking device to offset the world firewood crisis.” Brown acknowledged it was hard to imagine Ed David or Guy Stever talking up solar cookers, but “things may change. We can’t divorce anything from the needs of the rest of the world.”

• **B. F. Skinner**, psychologist, author of *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*: “I would like to see someone who took more interest in the behavioral sciences . . . to see the President more familiar with what is available on human behavior. The kind of behavior modification in education, counseling, and industry has never crept into government very far. The decision-makers think of historical analogies or think what they would do in a situation—we need modern analysis of human behavior brought to problems. . . . Decision-makers don’t look at all the consequences.” The raising of gas prices, for example—“that saves some gas but what about all the people who are resentful about those who can drive?”

• **Amitai Etzioni**, sociologist, director of the Center for Policy Research, Inc.: “My number one priority would be for the President to set up an ‘Earth NASA’ dedicated to developing the programs needed to deal with domestic problems. It would involve putting together about 100 programs in the federal bureaucracy, such as RANN [Research Applied to National Needs], experimental programs at the National Bureau of Standards, the National Institute on Education—each one dealing with one leg of the elephant—big, visible, and powerful enough to R & D our domestic problems.”

• **Garrett Hardin**, human ecologist and propounder of the “tragedy of the commons”: “He should have the sort of relationship with the President that Vannevar Bush had with Roosevelt—be around the White House and be available in an informal way. He would have to be a person the President had such confidence in that he could sit in on anything. . . . The important thing is to sort of lean against the President, cause him to shade his decisions some.” The science advisers of the past frequently have “failed to do very much good. We need one to whom the President can say, ‘Hey, Joe, what about this?’”

• **Margaret Mead**, anthropologist: “I do not see a social scientist as science adviser. I see a natural scientist, preferably a biologist, who can relate to both the social and physical sciences. The biologist should preferably be an ecologist,

Stever Gets Delayed Nod

H. Guyford Stever seems headed for prompt confirmation as President’s science adviser, but the timing of the announcement that the nomination was being sent to the Senate came as something of a surprise. A White House hold on the Stever nomination since mid-June had encouraged assumptions that it was politically sensitive and might not appear, at least until after the Republican convention.

Ford’s nomination of Stever had been strongly rumored in June, but four conservative Republican senators had objected to Stever because of National Science Foundation (NSF) management of science curriculum programs (*Science*, 2 July). Ford’s political advisers had reportedly urged him to avoid actions which could offend conservatives who might desert him in his neck-and-neck race with Ronald Reagan for the GOP presidential nomination.

If this was the case, why did the White House send the nomination forward when the contest for delegates was at fever pitch? The White House, characteristically, has no comment on the timing of the nomination. (The nomination itself was made with a minimum of the fanfare which often attends appointments of this sort. It was done through a “posting,” which involved an announcement limited to the bare essentials.) Stever himself is keeping tactfully mum on the subject. Some observers on Capitol Hill, however, find the timing inexplicable and, according to their political lights, are interpreting it as a product of either political courage or inept staff work.

Others speculated that the President apparently decided to go ahead because the move to restore the science adviser to the White House was getting continuing strong bipartisan support and the opposition had not gained momentum. Republican sources on Capitol Hill said as late as the day before the confirmation hearing when *Science* went to press that no concerted effort was being made to muster opposition to Stever.

Stever, if confirmed, would become the first full-blown presidential science adviser since President Nixon swept the scientists out of the White House in 1972. Since then, Stever has combined his role as ex cathedra President’s science adviser with the directorship of NSF he has held for 4 years.

No Fresh Ideas

As once and future science adviser, Stever, not surprisingly, did not propose any radical departures when asked about his plans and ideas for the job. Stever told *Science* he will continue doing what he has done as part-time science adviser, but now expects to be more intimately connected with the daily problems relating to science and technology.

He says he hopes the office will be able to go beyond fire-fighting and into long-range issues, but “with the size of the office, long-range issues will have to be farmed out to agencies and others to study . . . we do not have as big a team as is needed.” An immediate task is to sort out information that is already available: “There are quite a number of studies which either are pointed toward long-range issues or could be diverted to long-range issues, so the problem everybody has is then taking the studies that do automatically originate in our society and putting them to use.”

Getting a little more specific, Stever said, “Science and technology is still going to be very important in the traditional roles it’s had in defense. The space program has proved our tremendous technological capability. But we have not proven we can do as well in government with some of the civilian side of science and technology.” He would like to see some studies of laws and regulations to see to what extent they may be slowing or misdirecting research in the private sector. Agricultural research is one category that requires a “new look,” he said.

The first project to be overseen by the new office will be a 2-year study, mandated by the legislation, of the policies, programs, and organization of the entire federal science structure. An 8- to 14-member commission is supposed to be appointed by the President for this.

As for the role of the science adviser, Stever says, “the whole object is to try to be the translator—take ideas welling up in the scientific community and see that the government takes action on them.”—J.W. and C.H.