

Senators from the southern Atlantic states, for example, were told of studies indicating the presence of large phosphate and manganese deposits off the Carolina and Florida coasts. To judge from their contribution to the Conservation Fund debate, senators such as Ernest F. Hollins of South Carolina and Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii were impressed by Long's arguments. His views are likely to gain wider acceptance, moreover, once intensive development of outer-continental-shelf resources occurs in regions other than those adjacent to the Gulf states. Development of outer-shelf oil and gas is expected soon off the California coast near Santa Barbara, and somewhat later in the Gulf of Alaska.

But because the Willis bill and similar proposals not only reopen the "tidelands" controversy but have the look of special-interest legislation, their chances of acceptance seem poor. Senator Ellender himself has confessed that he is not optimistic. However, the prospects for less ambitious proposals which do not seek new bonanzas for the states adjacent to oil-rich submerged lands may be much brighter. Interest in marine resources was greatly stimulated by the passage in 1966 of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act and the National Sea Grant College and Program Act. On 24 June, Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, chairman of the Commerce Committee, was to hold hearings on a

new bill of his to establish a Marine Resources Fund. Each year the fund would receive \$50 million in outer-continental-shelf revenues, with up to half that amount going to the sea-grant program and the other half going to other marine-resource development programs. An identical measure, introduced by Representative Alton Lennon of North Carolina, chairman of the subcommittee on oceanography, and signed by 17 cosponsors, is pending in the House.

Just what will result from this surge of interest in the revenues from the outer continental shelf is not yet clear, but the scramble for these revenues has begun in earnest.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

## Hunger and Malnutrition: HEW Says Nation Must Know More and Do More

"Hunger and malnutrition are intolerable in this country and should not be allowed to exist," proclaims a recently completed report of Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). Few would radically disagree with such a statement. The question is, however, Why have hunger and malnutrition been allowed to exist?

Whenever an unmet social need surfaces, most people find it consoling to be able to point to a villain other than themselves. The "villains" most often mentioned in this case are the Department of Agriculture and its Secretary, Orville L. Freeman. The tendency to single out the Agriculture Department as a culprit has been heightened as the Poor People's Campaign has focused on the elimination of hunger as a top-priority issue and as the residents of Resurrection City have staged large demonstrations around the Agriculture Department.

Two of the charges which have been leveled against Agriculture are that the Department is oriented primarily toward helping the farmer (especially the wealthy farmer) dispose of his surplus crops, and that, under Freeman's administration, the Department has been returning many millions of

dollars to the Treasury, dollars which should have been used to feed Americans whose diets are inadequate. In its recent report HEW seems to be engaging in a rare practice—criticism of one federal agency by another—when it states: "We must change the emphasis of some of our major activities from efforts primarily designed to distribute and use surplus food supplies to efforts to deal with a critical health problem. There is no reason why we cannot see to it that the distribution of our enormous food supplies satisfy both economic and health needs."

In a 14 June hearing before his subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, Senator Joseph S. Clark, Jr. (D-Pa.), challenged Secretary Freeman directly: "My own view, tentative to be sure, is that philosophically you are so imbedded in the concept of disposing of surplus food for farmers . . . that your bureaucracy is incapable of making a necessary philosophical adjustment so that you really can feed the hungry as your primary concern." Clark told Freeman that he thought Congress should press to have HEW or the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) take over this job.

When hunger and malnutrition first

began to emerge as a public issue. Freeman seemed to play down its importance. Recently, however, Freeman has seemed to be moving to the position that malnutrition is a major problem and that his Department should make greater efforts to deal with it. On 13 June, Freeman asked Congress for a \$100-million increase in food stamp funds, as opposed to the \$20-million increase he had requested in February. When House Agriculture Committee chairman W. R. Poage (D-Tex.) angrily asked why he hadn't asked for a larger amount before, Freeman explained that he had acquired a deeper appreciation of poverty in recent months.

In his testimony the next day before Senator Clark's subcommittee, Freeman said he knew there was room for improvement in his Department's programs for feeding the poor, but he added that his Department had been, for the past 7 years, "toiling in a rocky soil of public indifference, watered with the casual interest of the Congress, state legislatures and local units of government."

Freeman has a valid point. A Congress, a President, or a public truly concerned about the food needs of the poor would have done much more about acting to fulfill these needs. In the 14 June Senate hearings, Senator George S. McGovern (D-S. D.) said: "There has been an unfortunate emphasis, I think, on fixing blame for existing conditions on some one person or some agency, when the fact is that the blame must be widely shared by all

## AMA Moves To End Discrimination

The American Medical Association (AMA) has taken its first formal step to prohibit racial discrimination within its chapters. The resolution—which has been the subject of a bitter dispute for years—calls for an amendment of AMA bylaws to state clearly that membership in the AMA or any of its constituent associations “shall not be denied or abridged on account of color, creed, race, religion or ethnic origin.”

