

propriety of political involvement. The committee concluded that, like other citizens, the university teacher "should be free to engage in political activities insofar as he can do so consistently with his obligations as a teacher and scholar."

The committee also dealt with the sponsorship of research, in which, it argued, "the more conspicuous dangers have tended to arise from federal funding." In its rules, the committee concluded that financial sponsors of research should avoid actions which would call into question the integrity of American academic institutions and should not sponsor research as a cover for intelligence activities.

The committee's recommendations on research were made somewhat stronger by the inclusion of a section, prepared by the political science department of the University of Oregon, which stated that all social science research done in universities "shall be free of any restrictions on its content, its procedures, or on the form or place of its publication," and that "social scientists shall be recognized as having

the same rights of free inquiry under government grants as do natural scientists." (The Oregon group said that, "while the natural sciences have been gaining from government more funds and more freedom in their research, the social sciences have gained more funds and less freedom.")

The APSA business meeting voted approval of the committee and its work and established a Standing Committee on Professional Ethics. Austin Ranney of the University of Wisconsin said that the actions taken, while not binding on the membership, at least moved the association out of the ethical area "where we are now, where we have nothing," to a point where more progress in the formulation of professional ethics was possible in the future.

In the establishment of a committee on professional ethics, in the amending of the constitution to permit more political involvement, and in some of the other actions taken by APSA, the more militant members achieved part of what they wanted. The Caucus for a New Political Science also sponsored separate scholarly meetings on the kinds

of subjects they thought should be discussed at the APSA meetings. The leaders of APSA were helpful in accommodating and publicizing the meetings of the Caucus for a New Political Science and, in so doing, may have defused any potential for revolt.

Three of the more militant APSA members put out a statement which said: "Even the Caucus for a New Political Science shows severe strains of conservatism." The three argued that, in the separate business meeting held by the Caucus for a New Political Science, "there were few people under 30, no women and no blacks, the tendency being to vote for people with academic reputations, those well-known in the Association." The executive committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science recommended that the topic for panel discussions at next year's APSA meeting be "Prospects for Revolution in America." At this point it looks as though any "revolution" in the sedate American Political Science Association is in the process of being contained and assimilated.

—BRYCE NELSON

IHD: International Symbol or "National Embarrassment"?

Of all the federal science programs whose budgets have been cut by Congress, perhaps the hardest hit have been the international programs. And of all the international programs, the U.S. arm of the International Hydrological Decade (IHD), which has had financial troubles since its inception, has had perhaps the thinnest time.

Conceived in the image of the highly successful International Geophysical Year (IGY), IHD began in January 1965 and is to run until 1974. On a worldwide basis it is directed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). It was set up to spur work in hydrology throughout the world and to try to get comprehensive water resource data for all participating countries. For countries already doing extensive work in hydrology—such as the United States—IHD

was to help make that work known throughout the world and to try to develop programs of a cooperative nature to complement the research being done.

U.S. State Department officials played a major role in initiating the program, and President Johnson gave IHD his verbal seal of approval in August 1964. But, since then, Congress has shown itself unwilling to make United States participation anything more than token.

"It's worse than a disappointment, it's a national embarrassment," says one member of the U.S. IHD National Committee. "We started this thing in the first place," he told *Science*, "and now other countries are taking it up. But our participation has been very small and we have always been late in providing our share of the hydrological information asked of us."

The U.S. National Committee, which

is under the supervision of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, was set up too late to request funds for fiscal year 1966. So some money within the U.S. Geological Survey was reshuffled to get the committee going. For fiscal 1967 and 1968, the committee requested \$2.5 million and \$2 million, respectively, within the budget of the Geological Survey, which acted as a representative of all the government agencies involved. Neither request was approved. Congress did appropriate \$168,000 to the Survey and \$90,000 to the Corps of Engineers for new projects conducted for IHD for fiscal year 1968, but approved no money directly to the National Committee. The National Science Foundation (NSF) has provided some funds, as has the Department of State, to support the committee's secretariat for administration, planning, and coordination. But the State Department has had trouble getting money for its own Water for Peace program, and its participation and interest in IHD have correspondingly waned.

For the current fiscal year (1969) the National Committee, on the advice of the Federal Council on Science and Technology, made its budget requests

through four agencies—NSF, the Geological Survey, the Corps of Engineers, and the Agency for International Development (AID). The requests—originally totaling some \$2.8 million—were all rejected. The extreme tightness of funds this year, together with the strong anti-foreign-aid-of-any-kind feeling that ran through Congress, kept the committee from getting money for the third straight year. Any funding of the National Committee for next year will have to come from the present budgets of the agencies involved. This money, National Committee executive secretary L. A. Heindl told *Science*, “may keep us going on a paper-pushing basis and serve to support a face-saving delegation to the international [UNESCO] Coordinating Council.”

