# SCIENCE

### AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presenta-tion and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of mi-nority or conflicting points of view, rather than by pub-lishing only material on which a consensus has been insing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*— including editorials, news and comment, and book re-views—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**

1979: E. Peter Geiduschek, Ward Goodenough, N. Bruce Hannay, Martin J. Klein, Franklin A. Long, Neal E. Miller, Jeffrey J. Wine 1980: Richard E. Balzhiser, Wallace S. Broeck-er, Clement L. Markert, Frank W. Putnam, Bry-ant W. Rossiter, Vera C. Rubin, Maxine F. Singer, Paul E. Waggoner, F. Karl Willenbrock

Publisher

## WILLIAM D. CAREY

#### Editor

## PHILIP H. ABELSON

**Editorial Staff** Managing Editor Robert V. Ormes Assistant Managing Editor JOHN E. RINGLE

**Business Manager** HANS NUSSBAUM Production Editor Ellen E. Murphy News Editor: BARBARA J. CULLITON

News and Comment: WILLIAM J. BROAD, LUTHER J. CARTER, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, ELIOT MARSHALL, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, R. JEFFREY SMITH, NICHOLAS ADE, JOHN WALSH. Editorial Assistant, SCHERRAINE MACK

MACK Research News: Beverly Karplus Hartline, Frederick F. Hartline, Richard A. Kerr, Gina Bari Kolata, Jean L. Marx, Thomas H. Maugh II, Arthur L. Robinson. Editorial Assistant, Fannie GROOM

Consulting Editor: Allen L. Hammond Associate Editors: Eleanore Butz, Mary Dorf-

Sylvia Eberhart, Judith Gottlieb, Ruth KULSTAD

Assistant Editors: CAITILIN GORDON, LOIS SCHMITT Book Reviews: KATHERINE LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG LIVINGSTON, Editor;

Letters: CHRISTINE KARLIK

Copy Editor: Isabella Bouldin Production: Nancy Hartnagel, John Baker; Ya I Swigart, Holly Bishop, Eleanor Warner; MARY MCDANIEL, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, SHARON RYAN Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: Grayce Finger,

Editor; CORRINE HARRIS, MARGARET LLOYD Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD SOMMER

Assistant to the Editors: RICHARD SOMMER Assistant to the Editors: RICHARD SOMMER Member and Subscription Records: ANN RAGLAND EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachu-setts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Per-missions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. For "Instructions for Contrib-utors," write the editorial office or see page xi, Science, 29 June 1979.

utors, white the current and 29 June 1979. BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

#### Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO Production Manager: MARGARET STERLING Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES Marketing Manager: HERBERT L. BURKLUND

Marketing Manager: HERBERT L. BURKLUND Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Steve Hamburger, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHI-CAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Mich-igan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581) ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway New York N Y 10036 Phone 212-

1515 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-730-1050

# **National Science Foundation**

During its 29-year existence the National Science Foundation has experienced moments of euphoric support and times of carping criticism. It now faces a period of uncertainty from which it could emerge either strengthened or weakened. Those who believe in the long-term benefits to society of programs carried on by NSF should follow closely and contribute to the indepth review of NSF now under way. The review is being conducted by the subcommittee on science, research, and technology, chaired by Representative George E. Brown, Jr. (D-Calif.). The year-long effort will include an examination of the basic statutes under which NSF operates and could probably lead to legislation changing in some ways the scope and thrust of NSF. Chairman Brown, who approaches the task in an open-minded fashion, intends that the examination should be reflective, thorough, and broad-ranging. Part of the subcommittee's review will be based on a series of public hearings in which advice will be sought from individuals, organizations, and communities. Other sources of counsel will include a commissioned study and ad hoc advisory groups.

Why is NSF being placed under scrutiny at this time? One reason cited is that 10 years have elapsed since the last searching look. Congress has responsibilities for oversight and legislation which should be discharged. Some of us adhere to the late Sam Rayburn's dictum, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." However, the temptation to improve a going concern is strong, particularly when, as in the case of NSF, circumstances in which it operates have changed. During the past 10 years the United States has lost much of its technological supremacy and ability to compete in foreign trade. Innovation has become one of the "buzz words" in Washington and it is natural that a possible role for NSF in fostering it has been identified. The past 10 years have also seen a great revolution in instrumentation. The new equipment is very powerful but it is very expensive. An inevitable move is on toward instrumentation centers. The past 10 years have also witnessed an important change in university science departments. Enrollments have leveled off or declined. Few new faculty positions are available. If graduates are to be placed, most of them must go to business and industry.

Representative Brown and the subcommittee reviewing NSF have identified at least 30 questions or issues for examination. They have not yet focused sharply on the matters that will receive maximum attention. However, given the spirit of immediacy that characterizes politics and the quickfix attitude of Washington, the tendency will be to move NSF further toward applied research. One of the questions for discussion posed by the subcommittee is, "To what extent should NSF support research intended to provide solutions for society's problems?" Another comment and questions are, "We often characterize basic research as an investment in the future, and strongly imply future productivity, industrial innovation, etc. How should NSF's concern with innovation and/or productivity be expressed, if at all? What role or connection should NSF have with research in industry? Can or should NSF promote good research in industry or the linkage between university research and industry?'

A short answer to the last set of questions is that relations between academia and industry could be improved, but the participation and funds of NSF are not required. The government merely needs to change its potent policies with respect to inventions arising under grants.

In its studies and deliberations, the subcommittee will be reminded of the enduring values of basic research. The words have been spoken before. Nevertheless, they are true. Congress should reflect on how much it spends on immediate efforts that often amount to plowing the waves. In contrast, it should note how little is invested for the future.

This is an important period in the life of NSF. It needs the voices of those who understand the importance of fundamental research. It also needs some fresh ideas on how best to justify its continuing efforts.