The contributions to total U.S. manufacturing in the Fourth Federal Reserve District states of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia declined from 1963 to 1982, although less dramatically than in particular urban areas (like Cleveland, Ohio), where primary and fabricated metals are most heavily concentrated.

Between 1963 and 1982 (the latest data available), the share of total U.S. manufacturing output fell about 2.04 percent in Ohio and 1.86 percent in Pennsylvania (chart 7). Only Michigan (-2.05 percent) and New York (-2.53 percent) showed worse manufacturing output shifts at the state level during that 20-year interval. Contrast these regional trends with the states of California (2.52 percent), Florida (0.98 percent), North Carolina (1.09 percent), and Texas (2.77 percent), where the share manufacturing output exploded during that period.

Between 1963 and 1982, Texas jumped from its position as the ninth-largest manufacturing state to the third largest, surpassing the states of Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. Of the four Ohio metropolitan areas (like Cleveland, Ohio), where primary and fabricated metals industries, have had greater relative declines in manufacturing employment and output are clearly evident in certain industries (such as primary and fabricated metals) and in some regions (such as Ohio and Pennsylvania). Other industries and regions, however, have had relatively strong growth over the past 20 years. On the whole, U.S. manufacturing output has demonstrated remarkable long-term stability. From a demand perspective, the U.S. economy has been drifting from a services base to a manufacturing base.

Bemoaning the demise of American manufacturing might simply be unwarranted. From an employment perspective, manufacturing is declining—its share has done so without non-stop since 1953. Similar downward trends in manufacturing employment and output are clearly evident in certain industries (such as primary and fabricated metals) and in some regions (such as Ohio and Pennsylvania). Other industries and regions, however, have had relatively strong growth over the past 20 years. On the whole, U.S. manufacturing output has demonstrated remarkable long-term stability. From a demand perspective, the U.S. economy has been drifting from a services base to a manufacturing base.

Before we put the U.S. manufacturing sector on the endangered species list, we need to evaluate it from more than one perspective. And, in the words of a popular cliche, “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

Is Manufacturing Disappearing? Uneasiness about the state of U.S. manufacturing invites a number of policy prescriptions. One obvious “remedy” is to protect U.S. manufacturers from foreign competition. Such a strategy would have a number of impacts, but improving the condition of U.S. manufacturing might not be one of them. It is possible that reducing the amount of low-cost imports would simply shift U.S. demand back into service markets, or even savings markets. Further, it would discourage the growth in manufacturing productivity and distort the appropriate allocation of U.S. resources.

Others have suggested that a more stimulative stance by U.S. policymakers might cure the manufacturing sector. This approach may only serve to encourage U.S. demand for foreign production and to further erode the U.S. manufacturing share of the world manufacturing market. Moreover, excessively stimulative domestic policies could lay the foundation for U.S. inflationary pressures in the future.

Bemoaning the demise of American manufacturing might simply be unwarranted. From an employment perspective, manufacturing is declining—it has done so virtually non-stop since 1953. Similar downward trends in manufacturing employment and output are clearly evident in certain industries (such as primary and fabricated metals) and in some regions (such as Ohio and Pennsylvania). Other industries and regions, however, have had relatively strong growth over the past 20 years. On the whole, U.S. manufacturing output has demonstrated remarkable long-term stability. From a demand perspective, the U.S. economy has been drifting from a services base to a manufacturing base.

Before we put the U.S. manufacturing sector on the endangered species list, we need to evaluate it from more than one perspective. And, in the words of a popular cliche, “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

Some policymakers continue to favor the idea of using trade barriers to protect U.S. manufacturing industries. In some measure, this view is based on a perception of underlying weaknesses in the U.S. manufacturing sector. There is a fear that the manufacturing sector is dying—or at the very least, that its importance to the economy is shrinking. This Economic Commentary offers some alternative perspectives on the trends in manufacturing.

