

North Atlantic Assembly—of which Senator Javits is so prominent a member—and the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania; and was held last May in Deauville. After an extensive study of the problems involved, the conference reached some conclusions, which may be of some interest to this subcommittee, as they are related to the exchange of goods and know-how.

The continuation of the conference work which was decided at Deauville may receive moral support from this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I have here the final report of the conference for this subcommittee, if you will allow me to put it at your disposal.

Chairman Boggs. It is so ordered.

(The report follows:)

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON TRANSATLANTIC TECHNOLOGICAL IMBALANCE AND COLLABORATION*

(Sponsored by the Scientific/Technological Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly and the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania; Hotel du Golf, Deauville, France, May 25–28, 1967)

INTRODUCTION

A conference dealing with the problems of technological imbalance in the Atlantic Community was held in Deauville, France, from May 25–28, 1967. The conference chose to work in five different panels which dealt with the following problems:

(1) *Education*.—Higher education (problems of scale, nature and quality), implications of cultural factors for scientific creativity, education in institutes of technology, university or other educational facilities, source and adequacy of educational funding.

(2) *Scientific Research*.—Status of pure research, basic research base, technological transfer organizations, information transfer schemes including common standards for documentation, reporting, institutional mechanisms.

(3) *Industrial Management*.—Size of corporations, national/international characteristics, size of national markets, impact of patents and licensing regulations, scope of U.S. investment in Europe, barriers to collaboration, management education and training, competitive situation of U.S. and European corporations in various industrial lines, attitudes toward privately financed research, adequacy of privately financed research.

(4) *Governmental role*.—Government investment in Research and Development (defense-oriented and non-defense-oriented), government contract policies, defense spin-offs, weapons standardization, security restrictions (i.e., McMahon Act), leadtime problems, military collaboration, political-economic competition, and rivalry (i.e., the SST), taxation policies (i.e., amortization time).

(5) *Technological Development and Application*.—Topics in this seminar dealt with present status, level of achievement, and priority with respect to: electronics, computers, avionics, ceramics, metallurgy, nuclear energy (peaceful and military applications), life matter (e.g., biophysics, biochemistry), problems of technological transfer.

I. DIAGNOSIS

The panels began their deliberations by asking the following questions: Is there a technological gap and will there be a gap in the future?

The answers varied according to the differences in definitions of the words "technological" and "gap" as well as to conflicting judgments. The differences of definition of "technological" derived from differences in focus on such phenomena as scientific research; the application of research to production; the marketing of production; investment, government and private, in research and development; as well as restraints upon political independence brought on by disparities in politically relevant technological resources.

*A draft report was presented at the Plenary Session of the Conference on the morning of May 28. This report incorporates suggestions and criticisms made at that time by the participants.