

These different definitions of "technological" made it difficult to agree on whether or not there was a gap because each person's reference was not the same. As the panels progressed, the referents became clearer, and a consensus was built which included the greatest number of participants. It was generally agreed that there was an overall imbalance between Europe and America, but in a number of specific industries and in certain areas of pure science Europe enjoys parity and even superiority. However, the number of such sectors was relatively small and the United States was seen to have a decided edge, not only in the overall conditions, asserted to result in technological growth, but in the specific results themselves, especially in the critical industries of aerospace, electronics and computers.

Thus, defining "gap" as an uneven distribution of technologically relevant resources, it was agreed that such a gap existed. There was also a sentiment that, even in the local circumstances where now the gap was not pronounced, the future was threatening because of the large scale impetus to technology which the Americans were able to stimulate in their society. Furthermore there were gaps within Europe itself and between Europe and the undeveloped nations. Under these circumstances, the panelists turned to the causes of the disparities identified.

While there is much variation in the individual cases, reflected in the different examples discussed in each panel, a number of common themes can be identified which lay at the base of the technological imbalance. Large scale European-Atlantic differences in values, mobility, institutional structures, size, and rigidity were seen to account for the discrepancies. Values or attitudes which might foster behavior leading to technological growth were found to be relatively weak in Europe. Whether the issue under discussion was the attitudes toward accepting innovation and change, or working to increase the profit of a firm, or moving to turn pure science into applied technology, the values of Europeans were deemed to be less supportive to technology than those of Americans.

Mobility was another common theme. The reference varied from one panel to the other. Some stressed the relatively greater capacity of Americans for geographic mobility, while other stressed the relative ease with which Americans enjoyed occupational mobility between universities, research institutes and the industrial sector. In each panel, the relative dynamism of American society was underlined as a major cause of technological superiority deemed to be dependent on the free exchange of individuals and information throughout the society. Special attention was paid to the link between the generator of science, the university, and the applicator of science, industry. The link was seen to be highly productive in the United States and relatively weak in Europe.

Related to the differences in mobility, are the differences in institutional structures. Communications between institutions and within institutions were deemed to be better in the United States than in Europe. In the new pragmatic political environment of the United States, government is allowed and even encouraged to play a major role in developing the U.S. technological base. Government aids industry by subsidizing research in the early non-profit stage. Industry profits from spin-offs from government initiated projects. Mutual benefits accrue from the structural relations which industry, government, and the university have evolved with each other. The relative absence of structural barriers against trade and the relative ease with which the different economic, political, and intellectual institutions can communicate with each other and adapt to changes in the needs of one or the other partner, all these assets of the dynamic environment were considered by many to be at the root of technological disparities.

For others, size was counted as a major asset in favor of the United States. Size of firm, to allow for capital formation and size of production facility, to allow for small unit cost, were said to work in the favor of the United States. The size of market was judged as an especially important and, perhaps, critical factor. However, some panelists argued that size alone was not the key factor. Some small firms have managed to be extraordinarily innovative. It was pointed out that the critical role of size varied from one phase of product development to the other, and from one sector to the other.

In all panels, mention was made of the relative rigidity of European factors of production. The flexibility and adaptability which characterizes social and economic institutions in the United States was deemed as a useful asset of a technologically receptive society. Unpredictable demands of a rapidly developing