

ET TU, . . .?

# Trouble for IBP

After solving its organizational problems, the U. S. biological program committee suffers the unkindest cut

When Dr. W. Frank Blair shed the relative security of the University of Texas to try his hand in the Washington jungle this February, he thought he was among friends.

He took over as chairman of the United States committee in the 54-nation International Biological Program—a program warmly endorsed by such Washington stalwarts as Dr. Leland J. Haworth, director of the National Science Foundation, whose budget should help support it, and Dr. Ivan L. Bennett Jr., deputy director of the White House's Office of Science and Technology and an old friend of IBP.

In its earlier days, IBP had had organizational problems (SN: 6/10/67, p. 556), but those were manageable, and U.S. contributions in such fields as airborne fungi, drainage basin ecosystems and the genetics of isolated populations were well along.

All that was lacking was money, and granted IBP's friends that should have been no problem. But that was before President Johnson, to save his proposed tax increase (SN: 5/18, p. 472), had to agree to a \$4 billion spending cut—which Congress may make \$6 billion.

Dr. Blair learned the facts of Washington life when, flanked by Haworth and Bennett, he went before a Congressional subcommittee chaired by another friend of IBP, Rep. Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.).

The Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics is considering a resolution which would authorize \$5 million to be spent on the IBP during the year starting July 1.

Daddario was prepared to favor the request out of hand.

"If in fact the IBP is as important as our inquiries suggest," he said as the hearings opened, "and as we have been advised by most of the witnesses

before us, it is incumbent upon us to find ways to implement it and that is, in fact, our purpose."

And he was as surprised as was Dr. Blair when Drs. Haworth and Bennett, speaking for the White House, recommended against it.

"I don't know whether we are making progress," Daddario said later. "We have a violent disagreement here."

Despite organizational progress and the existence of program requests, the U.S. part of the program, the Administration spokesmen say, is not far enough along for any major funding.

In his testimony Dr. Bennett says that while IBP may eventually prove to be important to the national interest, "the program has not yet been sufficiently developed to warrant large scale special funding during fiscal year 1969, particularly in the prevailing fiscal situation."

Dr. Haworth notes that the NSF budget for fiscal 1969 contains a line item of \$700,000 for IBP. He says NSF endorses both IBP and the desire behind the resolution to give the U.S. part "adequate financial support." But with respect to the specific \$5 million figure mentioned in the subcommittee resolution "we defer to the positions being taken by the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Science and Technology."

What is regarded as a reversal on the part of science officials left Dr. Blair a very disappointed man. He says, however, the situation appears to have improved somewhat with the finding of \$700,000 in fiscal 1968 Science Foundation funds which will allow a grasslands research program to get off to a modest start. Funds for this critical program's next year, he says, were included in the hoped-for \$5 million.

This wind fall may be counterbalanced if the \$700,000 item for fiscal



NAS

Blair: "Time is running out."

1969 is cut as part of a \$100 million cut in the NSF budget recommended by the House.

Dr. Blair feels that "if we don't get our program developed rather rapidly" this country may lose its position as the model for other IBP members. This position was gained because the United States appeared ready to go beyond merely reclassifying existing research with an IBP label.

Dr. Bennett appears to view the program differently. He contends that efforts must be made to determine how much existing work can be fitted into IBP.

The IBP is an attempt to investigate the biological basis for man's welfare on the planet (SN: 9/30/67, p. 316). This unwieldy topic has been narrowed down into an investigation of man's relationship to his various ecosystems, still somewhat unwieldy. Specific programs of study are now ready for U.S.

1 june 1968/vol. 93/science news/517

participation, according to Dr. Blair.

These are airborne troublemakers such as fungi, bacterial spores, allergens and insects; drainage basins as large ecosystems; Eskimo populations as a measure of human adaptability; evolution in isolated Hawaii, and seasonal changes in plant and animal life.

Supporters of the IBP idea say man is now in a crisis with more dangerous implications than the bloodiest war. They say it is vital that he understand the long-term effects of changes he makes in his environment, lest these include the poisoning of the planet.

They quite seriously raise the possibility of human extinction and warn that man may now be putting the finishing touches on environmental changes that ultimately and inexorably will prove fatal.

Essentially an organization among United Nations members, IBP's task is to integrate existing scientific inquiry that may have a bearing on the problem, and to launch new research when and where it is needed.

