

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	EVERETT I. MENDELSON
JOSEPH W. CHAMBERLAIN	NEAL E. MILLER
JOHN T. EDSALL	JOHN R. PIERCE
EMIL HAURY	KENNETH S. PITZER
ALEXANDER HOLLAENDER	ALEXANDER RICH
WILLARD F. LIBBY	DEWITT STETTIN, JR.
GORDON J. F. MACDONALD	CLARENCE M. ZENER

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher Business Manager
DAEL WOLFE HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

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

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News Editor: DANIEL S. GREENBERG

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH,* ELINOR LANGER, LUTHER J. CARTER, BRYCE NELSON, GILIAN PARRILLO, JOAN ANDERSON

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART

Editorial Assistants: JOANNE BELK, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, BEN CARLIN, CAROLYN CLARK, JANE COLE, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, KONSLYNNIETTA HUTCHINSON, ELEANOR JOHNSON, PAULA LECKY, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, LEAH RYAN, BARBARA SHEFFER

**European Office:* Lime Tree Farm, East Hagbourne, Berkshire, England. Telephone Didcot 3317

Advertising Staff

Director Production Manager

EARL J. SCHERAGO ROSE MARIE ROMAGNOLO

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES
Sales: New York, N.Y., 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858): ROBERT S. BUGBEE

Scotch Plains, N.J., 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873): C. RICHARD CALLIS

Medfield, Mass. 02052, 4 Rolling Lane (617-359-2370): RICHARD M. EZEQUELLE

Chicago, Ill. 60611, 919 N. Michigan Ave., Room 426 (312-DE-7-4973): HERBERT L. 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.

Public-Private Organizations

President Johnson's committee to review Central Intelligence Agency support of private organizations that operate abroad submitted two basic recommendations: that covert support of educational and private voluntary organizations be stopped, and that a public-private mechanism be developed to provide open governmental support of overseas activities of selected private organizations.

The President's committee concentrated on overseas activities, but the question of public support of private organizations that work for the public good is a wider one. In the 1966 annual report of the Carnegie Corporation, Alan Pifer advocated governmental support of selected scholarly and professional associations, health and community action agencies, nonuniversity research and educational institutions, defense advisory organizations, and agencies providing technical assistance. There is little doubt that it is desirable to have strong, independent organizations of all these types, but financing is a problem. Their own resources are often inadequate. Foundations cannot supply permanent help. Project-by-project support endangers independence. Pifer concludes that continuing government support is the only solution: "If we want to avoid an ever more extensive and powerful Federal Government, it would seem that we must now, paradoxically, use federal money to ensure that we have a viable alternative—a network of vigorous, well-financed nongovernmental organizations ready to serve government but able, in the public interest, to maintain their independence of it."

In response to his committee report, the President has now appointed a new committee, under the chairmanship of Secretary Rusk, to study ways of achieving the proposed mechanism for using public funds to assist private organizations that serve public purposes.

The provision of open and continuing support of organizations that operate overseas, as the President's committee recommended, or of a wider range of agencies, as Pifer proposed, presents a problem which Great Britain has solved more satisfactorily than the United States has. "It is no longer a bishop or a queen or a merchant-prince, but the little man in the street, who is the patron of learning. The little man in the street is very powerful. He is liable to exercise what de Tocqueville called the despotism of the majority." Sir Eric Ashby wrote these words about universities, but they apply as well to the institutions Pifer and the President's committee had in mind. That the despotism of the majority has not been exercised over British universities, Ashby continued, is due "to a very simple but remarkable device which has been invented in Britain for subsidizing intellectual activity without endangering its independence. It is a political invention of the first importance. It is simply this: Parliament entrusts financial control of science and other intellectual activities to bodies of men whose sympathies and interests lie less with Parliament than with those whom they are controlling."

This political invention is exemplified in Great Britain by the University Grants Committee and the British councils, and in several other countries by comparable institutions. A U.S. example is the peer system of evaluating research proposals submitted to government agencies. Pifer and the President's committee want to extend the principle so that we may avoid the dangers of covert support and government control while we gain the advantages of strong, independent nongovernmental organizations that serve the public interest.—DAEL WOLFE