SCIENCE

29 MAY 1987 VOLUME 236 NUMBER 4805

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 con flicting 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.

Publisher: Alvin W. Trivelpiece Editor: Daniel E. Koshland, Jr

Deputy Editors: Philip H. Abelson (Engineering and Applied Sciences); John I. Brauman (Physical Sciences)

FDITORIAL STAFF

Managing Editor: Patricia A. Morgan

Assistant Managing Editors: Nancy J. Hartnagel, John E.

Senior Editors: Eleanore Butz, Ruth Kulstad

Associate Editors: Martha Collins, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L Kelner, Edith Meyers, Phillip D. Szuromi, David F. Voss

etters Editor: Christine Gilbert

Book Reviews: Katherine Livingston, editor; Deborah F

This Week in Science: Ruth Levy Guyer Contributing Editor: Lawrence I. Grossman Chief Production Editor: Ellen E. Murphy

Editing Department: Lois Schmitt, head; Mary McDaniel, Barbara E. Patterson

Copy Desk: Lyle L. Green, Sharon Ryan, Beverly Shields,

Production Manager: Karen Schools

Assistant Production Manager: James Landry Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, Kathleen Cosimano,

Eleanor Warner Covers Editor: Grayce Finge

Manuscript Systems Analyst: William Carter

NEWS STAFF

News Editor: Barbara J. Culliton

News and Comment: Colin Norman, deputy editor; Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Eliot Marshall, Marjorie Sun

Research News: Roger Lewin, deputy editor; Deborah M. Barnes, Richard A. Kerr, Gina Kolata, Jean L. Marx, Arthur L. Robinson, M. Mitchell Waldron

European Correspondent: David Dickson

BUSINESS STAFF

Associate Publisher: William M. Miller, III Business Staff Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold Membership Recruitment: Gwendolyn Huddle Member and Subscription Records: Ann Ragland Guide to Biotechnology Products and Instruments:

ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

Director: Earl J. Scherago Production Manager: Donna Rivera Advertising Sales Manager: Richard L. Charles Marketing Manager: Herbert L. Burklund Sales: New York, NY 10036: J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broad-way (212-730-1050); Scotch Plains, NJ 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Chicago, IL 60611 Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); San Jose, CA 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16 St. (408 998-4690); Dorset, VT 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581); Damascus, MD 20872: Rick Sommer, 24808 Shrubbery Hill Ct. (301-972-9270); U.K., Europe: Nick Jones, +44(0647)52918; Telex 42513; FAX (0392) 31645.

Information for contributors appears on page xi of the 27 March 1987 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Telephone: 202-326-6500.

Advertising correspondence should be sent to Tenth Floor, 1515 Broadway, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO

The Challenge to U.S. Competitiveness

f the Soviet launch of Sputnik was a technological shock, and the oil crisis of 1973 an oil shock, then what is happening to us today can only be called a competitiveness shock. Although the competitive challenge is understood in some parts of industry and government, it is not widely understood for its significance and its threat to the national economic well-being and our standard of living.

One of our tasks is to meet the challenge of the globalization of the world economy. Industries and individual companies in the United States or in other countries ignore at their economic peril the need to operate in a global economy. The challenge is across the boardin market access, low-cost production, quality products, research and development, innovation, marketing, and education. The competition is for market share not only abroad but also in the United States. Access to global markets is critical to economic success. Although it is essential that products be competitive in cost, quality, and performance, in many cases economic and political necessity dictates that the products and institutions that produce them have an indigenous component.

A phenomenon, the long-term consequences of which are poorly understood, is that product design, engineering, and software development increasingly are likely to be done overseas. The implications for maintaining the essential U.S. engineering capability are worrisome because of the implied erosion of the U.S. base in knowledge and know-how. Whether automobiles or refrigerators, computers or microchips, nuclear power or energy transmission systems, the likelihood is increasing that the systems are assembled from components designed, engineered, manufactured, and shipped from all parts of the world.

Increasingly, excellence in research and engineering is to be found throughout the world, and the level of innovation is rising abroad. Witness the increase in the number of patents granted to foreign companies and individuals in the past year. More than 43 percent of the patents granted in the United States went to foreign entities.

It is time that our national policy recognizes the key role of engineering research and engineering application, alongside of scientific discovery, in meeting the global competitive challenge before us. This means allocating funds to, and creating programs for, engineering activity to an extent far greater than exists today. There must be a realization that engineering and technology are different from science and equally important. It also means encouraging private investment in engineering research and its application.

The absence of attention to excellence in manufacturing has been at the heart of some of our problems in industrial competitiveness. Until recently we have failed to treat the manufacturing process as a system; we have failed to provide adequate manufacturing education in our engineering and business schools; we have failed in many cases to provide the incentives of prestige and compensation to manufacturing engineering; and we have failed to make the capital investments in new manufacturing technology.

We are assured, however, by some economists and others that we need not worry about manufacturing moving offshore, since all we are witnessing is a natural, though painful, transition to a service economy in the United States. Although it is true that services increasingly are sources of employment and wealth generation, we face the dilemma that a thriving service economy is directly dependent on a vigorous manufacturing base. We need to recognize that the problems of manufacturing productivity and quality require a system approach. We need to examine manufacturing from the design phase to the producibility of the product to its marketing, and distribution. Only when this view is adopted throughout industry and academia will our manufacturing sector regain competitiveness.—ROBERT M. White,* President, National Academy of Engineering, Washington, DC 20418

29 MAY 1987 EDITORIAL 1041

^{*}Adapted from "Taking technological stock," Report of the President at the NAE 22nd Annual Meeting (National Academy of Engineering, Washington, DC, 1986).