The resolution, introduced by the Massachusetts Medical Society, states that, if a medical society denies membership for racial or religious reasons, the National AMA Judicial Council can oust it from the parent organization.

The resolution, which was adopted by 242 delegates to the AMA annual convention in San Francisco, was passed by a nearly unanimous voice vote on 18 June. The AMA House of Delegates, whose 242 members represent all 50 state medical societies, directed that the necessary amendments to the bylaws be prepared for consideration when the House of Delegates meets in Miami in December.

Although the AMA officially does not discriminate against Negroes, it is held that some county and state medical societies affiliated with AMA have failed to admit Negro physicians to membership through various ruses.

While Negro physicians have often complained and occasionally have sued for admission to the barred medical societies, legal action in many cases has been complicated because these societies are private organizations.

In effect, the denial of society membership in the past has often meant that Negro doctors have been barred from hospitals that set membership in the local society as a prerequisite for practicing medicine in specific institutions. Negro physicians say that this is an economic weapon used against them.

Of the nation's almost 300,000 physicians, about 7000 are Negroes. Of these, about 5000 are members of the National Medical Association, which is predominantly Negro.—MARTI MUELLER

of us.” (McGovern also criticized HEW for its slow start on the national nutrition study, listing it as one of a number of agencies “that really haven’t faced up to this problem.”)

One explanation for failure to face hunger and malnutrition is the fact that officials and citizens have been afflicted with several varieties of ignorance. One argument is that, since so little is known about nutritional patterns in the United States and about the effect of food-intake patterns on health, nothing significant can be accomplished. Others blame the ignorance of the ill-fed: “If they don’t know enough to eat an adequate diet, there’s nothing we can do to help them.” Others cite a different kind of ignorance: The fact that federal officials did not feel it was their responsibility to do anything about feeding the poor; one high federal health official was quoted as saying that, since it was nobody’s job specifically to

worry about hunger nobody in the government did anything about it.

Another form of ignorance that affected the official view was that arising from the natural disinclination to confront unpleasant human problems. A leading HEW official attributes the lack of awareness that some people in this country are undernourished to the “arrogance of affluence”—the assumption that in a rich country like the United States it is impossible for anyone to be underfed.

Such “arrogance” has been subjected to severe blows in recent months. In early 1967, attention was focused on malnutrition by visits of physicians sponsored by the Field Foundation and by visits of Clark’s Senate subcommittee to the Mississippi Delta. In April, “Hunger, U.S.A.,” a report by the Citizens’ Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, received wide attention; the

Board estimated that hunger and malnutrition affected 10 million Americans “and in all likelihood a substantially higher number.” The Poor People’s Campaign in Washington has helped spotlight the issue by attracting expanded press notice, such as the CBS television special “Hunger in America” on 21 May. Hearings on hunger and malnutrition are currently being held in both the Senate and the House.

Another development symbolizing an increased federal focus on the problem of hunger is the recently completed report of HEW Secretary Cohen entitled “Incidence and Location of Serious Hunger and Malnutrition and Health Problems Incident Thereto.” This report is, in a way, a legacy of the late Robert F. Kennedy, who sponsored an amendment to the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967, calling for a comprehensive survey on hunger and malnutrition by HEW.

Like other studies of the subject, the HEW report emphasizes that too little is known about hunger and malnutrition, but argues that lack of full knowledge should not delay action: “There is much that we know,” the report says, “if less precisely than we would like.”

The general conclusion of the HEW report is that “the poor who do receive assistance are not receiving sufficient financial support to provide adequate diets. Many of the poor, ineligible for public assistance, are equally unable to provide themselves with adequate diets. Our food programs do not reach all the people who need them. What epidemiological studies have been made,” the report continues, “show conclusively that poor people are suffering the consequences of the inadequacy of their diets: the children are smaller, they suffer from anemia and the effects of substandard protein and vitamin dietary intake. There is reason to believe that the continuing levels of inadequacy in dietary intake are associated with physical and mental damage.”

