

American Association for the Advancement of 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.

Publisher: Alvin W. Trivelpiece

Editor: Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

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

EDITORIAL STAFF

Managing Editor: Patricia A. Morgan

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

Senior Editors: Eleanor Butz, Ruth Kulstad

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

Letters Editor: Christine Gilbert

Book Reviews: Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Deborah F. Washburn

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, Anna Victoreen

Production Manager: Karen Schools

Assistant Production Manager: James Landry

Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, Eleanor Warner

Covers Editor: Grayce Finger

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, John Walsh

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

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: Shauna S. Roberts

ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

Director: Earl J. Scherago

Traffic Manager: Donna Rivera

Traffic Manager (Recruitment): Gwen Canter

Advertising Sales Manager: Richard L. Charles

Marketing Manager: Herbert L. Burkland

Sales: New York, NY 10036: J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broadway (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.

Technology and Global Industry

Scientists are highly aware of a climate of rapid change in many technologies, including, for instance, those of computers and materials. But most of us have not been as conscious of a rapid globalization of industry and roles of international companies in promoting it. An interesting discussion of factors that have led to intense global competition in manufacturing is provided in a publication* that stemmed from a symposium conducted in 1986 by the National Academy of Engineering.

Globalization was rooted in a homogenization of markets, decreasing costs of transport and communication, and decreasing trade barriers. In the developed countries, national markets have become increasingly similar in taste as income distributions have equalized. In this changing environment companies noted that they could achieve growing economies of scale in their R&D and production through tapping global markets. Changes in product and process technology have increased the minimum efficient size for production in a variety of industries.

The multinational companies originally established factories abroad to avoid tariff and other barriers in various countries. But with time they perceived that they might attain cost advantages in the new locations. As the multinational corporations have gained experience at such locations, their subsequent responses to opportunities have been quicker and more assured. Earlier, their practice was to develop a new product or technology in the home country and to manufacture and market the products at home before introducing them abroad. With time, the pace has quickened, and technology may be transferred abroad almost as quickly as it is developed at home.

Technological changes in communications and transportation have greatly reduced costs to late-industrializing countries for assimilating technological information and for moving goods and people across great distances. They can be highly competitive in supplying finished goods. They can also manufacture many components at low costs. The multinational companies have been quick to locate plants in those countries or to buy components from them. The practice of out-sourcing is important and growing. With U.S. multinational enterprises accounting for two-thirds or more of U.S. industrial output, most U.S. producers will be ceaselessly looking abroad for cost reductions.

Many of us have hoped that competence in science and innovation would enable this country to be competitive in global trade. However, experience is showing that firms and nations can lose ground in the commercialization of advanced technologies at a time when they are the major sources for technological innovations of industrial significance. Rarely do patents confer perfect protection. Trade secrets are useful but only if the product can be distributed while the underlying technology is kept secret. Today, with widespread scientific and engineering competence and powerful analytical and computing capabilities, technological secrets are hard to keep. When a new product achieves widespread consumer acceptance, many companies are likely to produce it. The winners among them will be those who achieve low costs of manufacture and high quality and have marketing skill. The United States has been comparatively weak in achieving low-cost manufacturing with high quality. In the past, U.S. engineers have tended to shun the factory floor. In contrast, Japanese engineers are active there, and through a series of small incremental improvements they usually succeed in achieving substantial economies.

Another source of U.S. failure to compete is in the quality of the labor force, particularly in its lack of vocational training. Both West Germany and Japan are superior in these aspects. More important is the impact of military R&D on U.S. engineering talent. Roughly half of total U.S. R&D expenditures are devoted to military research. In Japan about 2 percent is allocated to that effort. Earlier, there were important spin-offs for the United States, but military hardware is becoming increasingly remote from civilian applications. Another source of U.S. failure is an archaic set of antitrust policies. There is also need to revise national policies to influence managements to respond to foreign competition by creating new facilities and achieving higher productivity here rather than sourcing abroad. —PHILIP H. ABELSON

**Technology and Global Industry: Companies and Nations in the World Economy* (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1987), \$19.95.