

I feel that there are two things to which perhaps this resolution should speak. One is that it should urge the biological community in the United States to pay greater attention to the program. There must be ways of making the language a little more hortatory. And the other is there should be some mention of budget.

I think the heart of the matter really reaches to that. As I tried to say in my testimony, the average, let us say, young biologist on the way up in his career profession lives so much by the rule of grants and grantsmanship, whether the money eventually comes from the Federal Government or State programs or foundations, that he is roughly the way the new doctor was, the new medical man, in the 1940's: worrying about his immediate bread-and-butter problems.

The nub of the problem here is represented by the fact that there has been no identifiable budgeting for this program so far, and that means that many of the most active minds among young biologists will think that they have to go where the grants are. And there is something to it, I must say, if they are married and looking forward to a successful career.

There is an inevitable lack of enthusiasm by even the brightest biologists for activities which are not going to be financially or career rewarding. And that is why I called it dirty and formless, because environmental problems are not necessarily those which have an accepted and relatively easy success pattern, as, let's say, molecular biology has at the moment.

It is easy to be in molecular biology, especially if you are very bright, and to have an assured future. It is not easy to be in environmental biology if you are very bright, and to have an assured future. And it is simply a fiscal problem in a sense as well as a career advancement problem.

The average young man today wants to go, especially if he is bright, where his career will be probably the most assured and into an area of research where he will presumably have the most success, the most patting on the back eventually, and the most esteem by his colleagues. And this is a pioneer area, and pioneer areas are no more fashionable among highly skilled, trained professional men than they are to people who have to go out and meet any other kind of pioneer trial. So there is money involved in the lack of success of this program so far.

I think that those two things are perhaps simple explanations of the lack of ability of this program to catch on.

Mr. DADDARIO. Are the private foundations doing work in this area? You mentioned, for example, soil bacteria in the emerging nations.

Dr. RIPLEY. Rockefeller Foundation has pioneered for years in medical aspects of studies abroad, diseases and so on, as you know, and has done an enormous amount to develop a small but persistent tradition for American scientists, ranging from social scientists to medical scientists, to step out of their traditional role as career people inside the territorial confines of the United States and do pioneering work in everything from soil bacteria to various sorts of zoophytes to animals concerned with diseases, micro-organisms, and so on.

This is a somewhat diminishing field. I think their programs are gradually changing and evolving a little bit away from this. I think