

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

FREDERICK R. BLATTNER, BERNARD F. BURKE, ARNOLD DEMAIN, CHARLES L. DRAKE, ARTHUR F. FINDEIS, E. PETER GEIDUSCHEK, GLYNN ISAAC, NEAL E. MILLER, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, ALLEN NEWELL, RUTH PATRICK, BRYANT W. ROSSITER, VERA C. RUBIN, WILLIAM P. SLICHTER, SOLOMON H. SNYDER, PAUL E. WAGGONER, JOHN WOOD

Publisher: WILLIAM D. CAREY
Associate Publisher: ROBERT V. ORMES

Editor: PHILIP H. ABELSON

Editorial Staff

Assistant Managing Editor: JOHN E. RINGLE
Production Editor: ELLEN E. MURPHY
Business Manager: HANS NUSSBAUM
News Editor: BARBARA J. CULLITON
News and Comment: COLIN NORMAN (deputy editor), JEFFREY L. FOX, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, ELIOT MARSHALL, R. JEFFREY SMITH, MARJORIE SUN, JOHN WALSH
European Correspondent: DAVID DICKSON
Contributing Writer: LUTHER J. CARTER
Research News: ROGER LEWIN (deputy editor), RICHARD A. KERR, GINA KOLATA, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, M. MITCHELL WALDROP
Administrative Assistant, News: SCHERRAINE MACK;
Editorial Assistant, News: FANNIE GROOM
Senior Editors: ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DOREFMAN, RUTH KULSTAD
Associate Editors: MARTHA COLLINS, SYLVIA EBERHART, CAITILIN GORDON, LOIS SCHMITT
Assistant Editors: STEPHEN KEPPEL, LISA MCCULLOUGH, EDITH MEYERS
Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, *Editor:* LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG
Letters: CHRISTINE GILBERT
Copy Editor: ISABELLA BOULDIN
Production: JOHN BAKER, HOLLY BISHOP, ELEANOR WARNER, JEAN ROCKWOOD, SHARON RYAN, BEVERLY SHIELDS
Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: GRAYCE FINGER, *Editor:* GERALDINE CRUMP, CORRINE HARRIS
Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD G. SOMMER
Editorial Administrator: SUSAN ELLIOTT
Assistant to the Associate Publisher: ROSE LOWERY
Assistant to the Managing Editor: NANCY HARTNAGEL
Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE
Member and Subscription Records: ANN RAGLAND
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: Advancements, Washington. For "Information for Contributors," write to the editorial office or see page xi, *Science*, 30 March 1984.
BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO
Production Manager: GINA REILLY
Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES
Marketing Manager: HERBERT L. BURKLUND
Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Steve Hamburger, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); SAN JOSE, CALIF. 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16 St. (408-998-4690); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Diefenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581).
ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York 10036 (212-730-1050).

The Cultures of Science and Technology

In her editorial (10 February, p. 543), Anna J. Harrison succinctly differentiates among the processes of science, engineering, and technology. This is a valuable first step in clarifying the problems that the government faces in developing policies relevant to these areas. But policy-making efforts also require that we examine the cultures involved in the three processes and their constituencies. While, as Harrison points out, scientists are increasingly acting as engineers and engineers as scientists, that phenomenon is one of personal and intellectual mobility. When scientists act as problem-solvers, they adopt the engineering-technology culture and serve the engineering-technology constituency. The reverse is also true. Thus, it is appropriate here to ignore that mobility.

Science has as its constituency the general public. Within the science culture, the results of the science process are considered free goods. While secrecy may be observed to ensure priority, once results are in, publication is the rule. Institutions that fund the major work in science, universities, and fellow scientists measure scientists, among other things, by how well and quickly they disseminate results. Science is among the most open of activities. The output is knowledge and understanding, and this output is most often embodied in publications and in the process of teaching.

Engineering and technology are very different from science. There are, of course, engineering scientists engaged in engineering science—just as there are biological scientists and nuclear scientists—and they follow the science culture and leave as their legacy public scientific knowledge. Almost all engineering, as is the case with technology, however, reaches its expression in things and services. Only incidentally does engineering or technology result in a legacy of knowledge. That such knowledge is a by-product does not demean its importance; it merely identifies it as irrelevant to the driving forces in the culture and the constituency.

Because of this commonality in output, I shall use "technology" for both engineering and technology. Technologists strive to solve problems at a price that makes the public willing to select and use their solutions. Cost and price, reliability, and other attributes that lead to that selection are as much parts of the technologist's calculus as are stress, resistance, and friction. In our competitive, relatively capitalist society, the efforts of the technologist are mediated by companies that expect to profit from the public's adoption of the technologist's solution. In other societies the rewards to the mediating enterprises range from social status to political power.

Regardless of the society, the rewards go to the organization (and through it to the technologist) that most successfully achieves public adoption of the technology. Thus, while the public may be the technologist's ultimate constituency, the existence of this intermediary organization—and its rewards—set the technologist's culture. Technology is developed in secret. Publication is anathema, and the final test of validity is public use. Indeed, so strong is the drive for secrecy that early public policy created the U.S. patent system. Society went so far as to grant a monopoly to the technologist in exchange for revealing the technical knowledge embodied in the patent's disclosure. Engineers and technologists often work in teams and share knowledge within the host organization, but outside lie the competitors. Technologists work very hard to prevent the spread of their new knowledge. Thus, the legacy of technology is the material advancement of society.

The cultures of science and technology are thus almost opposites—a fact we either ignore or deny when we establish agencies under the rubric of "science and technology." If we are to make and implement sound public policy regarding science and technology, we must understand these differences and capitalize on them rather than deny them. Indeed the linking of science and technology that we do routinely may be the first hurdle of denial that we must overcome.—JORDAN J. BARUCH, *President, Jordan J. Baruch Associates, Washington, DC 20036*