

International Biological Program before you today. It happens that my views are fairly strong ones, very much in favor of a special appropriation to the IBP by Congress, but I must stress that although these views are shared by many of my colleagues participating in the IBP, the following is a personal statement.

There appear to be two schools of thought on the IBP.

First, it is a worthy enterprise to which adequate lipservice may from time to time be given—as so often is the case in international affairs—and for which the funding may be handled by existing agencies, Government and otherwise. Second, the IBP is a unique program analogous to the International Geophysical Year and is not encompassed by any agency or series of agencies. The second view, to which I subscribe, reminds us of the success of the IGY and points to its special appropriation. The second view states, IBP is either worth doing right as its own entity or not worth doing at all.

Nevertheless, we must begin with the aims of the IBP in order to determine its worthiness. IBP has as its theme the biological basis of productivity and human welfare. In determining whether this is a worthy cause, I am reminded of Charlton Ogburn's book, "The Winter Beach, William Morrow, 1966," pages 16 and 17, which reads:

Without being one who delights in illustrations of man's puniness in the limitless cosmos, a traveler may yet find it easier to bear the spectacle of the monumental ugliness we have wrought from the spoil of our countryside, the trash with which we have defaced it, the suppurated encrustations that our cities have become, by reflecting that the earth through its characteristic processes can, and one day doubtless will, shrug it off in favor of a fresh start.

A dramatic and somewhat emotional statement, agreed, but no less true. If we do indeed care for future generations, which I mostly doubt we really do, we simply must find out what those "characteristic processes" are on a world level, or the dire predictions of the biologists and demographers from Malthus to present will come true.

Can the IBP find out about these processes? On an international level, it appears to have the best chance so far and we note that its theme is directed exactly to that end—productivity and human welfare. And whereas I can think of no single really good reason to take from one pocket to put into another, I also can think of no single reason why we need a man on the moon prior to our learning to live right here with nature. Clearly, we do not know how at present, and to enforce this idea, I again resort to a quote, this time from Dr. Bostwick Ketchum in a letter of the Marine Productivity Subcommittee:

Only through the development of this basic understanding of the multitude of processes which combine to make the study of marine productivity can we hope to insure that future developments can proceed with minimum risk of destruction of our natural resources and beauty.

It happens that my field of interest is marine ecology, more specifically the polar marine mammals. I should now like to address my remarks to marine ecology. We are told, in the face of the depletion of space and resources by land, that the sea's unlimited resources shall solve all our problems. The Prophets of Panacea inform us of mineral and biological wealth unbounded. Yet we would remind this school of thought of several things:

(1) The sea remains to this day an area of international *laissez faire* where development proceeds largely willy-nilly and it is precisely in this way best to destroy resources, living or otherwise.