The Committee had planned an 18-month cooperative venture with the IHD National Committee of Canada to study the hydrology of the Great Lakes in 1970–71. Some money from the Corps of Engineers will be used for that project, but Heindl fears that the shortage of funds may cause the project to be significantly reduced in scope. Heindl, the sole professional staff member working for the committee, says that planned analyses of ground-water systems in the United States and various educational and training programs, including exchanges with other countries, will probably also have to be scrapped, or at least delayed.

The committee, Heindl emphasizes, does not plan to duplicate any programs that already exist. It is interested in doing things that are at present not being done, especially in undertaking joint programs with other countries—such as the proposed International Field Year for the Great Lakes, with Canada. Rather than work separately, American and Canadian hydrologists could work together and study the whole lake, rather than just their own side.

In the absence of any really substantive American participation in IHD, the leadership mantle has passed to the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union's financial commitment has not been announced, but it has participated much more seriously in IHD than the United States has, Heindl says. Unlike the United States it has provided all the hydrological data that have been requested, and it has published three manuals on basic hydrological practices for use by developing countries. It has also offered to teach and train hydrologists from developing countries, Heindl says. For those countries, he explained, participa-

tion in IHD is a major step toward learning how to control and utilize water resources more effectively. Water resources and their management are very important to developing countries, and with no more than token contributions from the United States, Heindl feels, many of them are turning to the Soviet Union for training and equipment.

Whether the Soviet Union is first in hydrological research may mean little to anyone but a hardened Cold Warrior. What is important—and Heindl emphasized this—is that the United States contribute its fair share to the program. Heindl said, for example, that the UNESCO Council wanted to compile a worldwide series of standardized maps of water resource data. But American maps would have to be converted to the metric system for use internationally. For this, Heindl said, he needed money. “With 100, 150 thousand dollars,” he said, “we could begin to make a meaningful contribution to the Decade.”

One of the committee's problems has been its inability to win the support of an influential congressman. Another has been the arduous budgetary route that has been followed. Because the Geological Survey has been the coordinating agency, one National Committee member said, “we end up being weighed against national programs.” The director of the Geological Survey “can't speak for an international program over a domestic one,” he said. As a result, when the Survey's budget is sliced, money for IHD is one of the first things to go.

The National Committee is continuing to look for possible financial support within existing budgets of interested agencies. But since both NSF and AID budgets were cut so extensively this year, that will be a difficult task. Perhaps more important, however, the committee members are looking for ways to have the IHD budget judged in respect to other international programs.

American participation in IHD seems to have suffered for several reasons. The program has had trouble fitting into the budget of any one agency and has been relegated to a low-priority position in several. It has been unable to attract the active support of the statesmen of science or of science-minded congressmen. And it has had the bad luck to be an international program at a time when Congress finds international programs expendable.—ANDREW JAMISON

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **SHIFT FROM CHICAGO:** Three behavioral sciences associations have canceled scheduled conventions in Chicago in protest of police action during the Democratic convention. The American Sociological Association has shifted its meetings for next year to San Francisco; the American Psychological Association has not yet selected a new site for next year; and the American Political Science Association will shift its scheduled 1970 convention.

● **SCIENTISTS PROTEST:** Sixty scientists at the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Mass., have charged that the Johnson Administration and all those who support the war in Vietnam must share the responsibility for the violence in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention. In a telegram sent 30 August to the White House, the scientists declared, “This brutal war makes a major contribution to the climate of violence in this country as well as to the divisions that split and threaten this nation.” The telegram was signed by four scientists who represented the group: George Wald, Harvard; H. O. Halvorson, University of Wisconsin; S. E. Luria, M.I.T.; and Irving London, Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

● **SHRINK-TANK:** The National Institute of Mental Health is financing the establishment of a research center in educational and social psychiatry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The center will evaluate clinical procedures that are used in diagnosing students' mental problems.

● **EXCAVATION RESEARCH:** A \$200-million 10-year government research effort to promote new underground excavation methods has been recommended by the National Research Council for the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines. The report suggests the use of underground excavation methods that would save land surfaces from the effects of mining operations, permit access to deep mineral deposits now out of man's reach, and provide more space for urban expansion and mass transportation. The report may be obtained for \$2.50 from the National Academy of Sciences, Printing and Publishing Office, 2101 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20418.