The HEW report devotes a separate section to health of the Indian population. It cites Bureau of Indian Affairs statistics indicating that the average annual income for a typical Indian reservation family (five to six members) is between \$1500 and \$1700. The report states that “it is virtually impossible for families with incomes at this level to have nutritionally adequate diets without substantial supplementation of what their limited financial resources

will provide." The report says, "Gross malnutrition is rare among the Indian population, but both it and milder nutritional deficiencies exist in greater numbers than is commonly supposed." The report cites a study of 676 children from 0 to 4 years of age discharged from the Tuba City Hospital on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona between 1 July 1967 and 30 April 1968. Of these, 13, under 1 year of age, were diagnosed as suffering from marasmus; 44, from malnutrition; 38, from iron-deficiency anemia; and 8,

from kwashiorkor (some doctors had thought kwashiorkor existed only in underdeveloped countries). The HEW report also mentioned studies indicating nutritional deprivation among the Fort Belknap and Blackfoot populations in Montana.

The report also contains a study of a sample of 1250 preschool children in Mississippi which states that 20 to 25 percent less protein and calories were consumed by nonwhite children than by white children, and that 25 percent of the nonwhite children were

anemic as compared with 10 percent of the white children.

The HEW report made several recommendations, which included the following: (i) that the states should set realistic standards for need by recipients of public assistance, based on current prices, and should pay 100 percent of the established standard; (ii) that the states should apply for research and demonstration grants, under the Social Security Act, to stage special programs and to study the effects of malnutrition on the poor; (iii)

## House Group Urges Cutback in Foreign Research

The House Research and Technical Programs subcommittee issued another chilly blast at U.S.-financed research done abroad. This subcommittee, which is chaired by Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.), made a similar attack in 1966.

Although the subcommittee, in its report "Foreign Research Dollar Drain," conceded that total U.S. dollar obligations for foreign research had decreased from somewhat more than \$26 million in 1966 to a figure of about \$21 million annually today, it criticized scientific agencies for failing to eliminate "non-urgent" foreign projects and for allowing the number of employees in foreign science offices to rise slightly.\*

In its press release, the subcommittee may have pandered a little to that portion of the population which finds many of the topics of scientific research somewhat absurd. The subcommittee called attention to an NIH grant to Australian researchers for the study of the teeth, dental arches, jaws, face, and skull of Australian aborigines and to an NIMH grant for the study of primates in East Africa. On the other hand, the subcommittee did emphasize that "neither general exhortations for dollar economies nor massive arbitrary cuts in permissible foreign research is an appropriate policy."

Reuss has tended to be a supporter of government-financed research, and it seems apparent that the main reason for his subcommittee's attack on U.S.-subsidized foreign research was his concern about the U.S. balance of payments deficit, which, his subcommittee's report pointed out, has risen from \$1.3 billion in 1965 to \$3.6 billion in 1967. The subcommittee stated that it has become "imperative" to eliminate the U.S. international deficit, both to maintain confidence in the dollar and to preserve international cooperation within the present monetary system until a more rational system of international payments can be worked out. The subcommittee concedes that the major part of the U.S. dollar drain is due to military expenditures in Vietnam, Europe, and elsewhere, but argues that the federal ex-

penditure on civilian purposes abroad, even that relatively small sum spent on research, needs separate scrutiny and control. Reuss serves both as chairman of the House subcommittee on International Finance and as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, assignments which bring him into close touch with the balance of payments problem.

The subcommittee urged that restrictions be placed on all the five agencies (Defense, HEW, AEC, NASA, and NSF) which sponsor dollar-subsidized foreign research. Defense and HEW (most of the HEW funds are spent by the National Institutes of Health) are by far the largest supporters of foreign scientific research. In 1968, it is estimated that Defense will incur \$8.2 million in dollar obligations for foreign research while HEW will total \$9.21 million.

The subcommittee urged that the President and Bureau of the Budget notify the five agencies which make dollar-financed foreign research grants, that, until the balance of payments emergency has ceased, dollar financing of new foreign research projects should be limited to those (i) which are urgently needed by the United States, (ii) which cannot be carried on in the United States by either American or foreign scientists, and (iii) which will not be financed by foreign countries despite specific U.S. efforts to obtain alternate financing for foreign scientists.

The subcommittee requested a careful examination of "the large volume of highly theoretical research" being subsidized by the United States in foreign countries in areas ranging from psychology to high-energy physics and mathematics. The subcommittee conceded that such research done by highly competent foreign scientists "can undoubtedly add to U.S. and world scientific knowledge," but argued that "the payoff from present investment is inherently uncertain and may be decades in the future."

This year, the governmental structure in Washington seems to feel besieged by the country's economic problems. The Reuss subcommittee's request is another indication of Congressional willingness to sacrifice the possibility of long-term scientific gain to meet the mounting problems of the present.—B.N.

\*Copies of the report, issued 23 June, can be obtained without charge from the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, Room B-377A, Rayburn Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.

that the various agencies of HEW should accelerate their nutritional activities, especially in regard to the Indian population; and (iv) that the role of all federal agencies involved in programs directed at alleviating hunger should be reassessed, and the programs better coordinated.

