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 publishing only materials and 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

Lanorial Board 1983: FREDERICK R. BLATTNER, BERNARD F. BURKE, CHARLES L. DRAKE, ARTHUR F. FINDEIS, E. PETER GEIDUSCHEK, GLYNN ISAAC, MILTON RUSSELL, WIL-LIAM P. SLICHTER, JOHN WOOD

1984: ARNOLD DEMAIN, NEAL E. MILLER, FREDER-ICK MOSTELLER, ALLEN NEWELL, RUTH PATRICK, BRYANT W. ROSSITER, VERA C. RUBIN, SOLOMON H. SNYDER, PAUL E. WAGGONER

Publisher: WILLIAM D. CAREY Associate Publisher: ROBERT V. ORMES

Editor: PHILIP H. ABELSON

Editorial Staff

Assistant Managing Editor: JOHN E. RINGLE Production Editor: ELLEN E. MURPHY Business Manager: HANS NUSSBAUM News Editor: BARBARA J. CULLITON

News Earlor, BARBARA J. Collin Norman (deputy editor), Jeffrey L. Fox, Constance Holden, Eliot Mar-, R. Jeffrey Smith, Marjorié Sun, John WALSH

 European Correspondent: DAVID DICKSON Contributing Writer: LUTHER J. CARTER Research News: ROGER LEWIN (deputy editor), RICH-ARD A. KERR, GINA KOLATA, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, M. MITCHELL WALDROP

Administrative Assistant, News: SCHERRAINE MACK; Editorial Assistant, News. Scherkaine Mack, Senior Editors: Eleanore Butz, Mary Dorfman,

RUTH KULSTAD Associate Editors: Sylvia Eberhart, Caitilin Gor-

DON, LOIS SCHMITT Assistant Editors: MARTHA COLLINS, STEPHEN

ASSISTANT LANDIS. MARTHA COLLINS, STEPHEN KEPPLE, EDITH MEYERS Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, Editor; LIN-DA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG Letters: CHRISTINE GILBERT

Copy Editor: Isabella Bouldin Production: John Baker, Susannah Borg; Holly Bishop, Eleanor Warner; Jean Rockwood, Shar-on Ryan, Beverly Shields

Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: GRAYCE FINGER, Editor; GERALDINE CRUMP, CORRINE HARRIS

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD G. SOMMER Assistant to the Editor: SUSAN ELLIOTT Assistant to the Associate Publisher: ROSE LOWERY Assistant to the Managing Editor: NANCY HARTNAGEL

Assistant to the Mandging Earlow, NANCY HARTNAGEL Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE 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 Permis-sions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: Ad-vancesci, Washington. For "Information for Contribu-tors," write to the editorial office or see page xi, *Science*, 24 June 1983. BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO Production Manager: GINA REILLY

Production Manager: GINA REILLY Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES 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. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); 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). ADVERENSING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor

ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-730-1050

The Continuing Relevance of Foundations

Philanthropic foundations have just undergone three days of hearings by the Oversight Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, chaired by Representative Charles Rangel. Neither the atmosphere nor the substance of the discussion bore any resemblance to past inquisitions when such foes as the late Wright Patman or B. Carroll Reece seemed bent at times on doing away with the very notion of using private money for public purposes through the device of the foundation.

SCIENCE

Today's less threatening situation derives in part from improved foundation behavior since 1969, some of it mandated by the legislation that grew out of hearings that year. More foundations, including most large ones, now publish full reports on how they have spent their money; all foundations must provide expenditure and other information to the Internal Revenue Service, which in turn makes the data available to the Foundation Center library system, where the public may consult them. All foundations are required to spend annually at least 5 percent of the value of their assets on philanthropy; the scandal of a few foundations enriching their directors or trustees but spending little on philanthropy thus no longer provokes the righteous wrath of Congress.

Another reason for a more benign atmosphere may be that foundations no longer seem like big game to congressional hunters. Their resources have been seriously eroded by inflation, and the growth of government spending in virtually all fields of interest to foundations has reduced their role to that of a very junior partner. Long gone are the days when Wycliffe Rose could dream of the Rockefeller Foundation carrying scientific education and research to all corners of the earth, or when the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching could undertake to reform all of American higher education, using its provision of pensions for faculty as leverage.

Even if the glory days are irretrievably gone, however, there remains much that private organized philanthropy can do. Foundations still enjoy some potential advantages over other funders. They are better able to enter a given field of endeavor selectively than is government, which generally finds that what it does for one it must do for all. For foundations, unlike corporations, philanthropy is their central purpose, their raison d'être, and they need not justify their grants to shareholders. Unlike most individual philanthropists, foundations can readily investigate a problem, using their still considerable ability to convene the relevant expertise (and to know where that expertise is to be found) or to commission study papers. They can take the time and exercise the patience to approach new initiatives thoughtfully-which is not to say that they invariably do so, of course. Foundations have never fully figured out how to evaluate results of their work, but at least they can try, and their political problems in doing so forthrightly and comprehensively ought to be fewer than those faced by government. To the extent that foundations can evaluate not only their own work but that of government, they have opportunities to influence the nation's agenda and to provide a service to the public that others are not likely to provide.

None of this requires omniscience on the part of foundations. But it does require clearheadedness about what philanthropy can and cannot do in this era of big government and big science, of enormous change and formidable challenges to human capacity. It requires the ability to resist fads and to eschew institutional vanity-abilities not yet universal in the foundation world but surely attainable. And it requires that foundations listen creatively, that they be receptive but not passive, as they strive to fulfill their unique role.—RICHARD W. LYMAN, President, The Rockefeller Foundation, 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York 10036