

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: Alvin W. Trivelpiece

Editor: Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

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

EDITORIAL STAFF

Managing Editor: Patricia A. Morgan

Assistant Managing Editor: Nancy J. Hartnagel

Senior Editors: Eleanor Butz, Ruth Kulstad

Associate Editors: Martha Coleman, R. Brooks Hanson,

Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Edith Meyers, Linda J.

Miller, Phillip D. Szurmi, David F. Voss

Letters Editor: Christine Gilbert

Book Reviews: Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Deborah Field Washburn

This Week in *Science*: Ruth Levy Guyer

Contributing Editor: Lawrence I. Grossman

Chief Production Editor: Ellen E. Murphy

Editing Department: Lois Schmitt, *head*; Mary McDaniel,

Patricia L. Moe, Barbara E. Patterson

Copy Desk: Joi S. Granger, Beverly Shields, Anna Victoreen, Barbara Wittig

Production Manager: Karen Schools

Assistant Production Manager: James Landry

Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, James J. Olivarri, Yolanda M. Rook

Covers Editor: Grayce Finger

Manuscript Systems Analyst: William Carter

NEWS STAFF

News Editor: Barbara J. Culliton

News and Comment: Colin Norman, *deputy editor*; William

Booth, Gregory Byrne, Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden,

Eliot Marshall, Marjorie Sun, John Walsh

Research News: Roger Lewin, *deputy editor*; Deborah M.

Barnes, Richard A. Kerr, Jean L. Marx, Robert Pool, Leslie

Roberts, M. Mitchell Waldrop

European Correspondent: David Dickson

BUSINESS STAFF

Business Staff Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

Classified Advertising Supervisor: Karen Morgenstern

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

Traffic Manager: Donna Rivera

Traffic Manager (Recruitment): Gwen Canter

Advertising Sales Manager: Richard L. Charles

Employment Sales Manager: Edward C. Keller

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); U.K., Europe: Nick Jones, +44(0647)52918; Telex 42513; FAX (0392) 31645.

Information for contributors appears on page XI of the 24 June 1988 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, New York, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO.

The Price of Progress

Scientists are feeling beleaguered these days, and there is some danger that their problems may be exacerbated if they develop a siege mentality. Recent charges—that they are cruel to animals but kind to colleagues accused of misconduct, that they show excessive zeal in trying to cure disease but lack of interest in protecting the environment—cause many scientists to react by labeling all critics as modern Luddites. Actually, this situation only illustrates the fact that science, like everything else in the world, is changing, and rapidly. What is needed is a careful appraisal of new rules to cope with the evolution of science and new approaches to public relations with a society that is increasingly threatened by the mystique of science.

One mistake in the face of these criticisms would be to argue that scientists cannot improve their own procedures. Some will argue that any change is an admission of guilt, but change and some misunderstanding are always the price of progress. Increases in the rate of discoveries, in the number of investigators, and in interdisciplinary research are having their impact on the old procedures. The days of the gifted amateur working with pins and sealing wax are over. When many authors from more than one laboratory are collaborating, it is impossible to expect everyone to know all of the experimental intricacies of all the work—but there is no escaping the fact that an author's name on the paper implies responsibility for all the work in that paper. If senior investigators share the credit when the work of students and collaborators is good, they must expect to share the blame when the work is poor. Hence, prudence suggests limiting groups to a size that can be competently supervised.

Those who expect progress without mistakes do not understand progress. When mistakes do occur, whether by fraud, sloppiness, or honest error, it is essential that they be corrected as rapidly as possible, and retractions, however embarrassing, must be made. In a smaller and cozier world, deviations from high standards of scholarship were dealt with informally; today's scientists need to realize that errors must be handled more formally, and in full view of an anxious public. In complex problems of fraud, misconduct, or error, scientists will need to develop procedures that nonscientists will find thorough, objective, and fair. Otherwise, the case will be made that laypersons must themselves be the judges, a potential nightmare when complex science is involved.

A new area of concern relates to the publication of all essential data for the verification of a research paper. Although it is axiomatic in science that such data should be available to the reader, some of modern science is so voluminous—DNA sequences, coordinates for x-ray structures, computer programs—that it cannot take up valuable journal space. Data banks are now available, but some investigators, out of laziness or desire to maintain proprietary advantage, fail to deposit their data. This should not be allowed. *Science*, together with a number of journals, has developed procedures to help ensure that any individual who publishes in these journals will send the appropriate information to data banks. In the old days of the small, old-boy network, such conditions could be enforced by word of mouth. The need for more formal procedures, which will be explained to authors, arises because of the exponential growth in the numbers of scientists and journals.

A willingness to examine our own procedures should not be interpreted as a need to change good procedures into cosmetic ones. Preserving the good, however, will require explaining the goals and procedures of modern science to an uninformed public. Scientists should, when possible, convert their specialized terminology into understandable language, so that scientific jargon is not interpreted as a protective device. The implications of new discoveries and our judicial procedures, warts and all, will have to be clarified. This can be done, and in many cases has been done brilliantly. Most of the public, in fact, hold scientists in high regard, and few would like to stop progress in its tracks. However, scientists must deal with the issues honestly. We cannot say we have eliminated all fraud, all pain to animals, all radioactive spills. We can say that science, like all other forms of human endeavor, will never proceed flawlessly, but scientists accept the responsibility to minimize the unpleasant side effects as well as to maximize the advance of the frontier.—DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.