On balance, the manufacturing sector is alive and well. Indeed, the prospects for manufacturing have been strengthening over an extended period. However, the distribution of output growth across manufacturing industries is uneven, with a few traditional industries at the bottom of the growth standings. But, other less traditional, manufacturing industries are leading U.S. industrial growth. Consequently, it is necessary to qualify any analysis of the manufacturing sector by examining it from several perspectives.

The Employment Perspective

It has become common business analysts to refer to the “alarming shift toward a service economy.” It would seem that this view is taken primarily from the perspective of employment. Manufacturing employment has been generating proportionately fewer jobs, on average, since the early 1960s (chart 1). As a share of total U.S. employment, manufacturing employment has fallen from approximately 35 percent of total employment in 1953 to only about 20 percent of total employment during the first half of 1985. The decline in durable goods manufacturing employment has been equally steep, falling from a share of about 20 percent of total employment in the early 1950s to near 12 percent today.

Certain manufacturing industries, such as primary and fabricated metals industries, have had greater relative employment declines than other manufacturing industries. In 1984, U.S. manufacturing represented only 0.5 percent less than its 35-year average (following a rather severe trough in 1982), and durable manufacturing output was virtually identical with its 35-year average last year (14.5 percent).

Michael F. Bryan is an economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. The author would like to thank John M. Davis, who provided the inspiration for this Economic Commentary. The views stated herein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland or of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

1. Data from the first two quarters of 1985 allow us to infer that the share of manufacturing output to total output might have inched downward in 1985 due to deterioration in nondurable manufacturing output. However, durable manufacturing output continued to hold at a high level in 1985 and may exceed its trend value for the year.
In terms of employment, it can be argued that the U.S. economy has been shifting toward a service-based economy. But, in the context of relative output, no comparable shifts have thus far occurred.

Chart 2: Manufacturing, Durable Share of Domestic Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Durable share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manufacturing's share of output has fluctuated around its mean value, yet the proportion of labor resources consumed by manufacturing has been dropping. This suggests that the manufacturing sector is building strength, rather than deteriorating, as labor productivity in U.S. manufacturing has increased over time (chart 3).

Since 1960, manufacturing industries have exceeded the average rate of labor productivity growth in the United States. Moreover, the pace of productivity in manufacturing relative to the average U.S. industry actually accelerated over the past 10 years. The rate of growth in durable manufacturing productivity has also been more than twice that of the average U.S. industry over the past decade.

The U.S. manufacturing sector has a popular image as an inefficient, resource-obese industry that is incapable of rigorous competition. The labor productivity improvement made in U.S. manufacturing, particularly since 1975, is a strong piece of evidence to the contrary.

Chart 3: Average Annual Rate of Labor Productivity Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Average Annual Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm business</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durables manufacturing</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm business</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm business</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative price effects from the high value of the U.S. dollar and investment tax credits for capital goods are more recent influences on manufactured goods sales. The strength of the dollar depresses the cost of imports. Imports naturally favor goods rather than services (insular as goods are more easily storable and transportable). Consequently, the strong dollar favors goods consumption over the consumption of services. The increased demand for foreign goods would in some measure spill over into domestic markets and put further downward pressure on U.S. manufacturing goods prices relative to U.S. services. In addition, a liberalization of taxation credits on capital equipment as a result of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 further encouraged the demand for durable goods through what was in essence a relative price adjustment. Regardless of source, which admittedly is only speculation, the impression of long-term trends in the U.S. manufacturing sector viewed from the perspective of demand is different from employment data. From a consumption point of view, the United States has actually been moving from a service-based economy to goods-based economy.
In terms of employment, it can be argued that the U.S. economy has been shifting toward a service-based economy. But, in the context of relative output, no comparable shifts have thus far occurred.

The U.S. manufacturing sector has a popular image as an inefficient, resource-obsess economy that is incapable of rigorous competition. The labor productivity improvement made in U.S. manufacturing, particularly since 1975, is a strong piece of evidence to the contrary.

