

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

1976

ALFRED E. BROWN	FRANK PRESS
JAMES F. CROW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
HANS LANDSBERG	MAXINE SINGER
EDWARD NEY	ARTHUR M. SQUIRES

1977

WARD GOODENOUGH	DONALD KENNEDY
CLIFFORD GROBSTEIN	NEAL E. MILLER
H. S. GUTOWSKY	RAYMOND H. THOMPSON
N. BRUCE HANNAY	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editors: RICHARD SEMIKLOSE

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, Editor; PHILIP M. BOFFEY, LUTHER J. CARTER, BARBARA J. CULLITON, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, NICHOLAS WADE. Editorial Assistant, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research News: ALLEN L. HAMMOND, WILLIAM D. METZ, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, JEAN L. MARX, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, GINA BARI KOLATA, FANNIE GROOM

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, LYNN MANFIELD, JANET KEGG

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: JOHN BAKER, ISABELLA BOULDIN, MARGARET BURESCH, ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, SYLVIA EBERHART, JUDITH GIVELBER, CAITILIN GORDON, CORRINE HARRIS, NANCY HARTNAGEL, OLIVER HEATWOLE, CHRISTINE KARLIK, RUTH KULSTAD, MARGARET LLOYD, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, YA LI SWIGART, ELEANOR WARNER

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD SOMMER

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE; Subscription Records and Member Records: ANN RAGLAND

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

MARGARET STERLING

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burklund, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 11 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581)

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phones: (Area Code 202) Central Office: 467-4350; Book Reviews: 467-4367; Business Office: 467-4411; Circulation: 467-4417; Guide to Scientific Instruments: 467-4480; News and Comment: 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions: 467-4483; Research News: 467-4321; Reviewing: 467-4443. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xi, *Science*, 26 March 1976. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Federal R & D and the Economy

Hearings cross the congressional firmament like shooting stars. Most are only a momentary glimmer. A few signal the existence of larger issues. The hearings held in April and May by the Thornton subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Technology were of the latter type. The subject was "Federal R & D Expenditure and the National Economy."

The issue revolves around the unanswered question whether the federal government should assure stable, long-term support for commercially oriented R & D. Some think such intervention is essential to the health and international competitiveness of the national economy. Yet most of our understanding of the relationship between R & D and the economy, with the important exception of agriculture, comes from 35 years of experience with defense- and space-oriented projects—of which the Manhattan and Apollo projects were spectacular examples—in which the federal government was both the funder and principal consumer of the R & D output.

There were four persistent themes in these hearings. One was that government and business operate in a climate of distrust, if not of hostility. Another was that R & D expenditures seem a weak and imperfect tool in comparison with tax, subsidy, antitrust regulation, education, and procurement policies. A third theme was the perceived negative effect of federal organization and management of its own R & D enterprises on several dependent sectors of the economy. Finally, the need for federal support of fundamental research was a clear and consistent theme. Every witness, regardless of philosophy, expressed deep concern for the health of the fundamental research effort. Apparently the case still has not been made that investment in fundamental research is not a discretionary societal luxury but an essential component of continued economic viability.

The sense of these hearings was that specific government intervention through R & D expenditure to stimulate the private sector is liable to be of limited effectiveness. There is little understanding or guidance available regarding what to do to achieve a particular desired result. Some opportunities stood out for analysis and perhaps experiment:

- Firms that perform R & D exclusively appear to play a critical role in the process of innovation. Differences in performance between firms created through federally supported R & D need to be explored.
- Small, highly innovative firms are important contributors of new products and processes, but are also most subject to failure in the course of normal economic fluctuations. Some alternatives need to be considered to cushion this impact.
- Policies and programs of other industrial countries are admired, but none has been tested in this country. Some selective, controlled experiments ought to be possible, at least on a limited basis.
- Innovation in the private, profit-making sector is a reasonably well-understood process. Similarities and differences in public sector innovation are not nearly as well described or explained.

What seems to be foreshadowed by the kinds of questions raised in these hearings is the broad issue of a national technology policy. Given our penchant in the United States for pluralistic, decentralized approaches to complex and important policy issues, clear-cut institutional structures or guidelines to action are not likely to appear. The least we should expect, however, is that existing centers of authority and initiative begin to review and refine their objectives. This would include the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense. The mission agencies—ERDA, NASA, and NIH—also are important constituents. Where these lead, others will follow.—T. DIXON LONG, *Provost, Western Reserve College, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106*

This editorial has been abstracted from a review of the hearings prepared by a subcommittee of the AAAS Science and Public Policy Committee. In addition to Mr. Long, its chairman, the subcommittee included John M. Logsdon and Edward E. David, Jr.