

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

1969

EMIL HAURY	KENNETH S. PITZER
WILLARD F. LIBBY	ALEXANDER RICH
EVERETT I. MENDELSON	CLARENCE M. ZENER
JOHN R. PIERCE	

1970

GUSTAF O. ARRHENIUS	RICHARD C. LEWONTIN
FRED R. EGGAN	ALFRED O. C. NIER
HARRY F. HARLOW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
MILTON HARRIS	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

DAEL WOLFLE

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News Editor: JOHN WALSH

Foreign Editor: DANIEL S. GREENBERG*

News and Comment: LUTHER J. CARTER, BRYCE NELSON, PHILIP M. BOFFEY, MARK W. OBERLE, MARTI MUELLER, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research Topics: ROBERT W. HOLCOMB

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART

Editorial Assistants: JOANNE BELK, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, HELEN CARTER, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, PAULA LECKY, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, VIRGINIA NUSSLE, SANDRA RATTLE, PATRICIA ROWE, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, BARBARA SHEFFER, RICHARD SOMMER, YA LI SWIGART, ALICE THEILE

* *European Office:* 22 Mulberry Walk, London, S.W. 3, England (Telephone: 352-9749)

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

KAY GOLDSTEIN

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Robert S. Bugbee, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); MEDFIELD, MASS. 02052: Richard M. Ezequille, 4 Rolling Lane (617-444-1439); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Herbert L. Burklund, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772)

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: 202-387-7171. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page 7, *Science*, 4 July 1969. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Who Will Plan the Future?

The increasing knowledge which is making it possible to plan the future to an extent quite unthinkable by any previous generation and, even more, the increasing need for long-range solutions to society's mounting problems give promise that the widening interest in future planning will continue. The establishment, in July, of a National Goals Staff in the Executive Office of the President is one of numerous signs. With much planning so strongly indicated, it is necessary to ask: Who should be responsible? The answer has two parts. In a pluralistic democracy, responsibility for initiating plans and for analyzing alternatives should be spread over all segments of society that can make useful contributions. Selection among alternatives should then be made in the public forums of legislatures and the market.

There is little current threat to the public processes of selection and decision. But there is danger that the initiating function will become unduly concentrated, for some of the institutions that should be involved are under strong attack.

Historically, some of the strongest influences on the future have resulted—although often not through deliberate planning—from private business catering to (and influencing) consumer preferences. The automobile, the elevator, the telephone, television, computers, pesticides, and the birth control pill have all had widely ramifying effects. Industry will go on innovating, but industry is under attack because pollution, noise, ecological damage, and some other effects of technology are harmful, and some extremists are attacking industry just for being private industry.

Universities have been the source of much of the knowledge that now makes planning more possible. But universities, despite the rarity of their acceptance of institutional responsibility for the ways in which new knowledge is used, are under attack for having any involvement with business and government, and, at the same time, are attacked for not being involved enough in local, social problems.

The private foundations have often been more farsighted than government or universities in identifying emerging problems and stimulating their study and analysis. But the House of Representatives has adopted legislation to prevent private foundations from sponsoring studies intended to influence public policy.

Each of these attacks has some justification. Industry has sometimes been callous and selfish. Universities have sometimes passively accepted conditions that should have been improved. There have been foundation abuses. These shortcomings should be corrected. But punitive restrictions on whole classes of institutions because of the shortcomings of some of their members will inevitably place more of the responsibility for planning in government hands.

Government agencies have to be involved; planning is part of their business, and some of the agencies have had substantial experience. The results have not been faultless, however, and in any event the processes of planning are too uncertain and the decisions too important to be entrusted to any one sector. No sector has a monopoly on wisdom, and participation by a variety of institutions is necessary to ensure that plans and decisions will be subject to continuous criticism, analysis, and possible revision. In deciding how faults of the past can be prevented in the future, it is therefore necessary to remember that the road marked by undue restrictions on the independence of private institutions is the road that leads toward control by government bureaucracy.

—DAEL WOLFLE