But the damaging influence of an increased foreign presence in manufacturing markets is inconsistent with the long-term stability in U.S. manufacturing output noted earlier. Consequently, the growth in foreign-manufactured goods in America could be a result of growth in the total demand for manufactured goods by U.S. consumers and industries.

If we track the share of real goods sales relative to total U.S. sales, a surprising growth pattern is evident (chart 3). Since 1977, the United States has been consuming above-average levels of goods. In fact, the share of goods in final sales reached a post-World War II high last year and will probably remain near this relatively high level in 1985.

Stronger growth patterns are evident in the durable goods sector. Between 1960 and 1963, durable goods sales represented 15.75 percent of total U.S. sales. The durable goods share of total sales topped 20 percent during the late 1970s and, in 1984, matched a post-World War II high of 20.3 percent.

A number of factors probably have encouraged the long-term growth in goods demand. For example, the upward trend in the share of durable goods to total final sales may be explained by the emergence of the "baby-boom" generation and by a proportionately greater share of single-person households. An increase in household formations produces a strong appetite for durable commodities, such as household furnishings, appliances, and automobiles. Buying habits affected by uncertainty about future inflation, a 1970s phenomenon, would also tend to favor goods markets, particularly durable goods markets, because of their inflation-hedging characteristics.

The relative price effects from the high value of the U.S. dollar and investment tax credits for capital goods are more recent influences on manufactured goods sales. The strength of the dollar depressed the cost of imports. Imports naturally favor goods rather than services (insofar as goods involved). Consequently, the strong dollar favors goods consumption over their inflation-hedging characteristics. The relative prices of goods to total final sales may be explained by the emergence of the "baby-boom" generation and by a proportionately greater share of single-person households.

In terms of employment, it can be argued that the U.S. economy has been shifting toward a service-based economy. But, in the context of relative output, no comparable shifts have thus far occurred.

The U.S. manufacturing sector has a popular image as an inefficient, resource-obsess economy that is incapable of rigorous competition. The labor productivity improvement made in U.S. manufacturing, particularly since 1975, is a strong piece of evidence to the contrary.

But the damaging influence of an increased foreign presence in manufacturing markets is inconsistent with the long-term stability in U.S. manufacturing output noted earlier. Consequently, the growth in foreign-manufactured goods in America could be a result of growth in the total demand for manufactured goods by U.S. consumers and industries.

If we track the share of real goods sales relative to total U.S. sales, a surprising growth pattern is evident (chart 3). Since 1977, the United States has been consuming above-average levels of goods. In fact, the share of goods in final sales reached a post-World War II high last year and will probably remain near this relatively high level in 1985.

Stronger growth patterns are evident in the durable goods sector. Between 1960 and 1963, durable goods sales represented 15.75 percent of total U.S. sales. The durable goods share of total sales topped 20 percent during the late 1970s and, in 1984, matched a post-World War II high of 20.3 percent.

A number of factors probably have encouraged the long-term growth in goods demand. For example, the upward trend in the share of durable goods to total final sales may be explained by the emergence of the "baby-boom" generation and by a proportionately greater share of single-person households. An increase in household formations produces a strong appetite for durable commodities, such as household furnishings, appliances, and automobiles. Buying habits affected by uncertainty about future inflation, a 1970s phenomenon, would also tend to favor goods markets, particularly durable goods markets, because of their inflation-hedging characteristics.

The relative price effects from the high value of the U.S. dollar and investment tax credits for capital goods are more recent influences on manufactured goods sales. The strength of the dollar depressed the cost of imports. Imports naturally favor goods rather than services (insofar as goods involved). Consequently, the strong dollar favors goods consumption over their inflation-hedging characteristics. The relative prices of goods to total final sales may be explained by the emergence of the "baby-boom" generation and by a proportionately greater share of single-person households.
Is Manufacturing Disappearing? Uneasiness about the state of U.S. manufacturing invites a number of policy prescriptions. One obvious "remedy" is to protect U.S. manufacturers from foreign competition. Such a strategy would have a number of impacts, but improving the condition of U.S. manufacturing might not be one of them. It is possible that reducing the amount of low-cost imports would simply shift U.S. demand back into service markets, or even savings markets. Further, it would discourage the growth in manufacturing productivity and distort the appropriate allocation of U.S. resources.

