

Dr. BLAIR. In general the European countries are ahead. Now there is a very good reason in the countries of the world. Particularly the Eastern European countries, like Poland, where everything is set up under an institute and the director of the institute says we are going to set up a program for IBP and they immediately start work so they are about 2 years ahead of us. So Australia has a program, and in all there are 55 countries, I believe, now do have programs under the IBP. The last ones behind us were the Latin American countries.

The one purpose of my trip last January was to stimulate enthusiasm, and they now have in Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and probably Peru, national committees, and three and possibly four of the seven countries I have listed now have committees. And they are quite enthusiastic, the people I have been corresponding with.

Mr. DADDARIO. Does this enthusiasm find itself connected with financial support?

Dr. BLAIR. It does not. And I feel this very sincerely. It is a matter of feeling that we have been cut off from you people in the United States in terms of communication. And I will admit that American dollars have been mentioned a few times, but for the most part I really sincerely believe it is just a matter of "we would like to work cooperatively with you people." And in one country, Brazil specifically, I know there will be some program which the President of the National Research Council indicated he would support.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would assume that our part of the participation not only is important to give our scientific people direction and overall support for the program, but because it will stimulate them to get some additional funding and attract additional people as well?

Dr. BLAIR. Yes, sir; I feel this very definitely. And this has happened to a lesser degree in Argentina.

Mr. DADDARIO. Thank you, Dr. Blair.

Dr. Sudia, I didn't know if you had finished when I asked that question.

Dr. SUDIA. Essentially so; yes, sir.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the presentations this morning, it comes to my mind that this may be a step in the solution of a larger problem of which I had previously been thinking. In western industrialized countries for 50 years or more we have tended to concentrate on the so-called hard sciences, engineering, physics, mathematics, and so forth, at what seems to me to be the expense of the ecological and environmental sciences. We should perhaps be thinking in terms of a framework in which this is not just an isolated event or a 5-year or 10-year program, but a movement toward securing a better balance in the status of human knowledge. If we look at it in this framework, perhaps we ought to be thinking in terms not only of a larger role through the National Science Foundation for the stimulation of additional professional competence in this area, but as is true of the other sciences, the physical sciences, for example, providing a greater amount of support through some of the mission-oriented agencies such as the Department of Agriculture or the Environmental Services Administration for basic research and development related to their particular missions which would be coordinated with the