

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

1972

ALFRED BROWN	FRANK PRESS
JAMES F. CROW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
THOMAS KUHN	WALTER O. ROBERTS
ELLIOTT W. MONTROLL	

1973

H. S. GUTOWSKY	GARDNER LINDZEY
ARTHUR D. HASLER	RAYMOND H. THOMPSON
RUDOLF KOMPFFNER	EDWARD O. WILSON
DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

WILLIAM BEVAN

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

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

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, ROBERT GILLETTE, NICHOLAS WADE, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, BARBARA J. CULLITON, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research News: ALLEN L. HAMMOND, WILLIAM D. METZ, THOMAS H. MAUGH II

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, KATHRYN MOUTON

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: MARGARET ALLEN, ISABELLA BOULDIN, BLAIR BURNS, ELEANORE BUTZ, RONNA CLINE, ANNETTE DIAMANTE, MARY DORFMAN, JUDITH GIVELBER, MARLENE GLASER, CORRINE HARRIS, OLIVER HEATWOLB, CHRISTINE KARLIK, MARSHALL KATHAN, MARGARET LLOYD, JANE MINOR, DANIEL RABOVSKY, PATRICIA ROWE, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, YA LI SWIGART, ALICE THEILE

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD SOMMER

Membership Recruitment: LEONARD WRAY; Subscriptions: BETTE SEEMUND; Addressing: THOMAS BAZAN

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

BONNIE SEMEL

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burkland, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: John P. Cahill, 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. Phones: (Area code 202) Central office: 467-4350; Book Reviews: 467-4367; Business Office: 467-4411; Circulation: 467-4417; Guide to Scientific Instruments: 467-4480; News and Comment: 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions: 467-4483; Research News: 467-4321; Reviewing: 467-4440. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xv, *Science*, 24 December 1971. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Behind the President's Message

Reactions to President Nixon's 16 March message to Congress on science and technology have ranged from damnation to high praise, with several intermediate critics complaining that it fell far short of the advance billing of the New Technology Opportunities Program or that it added little to what had already been said in the 1973 budget or the State of the Union message. Generally, the critics have treated the special message (or the special message and related statements from the White House) as an isolated event.

It is a mistake to consider the 16 March message by itself, for that message constitutes presidential affirmation of some proposals for change in science policy that have been brewing for several years. The President's concern for innovation and some of his proposals for encouraging innovation parallel closely recommendations contained in *Technological Innovation: Its Environment and Management*, the 1967 report of an external advisory committee to the Secretary of Commerce.

Or again, the President called for "a new partnership in science and technology—one which brings together the federal government, private enterprise, state and local governments, and our universities and research centers in a coordinated, cooperative effort to serve the national interest." The statement that "A more effective use of these resources can be made by combining the talents of industry, government, and universities in a new type of research organization" sounds as if it came directly from the President's message; in fact, it came from the 1971 report of the National Science Board (NSB). Similarly, some of the recommendations of the 1972 NSB report, *The Role of Engineers and Scientists in a National Policy for Technology*, are repeated in the President's message. This support, be it noted, came from the 25 members of the NSB, 20 of whom must be classed as academics rather than as industrialists or government managers.

None of these documents presents a fully worked out program; all recognize the need for more detailed planning. The President says, "We must define our goals carefully," and the NSB calls for the careful establishment of priorities. This hard work remains to be done; we have an outline of new policy, but not yet the working drawings.

A similar situation existed from 1945 to 1950, when the basic science policies of the next quarter century were being formulated. The federal government then outlined broad scientific and technological goals, and it decided to support the private sector instead of using governmental institutions as the major performers of research and development. But details of planning and emphasis were left to evolve.

Now the President has announced a new turn in national policy for research and development: more central planning and "directed" research; more multidisciplinary team studies; more emphasis on social goals; and more university-government-industry cooperation. Presidential support for these changes is in itself important, but the ideas are what call for primary attention. Their objectives are social and economic, and hence inherently political, a fact that has important implications for all the scientists and institutions of higher education involved. The specific proposals therefore deserve searching debate, for, if they are adopted, the current period will be remembered as the time of the most significant turning point in national science policy since the late 1940's.—DAEL WOLFE, *Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Washington, Seattle 98105*