Others have suggested that a more stimulative stance by U.S. economic policymakers might cure the manufacturing sector. This approach may only serve to encourage U.S. demand for foreign production and to further erode the U.S. manufacturing share of the world manufacturing market. Moreover, excessively stimulative domestic policies could lay the foundation for U.S. inflationary pressures in the future.

Bemoaning the demise of American manufacturing might simply be unwarranted. From an employment perspective, manufacturing is declining—it has done so virtually non-stop since 1953. Similar downturns in manufacturing employment and output are clearly evident in certain industries (such as primary and fabricated metals) and in some regions (such as Ohio and Pennsylvania). Other industries and regions, however, have had relatively strong growth over the past 20 years. On the whole, U.S. manufacturing output has demonstrated remarkable long-term stability. From a demand perspective, the U.S. economy has been shifting from a services base to a manufacturing base.

Before we put the U.S. manufacturing sector on the endangered species list, we need to evaluate it from more than one perspective. And, in the words of a popular cliché, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it!"

Some policymakers continue to favor the use of trade barriers to protect U.S. manufacturing industries. In some measure, this view is based on a perception of underlying weaknesses in the U.S. manufacturing sector. There is a fear that the manufacturing sector is dying—or at the very least, that its importance to the economy is shrinking. This Economic Commentary offers some alternative perspectives on the trends in manufacturing.

On balance, the manufacturing sector is alive and well. Indeed, the prospects for manufacturing have strengthened over an extended period. However, the distribution of output growth across manufacturing industries is uneven, with a few traditional industries at the bottom of the growth standings. But other, less traditional, manufacturing industries are leading U.S. industrial growth. Consequently, it is necessary to qualify any analysis of the manufacturing sector by examining it from several perspectives.

The Employment Perspective

It has become commonplace for business analysts to refer to the "alarming shift toward a service economy." It would seem that this view is taken primarily from the perspective of employment. Manufacturing employment has been generating proportionately fewer jobs on average, since the early 1960s (chart 1). As a share of total U.S. employment, manufacturing employment has fallen from approximately 35 percent of total employment in 1953 to only about 20 percent of total employment during the first half of 1985. The decline in durable goods manufacturing employment has been especially steep, falling from a share of about 20 percent of total employment in the early 1950s to near 12 percent today.

Some manufacturing industries, such as primary and fabricated metals, have given greater relative employment decline than other manufacturing industries, and fabricated metals manufacturing represented 2.5 percent of total U.S. employment—less than half the employment share it had in 1953. Virtually all major manufacturing industries, however, have demonstrated employment growth export-oriented manufacturing in the 32-year period since 1953. Even electrical machinery manufacturing, an impressively growing industry during the 1960s and 1970s, has lost a smaller share of total U.S. employment in 1984 (2.4 percent lower than it did during 1950-57 percent).

In short, the importance of manufacturing employment to total U.S. employment has been declining at a constant rate over an extended period. This pattern has been followed by most major manufacturing industries.

The Output Perspective

Trends in U.S. employment data and output data are not necessarily identical. If we examine the share of America’s manufacturing output in relation to our total output (measured by gross domestic product), a strikingly different picture of the long-term trends in manufacturing emerges (chart 2). Compared with the employment data, it becomes much more difficult to find convincing evidence that manufacturing output is significantly declining in importance to the economy.

Since 1953, manufacturing output as a share of total output has fluctuated around a mean of 24.7 percent (14.8 percent for durable manufacturing). In 1984, U.S. manufacturing represented 0.5 percent less than its 35-year average (following a rather severe trough in 1982), and durable manufacturing output was virtually identical with its 35-year average last year (14.5 percent).

The views stated herein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland or of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.