

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: Eleanor Butz, Ruth Kulstad

Associate Editors: Martha Coleman, R. Brooks Hanson, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelnner, Edith Meyers, Phillip D. Szurmi, 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, Patricia L. Moe, Barbara E. Patterson

Copy Desk: Jol S. Granger, Beverly Shields, Anna Victoreen, Barbara Wittig

Production Manager: Karen Schools

Assistant Production Manager: James Landry

Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, James J. Olivari

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

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

Employment Sales Manager: Edward C. Keller

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(0)64752918; Telex 42513; FAX (0392) 31645.

Information for contributors appears on page XI of the 25 March 1988 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.

World Competition in Biotechnology

Virtually every developed country and many developing countries have targeted leadership in biotechnology as a national goal. In efforts to compete with the United States in applications of molecular biology to produce pharmaceuticals, would-be competitors are latecomers, with limited prospects. But in agriculture, the picture is quite different, and the United States could become second-rate. In the United States, generous support of biomedical research for decades led to great advances in molecular biology and to the training of a large number of talented people capable of advancing the biomedical sciences. Would-be competitors have limited reservoirs of expert personnel. Another favorable factor for the United States has been an abundance of venture capital, which was in short supply elsewhere. For some possible competitors the cost of development and clinical trials of pharmaceuticals (\$75 to \$100 million) needed to gain approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration is an inhibiting factor.

In contrast to federal support of biomedical research, funds for basic research in plant biology have been meager and the sums provided individual investigators have been tiny. Consequently, the knowledge base of the molecular biology of plants is limited. The level of conventional agricultural science in other countries is comparable to that here, and in some instances possibly superior. Expertise in the new biotechnology is widespread. Average yields of wheat per hectare in the Netherlands are more than twice those in the United States as are yields in the United Kingdom. There are mitigating factors, but these do not cancel the contrasts in yields. Our balance of agricultural trade has dwindled.

The crop surpluses in the United States have been used as an argument for curtailing research. However, if we move slowly in exploiting new biotechnology, we will lose competitiveness fairly rapidly. The time span and the investment required to introduce modified plants or symbiotic bioengineered microorganisms is small compared with that required for pharmaceuticals. Economics is one reason for pursuing vigorous development of plant biotechnology. Other benefits include diminished need for fertilizers and pesticides. Were productivity to be increased, less land would be required for crops, with less related soil erosion.

Major companies are devoting substantial funds to agricultural biotechnology. Their efforts are complemented by many new, small outfits. But progress has been greatly impeded by regulatory processes and legal actions. Although some caution in introducing new technologies is warranted, caution has been overdone. For example, there has been concern about introducing into the field a corn plant with a single altered gene. But Howard A. Schneiderman has pointed out that to convert a corn plant into a weed would require hundreds of genetic changes, because corn does not have a "weedy personality."* Regulations should take into consideration the basic characteristics of plants into which a gene or genes are to be incorporated. Some of our crop varieties require human assistance for survival.

Another area in which progress is being impeded is in the introduction of beneficial soil microorganisms. A prejudice exists against organisms whose DNA has been modified by recombinant technology. But during most of this century, rhizobia (designed to enhance nitrogen fixation) have been added to millions of acres of agricultural soil. Roughly 10^{18} rhizobia improved through mutation by chemicals or radiation are added each year. This release has not produced a negative environmental impact. Inoculants of selected mycorrhizae have greatly helped in restoring wastelands. In estimating potential hazards of introducing modified organisms, the gene's location in the genome is important. A gene located on a plasmid is much more likely to be transferred to another organism than is a gene that is part of a chromosome.

Advances in molecular biology have created great opportunities for advances in agriculture. The United States can persist in a policy of starving agricultural basic research and of overregulating biotechnology. Others may not follow such a path.

—PHILIP H. ABELSON

*H. A. Schneiderman, "Biotechnology: A key to America's economic competitiveness in health care and agriculture," speech at the Second Annual American Society for Microbiology Conference on Biotechnology, San Diego, CA, June 1987.