

**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

FREDERICK R. BLATTNER, BERNARD F. BURKE, ARNOLD DEMAIN, CHARLES L. DRAKE, ARTHUR F. FINDEIS, E. PETER GEIDUSCHEK, GLYNN ISAAC, NEAL E. MILLER, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, ALLEN NEWELL, RUTH PATRICK, BRYANT W. ROSSITER, VERA C. RUBIN, WILLIAM P. SLICHTER, SOLOMON H. SNYDER, PAUL E. WAGGONER, JOHN WOOD

Publisher: WILLIAM D. CAREY

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 and Comment: COLIN NORMAN (deputy editor), JEFFREY L. FOX, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, ELIOT MARSHALL, R. JEFFREY SMITH, MARJORIE SUN, JOHN WALSH
European Correspondent: DAVID DICKSON
Contributing Writer: LUTHER J. CARTER
Research News: ROGER LEWIN (deputy editor), RICHARD 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: FANNIE GROOM
Senior Editors: ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, RUTH KULSTAD
Associate Editors: MARTHA COLLINS, SYLVIA EBERHART, CAITLIN GORDON, WILLIAM GREAVES, LOIS SCHMITT
Assistant Editors: STEPHEN KEPPEL, LISA MCCULLOUGH, EDITH MEYERS
Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, *Editor:* LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG
Letters: CHRISTINE GILBERT
Copy Editor: ISABELLA BOULDIN
Production: JOHN BAKER; HOLLY BISHOP, ELEANOR WARNER; JEAN ROCKWOOD, SHARON RYAN, BEVERLY SHIELDS
Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: GRAYCE FINGER, *Editor:* GERALDINE CRUMP, CORRINE HARRIS
Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD G. SOMMER
Editorial Administrator: SUSAN ELLIOTT
Assistant to the Associate Publisher: ROSE LOWERY
Assistant to the Managing Editor: NANCY HARTNAGEL
Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE
Member and Subscription Records: ANN RAGLAND
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Avenue, 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 Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: *Advancesci*, Washington. For "Information for Contributors," write to the editorial office or see page xi, *Science*, 29 June 1984.
BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO
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); CHICAGO, 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); SAN JOSE, CALIF. 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16 St. (408-998-4690); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Diefenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581).
ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York 10036 (212-730-1050).

Science Is Universal—The Practitioners Are Not

It is commonplace in the community to approach the debate concerning the level of federal support of science and engineering by emphasizing the importance of research accomplishments. Lost to sight is the great contribution of the research universities in educating scientists and engineers. Usually attention is called to advances made or to shining goals perceived. This is intended to demonstrate the value of basic research in the United States, with the implicit understanding that the major portion of public funds will be used at universities.

The argument is made that the yield of research from educational institutions has been important to the nation and that the continuation of the process is necessary. The system has indeed worked well, and the basic knowledge of nature so developed has been vital in the sequence of science to technology to ultimate use. Unfortunately, the science and engineering communities are finding shortfalls not only in their minimal annual expectations but also in the now widely accepted belief that there is extensive deterioration of the necessary supporting infrastructure—that is, facilities, equipment, and their support.

With all these accumulated problems it is surprising that the principal reason for continuing with the arrangement that we use in this country is either left out of the argument or, at best, used only as a secondary item. It is not recognized that although science is universal, scientists and engineers are a national resource.

The world requires technology of an ever higher order just to maintain itself, and the country requires the highest order of technology to maintain its leading position. It follows that the availability of a sufficient number of educated, high-quality scientists and engineers is crucial. Thus, the main reason for the use of pooled public funds (whether federal or more local) to support basic research in universities should be to ensure a steady stream of such people. Our system has done this well and provides good science, too, and it is in the country's best interest that the successful system be properly maintained.

There is currently furor about the inadequacies of our precollege school system, and that furor is based in large part on a perception of a lack of technical capability in the nation. This capability, which involves doing science, understanding science, translating science, and using the translation, must be fostered by an educational system both before and after 12th grade that is able to produce a suitable number of educated scientists and engineers. Past the college level the influx of federal, state, and private funds has done well so far in providing not only a steady stream of educated scientists and engineers but good science as well.

The point at issue here is understood in a recent National Research Council report entitled "Renewing U.S. Mathematics." On the first page the loss of support for mathematics is noted, "There has been declining attention to support of the seminal research," as well as the fact that "opportunities for achievement in mathematical research are at an all-time high." The report does go on to note the paucity of mathematicians, but by the thesis advanced here the order as well as the emphasis would be reversed.

Although we are properly impressed by fine ideas and impressive new salients into our ignorance, we are often bemused by a less rational view of such things as ranking—"number one" and other such competitive trappings that develop in a vain desire to simplify evaluation of a complex system. This leads to an exhausting attempt by each field, each institution, each individual, to be number one. I have no interest in stifling ambition but intend rather to suggest that the process of educating individuals, because of the relative anonymity associated with it, has not maintained its proper preeminent position. This has also led to the ambivalent way in which the community has tried to support its legitimate call on tax funds.—NORMAN HACKERMAN, *President, Rice University, Houston, Texas 77251*