

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

Editor: PHILIP H. ABELSON

Chief Business Officer: WILLIAM M. MILLER III

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, RUTH KULSTAD, MARY PRESCOTT

Associate Editors: MARTHA COLLINS, SYLVIA EBERHART, CAITILIN GORDON, WILLIAM GREAVES, LOIS SCHMITT

Assistant Editors: STEPHEN KEPPLER, 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 Chief Business Officer: 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: Advancesci, Washington. For "Information for Contributors," write to the editorial office or see page xi, *Science*, 28 September 1984.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager: DONNA RIVERA

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 Elegance of Choosing

A Soviet Embassy official, winding up an extended tour of duty in a reflective mood, remarked to his luncheon host that, all things considered, Americans and Russians are not all that different except for one thing; Americans have infinitely more choices. He did not add, though he might have, that the quantity of choices matters less than their quality.

In closed political systems most of the significant choices are made by the state through a structured planning process. Resources are mobilized to attain prescribed ends. In the Soviet Union the course of science and technology is directed through 170 comprehensive programs, 41 of which are targeted for accomplishment within the current 5-year plan, and the rest await the next planning round. It is an awesome way of doing the business of science and, if there is a flaw, it lies in the assumption that the research-production infrastructure has both the creativity and the efficiency to deliver planned objectives. Soviet science is not short on creativity, but there is many a fumble in handing off knowledge at the various stages of application, and Soviet officialdom does not conceal its frustration.

Comparatively speaking, the United States has the better of it despite the vagaries induced by the absence of straight-line planning and the unevenness of the roadbed on which science and technology travel. Ours is a system of interconnectedness rather than cohesion, but it admits light, ventilation, and improvisation. It prospers through flexibility, excellence in management, risk-taking, and good luck. Choices are considered, and directions readjusted or rejected at hundreds of nodes throughout the public, proprietary, and academic systems; decisions are reached for a multitude of objectives that may, or may not, bear upon the economic or national security goals of transient administrations. And because all this disaggregation yields a fine harvest, periodic calls for a national policy for science go begging.

Against this backdrop, the House Committee on Science and Technology is launching a massive inquiry into the contemporary arrangements for propagating science in the United States. It is a friendly search but one that will drive the congressional spade deeply into the turf of institutional self-satisfaction, which may be a very good thing. It will certainly go back to basics in the sense of recalibrating the efficacy of government's procedures for making investment choices, testing them against the new realities of sale, costs, and competitiveness that characterize the fruits of the past four decades. What we have here is a useful reminder that the Congress is equipped to exercise its voice as to priorities and objectives for science, along with its responsibilities to ponder the balance between national self-interest and global accountability relative to the hot pursuit of scientific and technical opportunity, its work may prove instructive.

If the recent elections reflect that state of popular preferences, as seems to be the case, one is led to think that government's roles will be increasingly limited and that pragmatism will strongly color its choices. The question then turns to time constants, to the difference between a pragmatism that hugs the short view and one that reaches for the longer term. It is a critical difference where science is concerned if for no other reason than that science is not an American monopoly. A kind of pragmatism that builds and solidifies joint scientific ventures with partners from other nations, in lieu of going it alone, would tilt toward the longer view. A version of pragmatism that consigns scientific knowledge to the category of trade secrets would take the other route. Seeing the difference with clarity is a key to the elegance of choosing.—WILLIAM D. CAREY