

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

1971

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

1972

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| ALFRED BROWN | FRANK PRESS |
| JAMES F. CROW | FRANK W. PUTNAM |
| THOMAS KUHN | WALTER O. ROBERTS |
| ELLIOTT W. MONTROLL | |

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

WILLIAM BEVAN

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

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

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, ROBERT J. BAZELL, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, ROBERT GILLETTE, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research Topics: ALLEN L. HAMMOND

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, MARLENE GLASER

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: MARGARET ALLEN, ISABELLA BOULDIN, BLAIR BURNS, ELEANORE BUTZ, RONNA CLINE, BARBARA GUARIN, CORRINE HARRIS, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, ELEANOR JOHNSON, MARSHALL KATHAN, MARGARET LLOYD, DANIEL RABOVSKY, PATRICIA ROWE, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, BARBARA SHEFFER, RICHARD SOMMER, YA LI SWIGART, ALICE THEILE, MARIE WEBNER

Membership Recruitment: LEONARD WRAY; **Subscriptions:** BETT SEEMUND; **Addressing:** THOMAS BAZAN

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

BONNIE SEMEL

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burkland, 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: John P. Cahill, 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. Phones: (Area code 202) Central office: 467-4350; Book Reviews: 467-4367; Business Office: 467-4411; Circulation: 467-4417; Guide to Scientific Instruments: 467-4480; News and Comment: 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions: 467-4483; Research Topics: 467-4455; Reviewing: 467-4440. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xv, *Science*, 26 March 1971. **ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE:** Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

One Objective for Science Teaching

Since coming to Washington and seeing at firsthand some of the problems of matching science to society, I have become concerned that public expectations of spectacular achievements are far greater than science and technology can produce. I see in the newspapers and hear from many of my lay friends that, if we can accomplish successfully the Apollo missions, we should be able to clean up the environment, provide adequate mass transportation, increase the availability of health care, and so on. Logically, such statements are non sequiturs, and yet they do have a certain amount of popular appeal. As a result of the remarkable accomplishments of science and technology there has arisen a general feeling that scientists and engineers can accomplish anything when they put their minds to it. Going to the moon seems, superficially at least, far more difficult and certainly more exotic than maintaining the biological oxygen demand at a reasonable level in the Potomac River.

Science and engineering are not omnipotent. There are several reasons why this is so. First, technology cannot violate the laws of nature. For example, we cannot build a perpetual motion machine because the first law of thermodynamics would be violated.

Second, a different constraint on science and technology is the so-called state-of-the-art. Deriving electric power from nuclear fusion sources would violate no law of nature, but such an achievement is beyond the state-of-the-art at the present time. Man can tailor the world to his liking only to a partial degree. Only certain pathways are open. Man and his society can pick only the best of those available, and none may be entirely palatable to all segments of society.

A third limitation on science and technology arises from economic, political, and legal constraints. It is generally conceded that satellite systems on the domestic scene would be useful and might solve important problems in communications. However, the country does not have domestic communication satellites, principally because the associated socio-political problems have not been solved.

Thus, science is constrained by the laws of nature, by the state-of-the-art at any given time, and by the structures of our society and our legal system. This deceptively simple statement is too often ignored by the public. In my view, the most important objective of science education is to make future generations aware of the real nature of the scientific and technological enterprise in just this sense.

What principles do we have which can accomplish this educational objective for science education? I believe that these subtleties can only be communicated through an experience with reality. This is a familiar viewpoint in teaching physics and chemistry where experimentation has long been an essential part of courses. One possible approach is to make available to the general student firsthand experience with a digital computer. A general purpose computer can theoretically solve any problem that is, in the language of automata theory, computable. Thus, the ambitions that the student may develop, or indeed that society may develop, for computer applications are essentially unlimited. However, before any one application can be brought to fruition, it must be reduced to a sequence of explicit steps that form the computer program. It is the discipline of reducing desires and ambitions to explicit operations that is missing in the lay concept of science and technology. The digital computer could be used for communicating that idea to the general student. Few experiences are as educational as finding that one's ideas must be made concrete lest they become ephemeral.—EDWARD E. DAVID, JR.

Dr. David is science adviser to President Nixon. This editorial is adapted from a talk given on 27 March 1971 at the 19th annual convention of the National Science Teachers Association during a symposium on the national assessment of educational progress.