

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.

Publisher: William D. Carey

Editor: Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

Deputy Editors: Philip H. Abelson (*Engineering and Applied Sciences*); John I. Brauman (*Physical Sciences*); Gardner Lindzey (*Social Sciences*)

EDITORIAL STAFF

Managing Editor: Patricia A. Morgan

Assistant Managing Editors: Nancy J. Hartnagel, John E. Ringle

Senior Editors: Eleanore Butz, Lawrence I. Grossman, Ruth Kulstad

Associate Editors: Martha Collins, Sylvia Eberhart, William Greaves, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Edith Meyers

Letters Editor: Christine Gilbert

Book Reviews: Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Linda Heiserman

This Week in Science: Ruth Levy Guyer

Chief Production Editor: Ellen E. Murphy

Editing Department: Lois Schmitt, *head*; Caitlin Gordon, Barbara E. Patterson

Copy Desk: Isabella Bouldin, *chief*; Mary McDaniel, Sharon Ryan, Beverly Shields

Production Manager: Karen Schools

Graphics and Production: John Baker, *assistant manager*; Holly Bishop, Kathleen Cosimano, Eleanor Warner

Covers Editor: Grayce Finger

Manuscript Systems Analyst: William Carter

NEWS STAFF

News Editor: Barbara J. Culliton

News and Comment: Colin Norman, *deputy editor*; Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Eliot Marshall, R. Jeffrey Smith, Marjorie Sun, John Walsh

Research News: Roger Lewin, *deputy editor*; Deborah M. Barnes, Richard A. Kerr, Gina Kolata, Jean L. Marx, Arthur L. Robinson, M. Mitchell Waldrop

European Correspondent: David Dickson

BUSINESS STAFF

Associate Publisher: William M. Miller, III

Business Staff Supervisor: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

Associate Business Supervisor: Leo Lewis

Membership Recruitment: Gwendolyn Huddle

Member and Subscription Records: Ann Ragland

Guide to Biotechnology Products and Instruments Editor: Richard G. Sommer

ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

Director: Earl J. Scherago

Production Manager: Donna Rivera

Advertising Sales Manager: Richard L. Charles

Marketing Manager: Herbert L. Burkland

Sales: New York, NY 10036: J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); Scotch Plains, NJ 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Chicago, IL 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); Beverly Hills, CA 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); San Jose, CA 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16 St. (408-998-4690); Dorset, VT 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581).

Instructions for contributors appears on page xi of the 28 March 1986 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Telephone: 202-326-6500.

Advertising correspondence should be sent to Tenth Floor, 1515 Broadway, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050.

Survival Politics: Science and the Budget Dilemma

At the 11th AAAS Research and Development Colloquium (26 and 27 March) in Washington, D.C., the hearts and minds of the 400 participants were riveted on the wondrous workings of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, a.k.a. the Deficit Reduction Act of 1986. No government speaker could predict the outcomes of the standoff between Congress and the Administration, much less the extent of the damage likely to befall funding for research and development. The good news was that the worst has already happened for the 1986 budget; the bad news was that under some scenarios the blow in 1987 could be much more damaging.

Not for the first time, the audience at the colloquium was advised to practice up on the martial arts, to climb into the ring and fight for their scientific lives, interests, and projects. The complaint is that legislators rarely hear from the scientists, who forget that reminders of their voting power are efficacious in inspiring legislators to do the right thing. There is a point to this, in that members of Congress are seldom visited by their scientific constituents during the long recesses when fence-mending and opinion-sounding are practiced. On the other hand, there is no lack of evidence that some universities have discovered the value of professional lobbying in persuading legislators to tuck money for special research facilities into appropriations bills. But the question is whether, in the long run, much semblance of balance and scientific merit in the conduct of research could survive the close and inelegant combat that pressure politics sooner or later becomes. It is one thing to systematically inform legislators about the consequences of allowing our scientific and engineering assets to depreciate with the concomitant danger to U.S. technological leadership, but quite another to employ the muscular tactics of the organized voting bloc. Perhaps a middle ground is to learn to thank legislators when they do stand up for science.

All this said, it is apparent that the overwhelming consensus for public investment in R&D is insufficient to avert damage to what Frank Press called the "ecology" of the research system in his remarks at the colloquium. In much of the ensuing discussion participants struggled with the question of the research community's ability to agree internally on strategies to preserve the core strengths of the system, as support dwindles. Here the issues pile up quickly: the upthrust of funding for defense-applied R&D while support for the nondefense sector rapidly ebbs; allocations to university-based special research centers as opposed to project support; the inevitable consequences of terminating support for student education; the displacement implications of costly megaprojects relative to general purpose research; and the fading chance to put a floor under the existing reinvestment deficit in the tools and facilities for research. Answers to these complex and confusing issues and to science's ability to find answers were not visible. But there was a strong sense that unless science produces some answers soon, government will produce them under the forcing pressures of its fiscal problems and its mainstream priorities.

Lost and unnoticed in the blizzard of the budget numbers is a significant data point. By the fifth year of the deficit-reduction plan now engraved in law, the discretionary region of federal expenditures—the area in which civil R&D reside—is programmed to fall to only 7 percent of total spending. The sleeper is that nondefense R&D will then occupy a startling fourth of the small discretionary pie. Here lies trouble, because such a conspicuous share of the controllable fraction of the budget is bound to draw heavy fire from every interest group that is feeling hunger pains.

At risk is the broad national consensus, supported by this Administration and all others since World War II, that strong financial support for basic research is not only critical to national strength but the almost exclusive responsibility of the federal government. If this can be reaffirmed by the President and Congress amid the confusion surrounding Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, the financial basis for the consensus can be stabilized. It is urgent for the scientific community to remind our political leaders of this and assist in the process of setting priorities. The clock is running.—WILLIAM D. CAREY and J. THOMAS RATCHFORD