

355-0343D  
002AMERICAN 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

1968

ROBERT L. BOWMAN  
JOSEPH W. CHAMBERLAIN  
JOHN T. EDSELL  
ALEXANDER HOLLAENDER  
GORDON J. F. MACDONALD  
NEAL E. MILLER  
DE WITT STETTEN, JR.

1969

EMIL HAURY  
WILLARD F. LIBBY  
EVERETT I. MENDELSON  
JOHN R. PIERCE  
KENNETH S. PITZER  
ALEXANDER RICH  
CLARENCE M. ZENER

## 1970

GUSTAF O. ARRHENIUS  
FRED R. EGGAN  
HARRY F. HARLOW  
MILTON HARRIS

RICHARD C. LEWONTIN  
ALFRED O. C. NIER  
FRANK W. PUTNAM

## Editorial Staff

## Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

## Publisher

DAEL WOLFFLE

## Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

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

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News Editor: JOHN WALSH

Foreign Editor: DANIEL S. GREENBERG\*

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, LUTHER J. CARTER, BRYCE NELSON, PHILIP M. BOFFEY, ANDREW JAMISON, MARTI MUELLER, ANN H. LARUS.

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART

Editorial Assistants: SUSAN AXELRAD, JOANNE BELK, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, BEN CARLIN, HELEN CARTER, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, KONSLYNNIETTA HUTCHINSON, ELEANOR JOHNSON, PAULA LECKY, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, BARBARA SHEFFER, YA LI SWIGART, ALICE THEILE

\* European Office: 22 Mulberry Walk, London, S.W. 3, England (Telephone: 352-9749)

## Advertising Staff

## Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

## Production Manager

KAY GOLDSTEIN

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. See also page 1709, *Science*, 29 December 1967. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

## National Science Foundation Priorities

The recently passed Daddario bill gives the National Science Foundation new and additional responsibilities. The same Congress that adopted this bill is about to give the NSF an appropriation almost 20 percent below the \$500 million level of the past 2 years. The figure will be between the \$400 million already approved by the House and the \$410 million approved by the Senate. The amount that can be spent may be somewhat different; carry-over of funds from earlier years may allow expenditure of as much as \$460 million, or the reductions required by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act may limit expenditures to less than the appropriated amount.

Someday soon the Bureau of the Budget will tell NSF how much it can spend in the fiscal year that started on 1 July. Present indications are that the deepest cuts will be in support for the construction of scientific facilities and for improving promising scientific institutions. New grants for these purposes will be few. Funds for research will not be so severely reduced, but, even so, research grants will probably be made to slightly fewer institutions than received them in recent years.

The new law requires NSF to report annually the amount of federal money received by each college or university and other appropriate nonprofit institution in the United States. Congressmen are always interested in what flows into their districts. This year some of them will be disappointed. Some members of Congress, however, were quite aware that they were restricting the spread of NSF funds. During the Senate discussion, Senator Pell said that the reduced appropriation would necessarily bring a disproportionate decrease in the funds available for "developing the science resources of institutions which are promising but which have not been in the top levels of science achievement because NSF cannot disrupt important ongoing activities and must honor prior commitments."

This result is inevitable. Prior commitments must be honored. Research projects and institutional development programs that are already well started must have priority over new ones. Quality must remain the primary criterion of selection. In the first annual report of the Foundation, the chairman of the National Science Board, James B. Conant, wrote: "In the advance of science and its applications to many practical problems, there is no substitute for first-class men. Ten second-rate scientists cannot do the work of one who is in the first rank."

These general policy lines are clear enough. But applying them will require the NSF staff to squeeze project budgets into tighter molds, to reject more proposals, and to contract the geographic and institutional spread of NSF funds. There will inevitably be much debate over the relative priority of different programs.

Altogether it will be a difficult year, and from this distance fiscal year 1970 does not look much brighter. Unless national and international problems have abated more than seems reasonable to expect, the new President will probably have to ask Congress to extend the income tax surcharge beyond 30 June 1969. Congress may then insist, as it did this year, on a reduction in expenditures. Even if these speculations turn out to be inaccurate, a substantial increase for the NSF seems unlikely. The policy decisions, priorities, and curtailments required this year are likely to be governing for at least another year.—DAEL WOLFFLE