

## 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, Ruth Kulstad

**Associate Editors:** Martha Collins, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelnner, Edith Meyers, Phillip D. Szuroni, David F. Voss

**Letters Editor:** Christine Gilbert

**Book Reviews:** Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Deborah F. Washburn

**This Week in Science:** Ruth Levy Guyer

**Chief Production Editor:** Ellen E. Murphy

**Editing Department:** Lois Schmitt, *head*; Caitilin Gordon, Mary McDaniel, Barbara E. Patterson

**Copy Desk:** Lyle L. Green, Sharon Ryan, Beverly Shields, Anna Victoreen

**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, 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 Manager:** Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

**Classified Advertising:** Leo Lewis

**Membership Recruitment:** Gwendolyn Huddle

**Member and Subscription Records:** Ann Ragland

**Guide to Biotechnology Products and Instruments:** Shauna S. Roberts

## ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

**Director:** Earl J. Scherago

**Production Manager:** Donna Rivera

**Advertising Sales Manager:** Richard L. Charles

**Marketing Manager:** Herbert L. Burklund

**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); 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); Damascus, MD 20872: Rick Sommer, 24808 Shrubbery Hill Ct. (301-972-9270).

Instructions for contributors appears on page xi of the 26 September 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 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO.

## The Fifth Decade

The 40th anniversary of the Office of Naval Research is an occasion for congratulations and presents an opportunity for estimating prospects for government-supported research and development in coming years. The ONR, to borrow from the language of summitry, served as the base camp from whence government set out to become the nation's patron of fundamental research. The flexibility, outreach, and breadth of vision the ONR contributed to postwar science serves as a striking model in the new context of today's challenges.

Few would have thought, in the interval between the end of the war and the onset of superpower tensions, that government's stakes in research and development would reach the present scale. In the mid-1960's a spokesman for the Bureau of the Budget would venture to tell a meeting of research administrators that because in the previous 5 years federal funds had doubled to the level of \$15 billion, the era of fast growth was over. It took another 14 years, but the total doubled again. Now, in just the past 6 years, we have had the third doubling. Even after adjusting for inflation, the acceleration of support is striking.

Do the cards foretell a fourth doubling—perhaps before the new century sets in? Given the composition of the research and development agenda, loaded as it is in favor of defense and space, no one can say that the potential is not there. Aside from pressures for defense-related development, the basic sciences are pregnant with opportunities awaiting funding, as the flow of reports from the National Research Council demonstrates. But funds are not distributed evenly over the spectrum of federally financed research and development, a problem reflected in the current appropriation for the National Science Foundation with its clutter of floors and ceilings attesting to the politics of science.

Even in a moderate growth scenario, there always are winners and losers, but when we are in a cycle in which discretionary spending is to be minimized while preemptive priorities are maximized, queuing difficulties are likely to be very severe. Whether, indeed, another doubling from a high base of roughly \$60 billion is even desirable turns on whether the productive capacity of existing research assets can be stretched that much, given the prolonged reinvestment drought in science education and research infrastructure. It would be very rash public policy to chase the elusive imp of "competitiveness" with a funding frenzy that takes for granted the sufficiency and resiliency of the research and development system's reserve capacities.

If in the fifth postwar decade science is confronted with a version of limits to growth, save for privileged areas of research and development as defined on government's terms, there is a lot to think about. With less support than will be needed to advance all fields of research, the unity of science can give way to contention between and among disciplines, each looking out for itself regardless of the cost to science as a whole. It would not be a pretty scene. A more mature behavior, reflecting the stages of growth through which science has come, would involve the convergence of disciplines and their organizations in a process of rationalization of ends and means in the presence of limits.

It would stretch credibility to claim that science has the institutional arrangements for such an undertaking, although they could be assembled with enough leadership and hard work. The issues to be addressed thereafter are both difficult and interrelated. They bear on the balance between big and small science, native pride and internationalization, targeting strategies and the free play of opportunities, distributive equity and concentration, and the workability of new funding mechanisms, to give only a partial listing. If it all sounds troublesome, and it is, the case would be worse if the complexities of rationalization were left entirely to government and its responses to the dictates of budgetary pragmatism.

The core features of the long partnership of science with government are still substantially in place, thanks in large measure to the enduring work done long ago by farsighted leaders at ONR. Now, as the growth capacity of science sights oncoming constraints on public investment, the fifth decade will put to test the partnership's abilities to address, through a workable institutional process, the emerging dilemmas of choice.

—WILLIAM D. CAREY