But it takes more than studies and recommendations to solve major social problems, and it is doubtful, in view of the demands of the Vietnam war, that sufficient money will be available to make much of a dent. It was difficult for HEW to find even the limited amount of money necessary for this preliminary study on hunger and malnutrition, and the national nutrition study which has been promised is far from completed. In its report, HEW pointed out that, "with the present uncertainties as to future budget availability, it is plain we may not be able to do all the things we would like to do to improve nutrition and health."

Secretary Freeman pointed out earlier this month that it was impossible to fund or place in operation his goal for the provision of food stamps in this fiscal year, or even the next one.

It is obvious that the times demand more than the vague hope for future progress. As Benjamin Ortiz, resident of Resurrection City from Camden, New Jersey, said in the Senate hearing on hunger earlier this month: "Conferences, sitting-down, talk; I am tired of talking, man. Action is what we need."

The Poor People's Campaign has given top priority to demanding federal action to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in the United States; its demands on this subject are regarded as legitimate even by some members of the Administration and congressional "establishments." If these demands of the militant poor are ignored, the prospects for domestic tranquility in coming months will be slim indeed.

—BRYCE NELSON

## A POINT OF VIEW

*Excerpts from the commencement address of historian Richard Hofstadter at Columbia University on 4 June, at the beginning of which about 300 students and several teachers walked out in protest against the university. Hofstadter replaced Grayson Kirk, who, for the first time since he became president of Columbia, in 1952, did not deliver the commencement address, so as to avoid the possibility of provoking a massive incident.*

The technique of the forceable occupation and closure of a university's buildings with the intention of bringing its activities to a halt is no ordinary bargaining device—it is a thrust at the vitals of university life. It is a powerful device for control by a determined minority, and its continued use would be fatal to any university. In the next few years the universities of this country will have to find the effective strategy to cope with it, and to distinguish it sharply and permanently from the many devices of legitimate student petition, demonstration, and protest. . . . [All] our students are troubled today by two facts of the most fundamental consequence for all of us—the persistence at home of poverty and racial injustice, and abroad of the war in Vietnam. It is the first of these that we will have to live with the longer and address ourselves to much more fully, imaginatively and generously than we have so far done. But in the short run the escalation of this cruel and misconceived venture in Vietnam has done more than any other thing to inflame our students, to undermine their belief in the legitimacy of our normal political processes, and to convince them that violence is the order of the day.

I share this horror at this war, and I consider that the deep alienation it has inflicted on young Americans who would otherwise be well disposed toward their country is one of the staggering uncountable costs of the Vietnam undertaking. This war has already toppled a President; but its full effects on our national life have not yet been reckoned.

## RECENT DEATHS

**Irving H. Blake**, 80; professor emeritus of zoology, University of Nebraska, 6 May.

**Joseph H. Cooper**, 55; research chemist, E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Inc., 22 May.

**Robert Heine-Geldern**, 83; Austrian specialist on ancient cultures and founder of the Committee for Urgent Ethnological Studies under the UN; 25 May.

**Robert L. King**, 71; former professor of zoology, University of Iowa, and director of Iowa Lakeside Laboratory; 19 May.

**Earl A. Long**, 58; chairman of the department of physics, University of Alabama; 15 May.

**John Nichols**, 69; former president of Idaho State College and former president of New Mexico A&M College; 5 May.

**J. Neal Phillips**, 47; research scientist for the Central Intelligence Agency; 8 June.

**Arthur C. Shead**, 77; associate professor emeritus of chemistry; University of Oklahoma; 17 June.

**Benjamin L. Smits**, 79; former professor of chemistry at Kansas State University; 3 June.

**Karl A. Stiles**, 72; former head of the department of zoology, Michigan State University; 16 May.

**Alma G. Stokely**, 90; emeritus professor of plant science, Mount Holyoke College; 18 March.

**David H. Swann**, 53; geologist in the stratigraphy section of Illinois State Geological Survey; 25 May.

**Carl B. Swisher**, 71; professor emeritus of political science, Johns Hopkins University; 14 June.

**Lawrence A. Walsh**, 71; provost emeritus of Fordham University and former dean of Fordham College; 3 June.

**William S. Wilcox**, 45; senior research adviser, Southern Research Institute; 7 June.

**Vernon A. Wilkerson**, 68; head of the department of biochemistry, Howard University; 24 May.

**Herbert P. Woodward**, 68; dean emeritus of the Rutgers University College of Arts and Sciences; 2 June.

**Edwin A. Wynne**, 56; senior research chemist at the chemical manufacturing division, Fisher Scientific Company; 13 June.