

# Letters

## Farewell to Daddario

Let me begin with a declarative statement: Daniel Greenberg is back on the U.S. reporting team for *Science* and has written a characteristically Greenbergian "treatment" of departing Congressman Emilio Daddario (25 Sept., p. 1291). Older readers of *Science*, who may not have read this treatment, will, nevertheless, be able to make a pretty good guess as to what it is like: knowledgeable, personalized, lively, and occasionally unfair in its treatment of individuals. New readers of *Science* who have read this article, and whose sensitivities may still be quivering from some of its unfair aspects, possibly need some further understanding both of Daddario and of Greenberg's article, and this letter addresses itself to each topic.

First, it is important to say that Daddario is a congressman with modest seniority, having been a member of Congress since 1958. He has earned a well-deserved reputation as one of the most honest, concerned, and effective members of Congress, and one who surely would have been reelected to the Congress had he chosen to run. He has especially concerned himself with federal science policy. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, he has played a major role in the evolution of the National Science Foundation, in the analysis of federal science policy, and in the development of technology assessment, a new, important interdisciplinary area of study. Daddario, as well as the subcommittee which he chairs, has been a principal channel of communication between Congress and the U.S. scientific community, and his special knowledge and qualities will be greatly missed.

Now, let me help the new reader to reconsider Greenberg's article on Daddario. You should do this in stages.

First, cover up the unfair and hurtful first paragraph of the article (and perhaps also the last sentence, which appears to be staking out a later area for potential attack). Next, read the body of the article. Leave aside the somewhat overlively language and the occasional bizarre use of English. You will then find that Greenberg's analysis of Daddario's accomplishments and importance is coherent, specific, and generally favorable. His conclusions are, in fact, very similar to those given in the above paragraph. Greenberg completes his discussion with the handsome comment that "The remarkable thing is that he did so much with so little, and the pity is that the peculiarities of congressional power kept him from a position where he might have done more."

In view of this admiring final tribute, how is one to explain Greenberg's first paragraph? How, conceivably, can Greenberg describe Congressman Daddario as "irrelevant" to the science community? What led him to use the patently unfair adjective "grotesque" for the reorganized National Science Foundation, an organization which seems to be doing rather well these days? And what could lead Greenberg to summarize the Daddario subcommittee's efforts on science policy as "summer-long hearings on that shopworn phantom, the need for a national science policy, otherwise known, in the present-day context, as more money?" Regretfully, beyond the unhelpful observation, "that's Greenberg," I have no useful explanation as to why this particular kind of verbal overkill is written in the first place, and, in the second place, why it ends up appearing in *Science*, and I remain deeply distressed that its target is so fine and able a man as Emilio Daddario.

F. A. LONG  
*Program on Science, Technology and Society, 632 Clark Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850*

In this time of social crisis and political unrest, what is the best way for the AAAS to "improve the effectiveness of science in the promotion of human welfare"? This question now dominates the agenda of the AAAS Committee on Science in the Promotion of Human Welfare.

Social change calls for reassessment of the responsibilities that the AAAS can and should undertake. Many persons and groups today are asking: What actions relating to political and social issues should be taken by the Association as our country's largest and most representative scientific organization? How might such actions affect the ability of the AAAS to further the work of science itself?

We the members of the committee believe that these questions urgently demand answers that require programs of action. We have arrived at some answers, formulated a general program, and started developing strategies to put the program into effect.

In our view, making science more effective in promoting human welfare calls for intensified efforts of three kinds:

1) More explicitly *defining* the requirements for scientific knowledge in terms that relate operationally both to the particular societal problem to be solved and to the particular scientific activity that produces the knowledge needed.

2) More efficiently *developing* the socially required knowledge that has not been produced as yet.

3) More effectively *disseminating* the knowledge to the policy makers and problem solvers involved, wherever and wherever they may be.

This three-part formulation of a program to define, develop, and disseminate knowledge reflects many considerations. Problem solvers often fail to ask the pertinent scientific questions and scientists frequently misjudge the applicability of their research results. Priorities in applied research do not correlate efficiently with social priorities. Most especially, the problem solvers, including governmental and political leaders as well as technologists, too often are not getting hold of applicable scientific knowledge in a form that they can really understand and put to use.

Already the AAAS conducts efforts of all three kinds through mechanisms such as publications, symposia, commission studies, committees, and channels