

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.

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 Editor: Nancy J. Hartnagel

Senior Editors: Eleanore Butz, Ruth Kulstad

Associate Editors: Martha Collins, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Edith Meyers, Phillip D. Szuroni, Kim D. Vandegriff, 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*; Michele A. Cleary, Mary McDaniel, Barbara E. Patterson

Copy Desk: Beverly Shields, Anna Victoreen

Production Manager: Karen Schools

Assistant Production Manager: James Landry

Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, James J. Olivari, 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*; William Booth, Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Eliot Marshall, Marjorie Sun, John Walsh

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

European Correspondent: David Dickson

BUSINESS STAFF

Associate Publisher: William M. Miller, III

Business Staff Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

Classified Advertising Supervisor: Karen Morgenstern

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 25 September 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.

Federal and Trade Deficits

If the budget deficit and especially the foreign trade deficit are substantially curtailed soon, great damage will probably be averted. However, continuation of present trends for an indefinite period could make the recent Wall Street crash only a prelude to other, more serious sequelae.

Some economists have written that the foreign trade and budget deficits are closely related. There is a partial, but not a one-to-one, relation. Lowering the budget deficit will not eliminate costs of oil imports. Other economists have stated that lowering the value of the dollar will cure the trade deficit. Although some improvement in competitiveness will arise from a weak dollar, that is no cure-all.

The "Advance report on U.S. merchandise trade: September 1987," prepared by the U.S. Department of Commerce and issued 12 November provides useful information on the matter. A superficial examination of the report showing that the September deficit was less than that in August gave rise to a 1-day rally on Wall Street. But numbers for 1 month are not necessarily a faithful indication of what is occurring. The total numbers for the third quarter and for the first 9 months of 1987 show a poorer performance than the corresponding 1986 figures, that is \$46.234 billion versus \$44.828 billion for the third quarter and \$128.165 billion versus \$123.452 billion for the first 9 months.

The weak dollar has had a beneficial effect on our trade deficit with the European Economic Community. In the first 9 months of 1987, the imbalance was \$17.643 billion versus \$20.623 billion the year before. There was no improvement in trade with Japan (\$44.323 billion versus \$43.028 billion).

The large and more intractable problems are trade relations with newly industrializing countries and increasing use of imported oil. This year our imports of oil and its products will cost about \$44 billion versus about \$38 billion in 1986. The growth of our trade imbalance with East Asian countries—Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore—is symptomatic of additional problems we will encounter with industrializing countries. During the first 9 months of 1987 our trade deficit with the four countries grew to \$28.842 billion from \$22.553 billion in 1986. Their currencies are not tied to the yen or Deutsche mark but rather are roughly aligned with the dollar. Thus weakening the dollar further will not cure our deficit with the four countries. A rapidly rising portion of U.S. imports from these countries is high-tech or other products that in the past have been produced only in advanced industrialized countries. Their exports to us are about three times their imports from us, as is the case in our trade with Japan. Other developing countries with which the United States has substantial trade deficits include Brazil, Mexico, and the People's Republic of China. During the first 9 months of this year, our trade deficit with China grew to \$2.896 billion from \$1.409 billion in the corresponding months of 1986.

In the future our worst problem is likely to be demand for imported oil. Domestic production is down and will continue to decline. Completions of oil wells in the past 12 months have been at half the rate of 2 years ago. At the same time, consumption of products has increased. This is notably true of transportation liquids, uses of which are setting all-time records. Federal actions to increase the speed limit and decrease the mandated mileage for new cars have been moves in the wrong direction.

In the time between February 1985 and the present, a very large drop in the comparative value of the dollar slowed, but did not stop, the increase in the trade deficit. However, it made tangible assets in the United States look cheap, and foreigners are openly and surreptitiously buying up choice real estate, production plants, and other items. In terms of yen or Deutsche marks, members of OPEC are receiving about one-third the currency per barrel of oil that they obtained in 1985. At some point, they might demand payment in a strong currency.

Congress is aware that we must do something about the two deficits. But the thousand-page trade bill, if passed, would probably be vetoed and, if enacted, would make little difference. Washington will provide leadership, but only if the people demand it. The dawdling behavior of Congress and the Administration with respect to budget-deficit reduction suggests that an additional and more unpleasant shock than occurred on 19 October will be required before really significant actions are taken.—PHILIP H. ABELSON