Dr. Blair believes planning of the U.S. participation in IBP has now

reached the stage where action is necessary lest the effort lose momentum.

Noting that a year has passed of the five officially granted for the actual work of IBP, he says: "I don't want to be dramatic, but I really think we are reaching the stage where time is running out on us. I feel there is a real environmental crisis."

His program directors could use \$7.5 million, Dr. Blair says, though the \$5 million under consideration is enough to let the U.S. effort go forward.

But \$5 million appears to be \$5 million too much in new money; even if the resolution were reported favorably this year, over the Administration reservations; it is unlikely that it would be adopted—not because Congress is not in favor of IBP, but simply because there is no money available.

Thus no one, except apparently Dr. Blair, was surprised that Drs. Bennett and Haworth recommended delay in any major IBP funding.

What did surprise many was their contention that the U.S. participation is not well enough organized yet for funding. ◇

vices at Harvard University, says, "Our young people have been taught to be violent all their lives, so we should not be so surprised." A breakdown in personal restraints creates a society in which each is against all, he says. "It's depressing to be in a country where personal inhibitions and customary restraints have broken down." Elders have failed to communicate with their younger colleagues, says Dr. Farnsworth.

Adds Dr. Raymond W. Waggoner, president-elect of the APA: "The kind of thing at Columbia seems just impossible."

**Western family** styles—the small parent-child unit instead of larger family groups—have led to a situation in which adults can give their children only Western society to believe in, he contends. That is not enough; Dr. Waggoner characterizes youth unrest as an "infection that has gone around the world (along with Westernization) leading to revolt against authority."

To French psychiatrist Dr. Leon Chertok, youth protest represents a new, confusing phenomenon. He says he can find in it neither political nor economic factors that are traditional to revolutions.

The American problem has been attributed to three issues: Vietnam, racial struggles and drugs. But Dr. Chertok finds none of these explanations true of France, and yet "we are faced with the same unrest in an amplified way."

In the opinion of other psychiatrists, however, the political factors are just as much present in 1968 as they ever were, only more subtly and specific to each country. What is universal, they agree, is a loss of faith in the old value symbols—country, religion, scientific progress and modern government.

"There is an absence of something to believe in, to differentiate between good and bad," says Dr. Abraham Maslow, president of the American Psychological Association. "Not only youth but much of mankind is suffering from this illness."

**Disagreement arises** on the question of whether youth can find, or indeed, is even looking for new values.

To Dr. Robert H. Felix, former director of the National Institute of Mental Health, now at St. Louis University, youth protest represents the signs of health. "I submit we are not seeing a loss of values, but a creation of values. My plea is don't damn (the protesters) but say a prayer and bear with them. I think out of this will come a greater set of values than we have had before."

Young people are moving toward more universal, humane values, Dr. Maslow explains. Nationalism is being transcended. There is movement toward the idea of a single human species. Also the opportunities are greater in 1968—

## EXPLORING UNREST

### Impeccable ideals; stupid means

Adults have been lamenting for years the alienation, impersonality and materialism of modern society, the growth of oversized universities with their loss of individual options, the breakdown of family units and transfer of rearing functions to schools and the diminishing concern of one human being for another.

Now young people are acting on these ideas in protests at universities around the world (SN: 5/25, p. 493), much to the professed surprise of adults.

"Adults have been mouthing these things for a decade," says Dr. J. Robertson Unwin, psychiatrist in adolescent studies at McGill University's Allan Memorial Institute, Montreal. "What do they think kids are—just lumps of rock that will not react?"

Youth unrest and protest, in Dr. Unwin's opinion, offers a means for adult society to try out new ideas. As in Mao Tse Tung's Cultural Revolution, young people become, in effect, shock troops for their elders. Youth provides the idealistic commitment; dissatisfied adults provide the ideas behind their protest.

At their recent annual meeting in Boston (see p. 523), members of the American Psychiatric Association met with Dr. Unwin and psychiatrists from other nations to discuss international youth problems. The seminar was spon-



Wide World Photos

### Parisian students: everyone's problem

sored by the Forest Hospital Foundation in Chicago.

Attitudes toward outbreaks at the Sorbonne, Columbia University and elsewhere ran the gamut from dismay to hope, depending on whether the protest was seen as the sign of a sick society or the mark of a struggle toward health.

Expressing dismay, Dr. Dana Farnsworth, authority on college health ser-