

353-0347D  
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

1970

GUSTAF O. ARRHENIUS	RICHARD C. LEWONTIN
FRED R. EGGAN	ALFRED O. C. NIER
HARRY F. HARLOW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
MILTON HARRIS	

1971

THOMAS EISNER	NEAL MILLER
AMITAI ETZIONI	BRUCE MURRAY
EMIL HAURY	JOHN R. PIERCE
DANIEL KOSHLAND, JR.	

## Editorial Staff

## Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Business Manager: Hans Nussbaum

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

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

Assistants to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN, PAULA LECKY

News Editor: JOHN WALSH

Foreign Editor: DANIEL S. GREENBERG\*

News and Comment: LUTHER J. CARTER, PHILIP M. BOFFEY, NANCY GRUCHOW, SCHERRAINE MACK, SAMUEL Z. GOLDBABER, THOMAS P. SOUTHWICK

Research Topics: ROBERT W. HOLCOMB

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, CAROL BROWN

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: JOANNE BELK, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, NANCY HAMILTON, CORINE HARRIS, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, MARSHALL KATHAN, MARGARET LLOYD, VIRGINIA NUESSE, PATRICIA ROWE, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, BARBARA SHEFFER, RICHARD SOMMER, YA LI SWIGART, ALICE THEILE, MARIE WEBNER

Membership, Subscriptions, and Circulation: Thomas Bazan, Patricia Caesar, Bett Seemund

\* 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. 10036: Robert S. Bugbee, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); MEDFIELD, MASS. 02052: Richard M. Ezequille, 4 Rolling Lane (617-444-1439); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Herbert L. Burkland, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772)

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 xviA, *Science*, 27 March 1970. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

← Circle No. 4 on Readers' Service Card

## New Policy for the Government-University Partnership

For the first time since the period 1945-47 the United States is in the midst of shaping a new science policy. The old government-university partnership had already lost its basic rationale even before the events of early May. The campuses are now centers of questioning of many aspects of the connection between university and government at the same time that the Administration is checking budgetary support, applying political tests to appointments for technical positions, and dismantling the organization for science within the government. The two parts of the government-university partnership are thus moving away from one another so fast that even to talk of science policy in the present circumstances is to look toward the creation of a new partnership, not a revival of the old one.

A listing of the changes now going on which will shape the new science policy might include:

1) The Department of Defense has lost its ability to justify support for basic research and also to attract the services of many scientists. Yet the problems of military research are now unprecedentedly difficult because of the serious implications of the diplomatic and military policies of the Administration. If the scientists knowledgeable in military research, who provide one of the groups with the best chance to change the course of events with competent criticism, lose touch with the Department of Defense completely, an unparalleled disaster could ensue. Yet a reordering of the relation of the scientific community to the Department of Defense cannot be postponed.

2) The scientific community must pay much more attention to environmental problems. In attempting to alter priorities in favor of the environment, architects of the new science policy must bear in mind the need for disciplines long relatively neglected and remember the presence in the government of old and stable research traditions which have been considering the environment for more than a century.

3) The space program must find a role for itself with predominantly scientific objectives and a steady state of funding.

4) The social sciences must receive greater emphasis both because they have demonstrated increased effectiveness in the last quarter century and because the demand for their application has increased. The question must be faced of how to mesh them with sensitive social problems and also with projects heretofore considered the preserve of the natural sciences without destroying their integrity.

5) The justification of federal support for research in the universities must emphasize the goal of building healthy institutions in the national interest. The support must extend to the humanities and to those parts of the social and natural sciences which contribute strongly to the institutions but whose connection with practical applications is indirect.

6) Support for education must contemplate a national research program with a radically different mix of disciplines from that recently prevailing.

A science policy which takes into account the changing realities of 1970 cannot confine itself to a single problem, a single agency, or a single mechanism for reorganization. The science agencies, the Executive Office of the President, and the White House must be viewed as an interacting whole. In addition, the Congress must seriously contemplate taking responsibility for shaping the whole structure in a way which will honor both the freedom and the unique potentialities of the scientific community.—A. HUNTER DUPREE, *Brown University*