

353-43320

715

American Association for the Advancement of Science

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Paul M. Gross, *Retiring President, Chairman*
 Alan T. Waterman, *President*
 Laurence M. Gould, *President Elect*
 Henry Eyring Mina Rees
 H. Bentley Glass Walter Orr Roberts
 Don K. Price Alfred S. Romer
 William W. Rubey
 Paul E. Klopsteg Dael Wolfe
Treasurer *Executive Officer*

SECTION VICE PRESIDENTS AND SECRETARIES

MATHEMATICS (A)
 Magnus R. Hestenes Wallace Givens
 PHYSICS (B)
 Elmer Hutchisson Stanley S. Ballard
 CHEMISTRY (C)
 Milton Orchin S. L. Meisel
 ASTRONOMY (D)
 Paul Herget Frank Bradshaw Wood
 GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY (E)
 John C. Reed Richard H. Mahard
 ZOOLOGICAL SCIENCES (F)
 Dietrich Bodenstern David W. Bishop
 BOTANICAL SCIENCES (G)
 Aaron J. Sharp Harriet B. Creighton
 ANTHROPOLOGY (H)
 David A. Baerreis Eleanor Leacock
 PSYCHOLOGY (I)
 Lloyd G. Humphreys Frank W. Finger
 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES (K)
 Kingsley Davis Ithiel de Sola Pool
 HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE (L)
 Adolph Grünbaum N. Russell Hanson
 ENGINEERING (M)
 Clarence E. Davies Leroy K. Wheelock
 MEDICAL SCIENCES (N)
 Francis D. Moore Oscar Touster
 DENTISTRY (Nd)
 Paul E. Boyle S. J. Kreshover
 PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES (Np)
 Don E. Francke
 AGRICULTURE (O)
 A. H. Moseman Howard B. Sprague
 INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE (P)
 Alfred T. Waidelich Allen T. Bonnell
 EDUCATION (Q)
 H. E. Wise Herbert A. Smith
 INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION (T)
 Foster E. Mohrhardt Phyllis V. Parkins
 STATISTICS (U)
 Harold Hotelling Morris B. Ullman

PACIFIC DIVISION

John P. Tully Robert C. Miller
President *Secretary*

SOUTHWESTERN AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN DIVISION

Anton H. Berkman Marlowe G. Anderson
President *Executive Secretary*

ALASKA DIVISION

Allan H. Mick George Dahlgren
President *Executive Secretary*

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.

How Guard Our Diversity in Science?

Recently Jerome Wiesner testified before the House Committee on Government Appropriations that the government plans to allocate for the coming fiscal year the sum of \$12.3 billion for support of research and development in the nation. Although this sum represents only about 15 percent of the overall federal budget, it amounts to well over one-third that portion not formally committed.

These are awesome figures. Their positive impact is clear enough. But there are cautionary aspects that cannot be stressed too often. They were introduced by the President when he observed that federally financed activities in defense, space, and atomic energy absorb roughly two-thirds of our total supply of physical scientists and engineers. They are further emphasized by a committee headed by J. Herbert Holloman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. Such is the stress created by this drain that we are actually falling behind Western Europe, England, and Japan in our resources of scientific talent available to industrial production.

Throughout our national history we have depended on a demand mechanism to distribute human effort and resources in a pattern which, if sometimes wasteful in the short term, in the long term provided proven benefits. This approach has served us well. But it assumed two fundamental premises, among others: that available resources of trained human talent would continue to be great enough to fill all demands, and that their commitments would continue to be highly plural in nature and, moreover, flexible. What do we do when so large a fraction of the reserve is being inflexibly committed to specific enterprises that the bottom of the barrel is visible? What do we do when—as is not yet universally recognized—it is not dollars but unbuyable human gifts that will set the limit?

But there is another dimension to this matter of plural commitment of scientific and engineering talent. In the past, we have owed some of the greatest advances in our understanding of nature—not to mention the greatest leaps in technical exploitation—to the work of individual genius ill-fitted to the kind of specific scientific commitment that faces us on such a colossal scale today. It would be strange if the potential of such individuals in the years to come were less than it has been in the past. Indeed, it ought to be yet greater. For the substrate of scientific knowledge with which it works today is enormously larger. And again, the absolute numbers of such exceptionally gifted individuals among us should increase in the future, provided that conditions for their discovery and development do not deteriorate.

But what part of this priceless resource is annually swept irrevocably into the maw of activities organized about sharply committed goals? What part is annually consigned, at a formative age, to an environment which, while it may produce worthy scientific citizens, may also extinguish the full reach of their potential? These are very serious questions indeed. They ought to be argued and thought about deeply at every level by those concerned for our future scientific welfare and progress.—CARRYL P. HASKINS, *Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, D.C.*