

tails of this support—how many millions for this and that—I will rapidly pass over, unless you want to ask questions.

Mr. DADDARIO. Without going into the amounts spent, would it be helpful to, considering the growing importance of the subject, bring it together under a division of ecology? Do you believe that we are doing the right thing the way we are now by giving support in all of the related areas?

Dr. DEEVEY. I think some greater degree of centralization would be helpful, but I would not for a moment, sitting in the chair where I now do, advocate the consolidation of research support for all basic ecology into one central division, because too many genuinely important scientific problems would be created by doing that.

The present way is pretty good. It is not perfect. Some of us think that a section of environmental biology is, in fact, in operation now, although for various reasons including civil service constraints we don't quite call it that. The alternative you suggest, of taking this whole piece of environmental biology and incorporating it, for example, within the division of environmental science, which includes meteorology and oceanography, atmospheric science and Antarctic programs, et cetera, though it might help ecology, would remove its contact or potentially could remove its fundamental contact with other kinds of biology. The subject is so multidisciplinary that one has to think very carefully before launching an institutional reorganization of that sort because what you gain in one direction you may lose in another.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is because of this multidisciplinary characteristic that perhaps it ought to be in this institute that Dr. Cole is talking about.

Dr. DEEVEY. The National Institute of Ecology, as I conceive it, is quite a different affair from a National Science Foundation and basic research support. A national institute of ecology is large, but not so unmanageable that it fragments again the moment you try to pull it together. It focuses on environmental biology. It recognizes that you can not define the whole of the field that way, but it focuses on this and is intended as a step in several directions at once.

To enlarge the activity or the responsibility of environmental biology, by trying overnight to create some gigantic affair that includes the sociologists, the social psychologists and all the earth scientists too, this would seem—well, it may come in 25 years' time—it is hard to predict—but at the moment the cumbersomeness of such an organization would defeat its purpose, I would say.

One wants to start with what seems to be manageable, what seems to be "doable" and, what desperately needs doing.

Mr. DADDARIO. Well, it is something that needs to be analyzed. We are certainly not going to make a determination about it here and now.

Dr. CANTON. I serve on the Advisory Committee of the Division of Environmental Sciences in the National Science Foundation, and if I might, I would request a clarification here, please?

Are you suggesting the NSF's Division of Environmental Sciences serve as the main ecological unit, or were you asking Dr. Deevey to react to a hypothetical model of a division of environmental sciences in which environmental biology is one of the components?