

American Association for the Advancement of Science

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alan T. Waterman, <i>Retiring President, Chairman</i>	Laurence M. Gould, <i>President</i>
Henry Eyring, <i>President Elect</i>	
John W. Gardner	Mina Rees
H. Bentley Glass	Walter Orr Roberts
David R. Goddard	Athelsan F. Spilhaus
Don K. Price	H. Burr Steinbach
Paul E. Klopsteg <i>Treasurer</i>	Dael Wolfe <i>Executive Officer</i>

VICE PRESIDENTS AND SECRETARIES OF SECTIONS

MATHEMATICS (A)	Wallace Givens
R. W. Hamming	
PHYSICS (B)	Stanley S. Ballard
Ralph A. Sawyer	
CHEMISTRY (C)	S. L. Meisel
Roland Rivest	
ASTRONOMY (D)	Frank Bradshaw Wood
Walter Orr Roberts	
GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY (E)	Richard H. Mahard
Trevor Lloyd	
ZOOLOGICAL SCIENCES (F)	David W. Bishop
Arthur D. Hasler	
BOTANICAL SCIENCES (G)	Warren H. Wagner
Harriet B. Creighton	
ANTHROPOLOGY (H)	Eleanor Leacock
Anthony F. C. Wallace	
PSYCHOLOGY (I)	Frank W. Finger
Lorin A. Riggs	
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES (K)	Ithiel de Sola Pool
Harold D. Lasswell	
HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE (L)	N. Russell Hanson
John Murdoch	
ENGINEERING (M)	Leroy K. Wheelock
Charles F. Savage	
MEDICAL SCIENCES (N)	Oscar Touster
James Ebert	
DENTISTRY (Nd)	S. J. Kreshover
James A. English	
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES (Np)	Joseph P. Buckley
Lee H. MacDonald	
AGRICULTURE (O)	Howard B. Sprague
Edward F. Knipping	
INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE (P)	Allen T. Bonnell
EDUCATION (Q)	Frederic B. Dutton
Herbert S. Conrad	
INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION (T)	Phyllis V. Parkins
Wallace R. Brode	
STATISTICS (U)	Morris B. Ullman
Samuel S. Wilks	

PACIFIC DIVISION

Phil E. Church <i>President</i>	Robert C. Miller <i>Secretary</i>
------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

SOUTHWESTERN AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN DIVISION

Edwin R. Helwig <i>President</i>	Marlowe G. Anderson <i>Executive Secretary</i>
-------------------------------------	---

ALASKA DIVISION

Allan H. Mick <i>President</i>	George Dahlgren <i>Executive Secretary</i>
-----------------------------------	---

The American Association for the Advancement of Science was founded in 1848 and incorporated in 1874. Its objects are to further the work of scientists, to facilitate cooperation among them, to improve the effectiveness of science in the promotion of human welfare, and to increase public understanding and appreciation of the importance and promise of the methods of science in human progress.

Lost Opportunities

Why do social scientists not take better advantage of major and foreseeable social changes to study the processes and effects that are involved? In its tax reduction program the U.S. is undertaking one of the greatest economic and fiscal experiments in modern history. The President has announced a "war on poverty." Integration is bringing a variety of sweeping changes. There will be practically oriented studies related to these programs, and government agencies are likely to study the public policy aspects. But where are the plans for fundamental or basic research on these changes prior to, during, and after their occurrence in order to gain additional understanding of the social processes involved?

Natural scientists are more forehanded. A solar eclipse is preceded by elaborate preparation in order to gain the maximum possible amount of new information during the fleeting moment of the event itself. The International Geophysical Year included arrangements for a world-wide warning system so that observations of solar flares and other particularly significant events could be coordinated on a world-wide basis. The U.S. Geological Survey maintains an observatory on the rim of Kilauea to study the forewarnings, the active processes, and the subsidence of volcanic eruptions.

This difference between social scientists and other scientists does not exist because of differences in predictability of the events with which they are concerned. Social change cannot be anticipated with the precise timing of an eclipse, but the timing is often more predictable than it is for a volcanic eruption. The difficulty is not lack of money; there is a fair amount available for research in the social sciences. Nor is it entirely slowness in making funds available; the National Science Foundation gave immediate support to a quickly planned study of reactions to the assassination of President Kennedy.

Perhaps the problem is inexperience in tackling such large issues. If so, help is available from a wealth of experience in the planning and coordination of large-scale efforts in other fields; the large survey groups have relevant experience; and a few major universities could give special attention to such studies.

Maybe the reason is lack of interest. Months before the first satellite went into orbit, two or three of us tried to persuade social scientists to plan a study of popular knowledge about space and of attitudes toward human exploration of space, for then, before the first satellite was successfully launched, was the time to start such a study if information on a before-and-after basis was desired. A biologist and a physicist whom we invited to participate were eager to contribute their specialized knowledge to the planning of such a study, but the social scientists we invited all replied that they were too busy or for some other reason could not take part.

The processes and effects of something like the tax reduction program are, of course, exceedingly complex; to study them in their naturalistic setting is not easy. But complexity and difficulty are not peculiar to the social sciences; it is often easier to analyze a process in vitro than in vivo. Some things, however, can be observed only in their natural settings. In not studying them when they occur, social scientists are losing priceless opportunities to learn more about the processes involved in major social change.—D.W.