

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

ROBERT L. BOWMAN	WILLARD F. LIBBY
MELVIN CALVIN	GORDON J. F. MACDONALD
JOSEPH W. CHAMBERLAIN	EVERETT I. MENDELSON
FARRINGTON DANIELS	NEAL E. MILLER
JOHN T. EDSALL	JOHN R. PIERCE
DAVID R. GODDARD	COLIN S. PITTENDRIGH
EMIL HAURY	KENNETH S. PITZER
ALEXANDER HOLLAENDER	ALEXANDER RICH
ROBERT JASTROW	DEWITT STETTEN, JR.
EDWIN M. LERNER, II	EDWARD L. TATUM
	CLARENCE M. ZENER

## 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 and Comment: DANIEL S. GREENBERG, JOHN WALSH, ELINOR LANGER, MARION ZEIGER, JANE AYRES

Europe: VICTOR K. MCELHENY, Flat 3, 18 Kensington Court Place, London, W.8, England (Western 5360)

Book Reviews: SARAH S. DEES

Editorial Assistants: JAMES BLESSING, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, BEN CARLIN, SYLVIA EBERHART, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, MARCIA JODLBAUER, RUTH KINGERLEE, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, ELLEN SALTZ

## Advertising Staff

## Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

## Production Manager

RAYMONDE SALAMA

Sales: New York, N.Y., 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858): RICHARD L. CHARLES, ROBERT S. BUGBEE  
Scotch Plains, N.J., 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873): C. RICHARD CALLIS

Chicago, Ill., 6 W. Ontario St. (312-DE-7-4973): HERBERT BURKLUND

Los Angeles 45, Calif., 8255 Beverly Blvd. (213-653-9817): WINN NANCE

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. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE 6-1858.

## New Directions for the National Science Foundation

On 22 June, the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development opened the first comprehensive legislative review—as distinct from annual appropriations hearings—that the National Science Foundation has had since its establishment 15 years ago (*Science*, 11 June 1965). The hearings are sure to include an examination of the Foundation's programs and activities, its operational policies, and the extent to which it has met its large responsibilities. We hope that the committee members and the witnesses who appear before them will go beyond these matters to a consideration of the Foundation's future role.

The Foundation's record is, on the whole, a fine one and there is little point in taking up much time at the legislative hearings either in criticisms or compliments. Nor should overmuch attention be given to such topics as overhead rates, geographic distribution, or the relative merits of different forms of support, for although these matters still press for decision, they are already widely discussed.

There are other, newer, and more fundamental issues that concern the Foundation's future. One deals with scope. Should the Foundation, as a number of recent observers have recommended, assume a much larger fraction of the federal responsibility for supporting basic research, perhaps becoming the major source of federal funds for academic research, while the agencies with primary responsibilities of a more practical character become relatively less important in the support of basic research?

This is not the only possibility of change. The nation needs better means for seeing that new knowledge is put to civilian use. Should the Foundation expand in the direction of greater involvement in the applications of science to much needed technological developments such as weather control, solar energy, earthquake prediction, transportation improvement, and others in which Congress and the nation would welcome successful end items?

There is need for such work, but there are also arguments for keeping the Foundation as one major scientific agency that does not have responsibilities for practical missions. In fact, the Foundation might move in the direction of scientific purity. If it were to leave operations and technology to other agencies and were to relinquish some of its educational responsibilities to the increasingly vigorous U.S. Office of Education, it could concentrate its energies on the support and improvement of basic research and graduate education in the sciences. Such a retraction of scope seems unlikely but would be welcomed by some scientists.

As still another direction of change, the Foundation might evolve into an agency of broad responsibility for higher education, one that would fuse the strengths and techniques that have been developed by the Foundation with the almost overwhelming responsibilities of the Office of Education and the incipient activities of the prospective National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The science programs of the federal government have led the way in the establishment of stronger and broader interactions between the federal government and the total educational effort of the nation. The next step could be a union that would frighten some of the interested parties and appear to others to be a new frontier of intellectual leadership undreamed of when the National Science Foundation was planned or established.

The Foundation cannot take all of these diverging courses, but surely it will change, and its future may be as different from the present as the present Foundation is from the one envisioned 15 years ago. The current hearings provide an opportunity for some thoughtful speculation about how the Foundation can best meet future needs.—DAEL WOLFLE