Appalachian Program: A Mechanism for a National Growth Policy?

The Appalachian regional development program was undertaken 5 years ago as an effort to lift a once neglected and nearly forgotten region out of backwardness and poverty. This program, which has achieved significant gains but has not yet brought Appalachia close to deliverance, may turn out to have an important bearing on such critical national issues as those related to national growth and population distribution.

By most indices, Appalachia, the highland region extending from southern New York to northern Alabama, has been behind the rest of the United States. Unemployment has been high, incomes low, and public facilities and services such as roads, schools, and health programs have been poor. Mechanization of the coal mines during the 1940's and 1950's left thousands of miners jobless, and the coal fields (and most of the rest of Appalachia) were not able to attract new industry. The exodus of the "hillbillies" from Appalachia to the metropolises of the Northeast and Midwest has been one of the great migrations of the downtrodden, comparable to the movement of Dust Bowl "Okies" to California and the migration of blacks from the rural South to the northern ghettos.

The people of Appalachia have received little benefit from the rich resources of their region, resources which for more than half a century have been ferociously exploited by outside interests. "Much of the wealth produced by coal and timber was seldom seen locally," said the report of the presidential commission that recommended establishing the Appalachia program. "It went downstream with the great hardwood logs; it rode out on rails with the coal cars; it was mailed between distant cities as royalty checks from nonresident operators to holding companies who had bought rights to the land for 50 cents or a dollar an acre."

Moreover, strip and auger mining of coal, which continues on an increasing scale, has "disturbed"—in many cases devastated—an area as large as Connecticut and Rhode Island combined, leaving ridge after ridge scarred with deep cuts and massive spoil banks. Public exasperation at the landslides, erosion, stream pollution, and landscape blight caused by strip and auger mining recently has led the elected officials of Knott County and Leslie County, in eastern Kentucky, to try to stop these mining practices altogether.

The Appalachian program is a legacy of the Kennedy administration. Campaigning in the critical West Virginia primary of 1960, John F. Kennedy promised to relieve the region's misery. As president, Kennedy later set in motion the studies and planning that led to passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

Breaking the Isolation

More than $1 billion in special aid funds have been given to the 13 Appalachian states under the act. The development strategy has not focused on building industrial parks but on improving public facilities and services. More than half of the money has gone for highways to help Appalachia break out of its isolation. But substantial sums also have been spent on vocational schools, health facilities, and other needs. Projects are often interrelated, as, for instance, in the case of a new vocational school that depends upon a highway improvement to allow it to draw students from a wide area. A major achievement of the program has been to help localities in the region overcome the Hatfield-McCoy syndrome by learning to cooperate in multicounty development districts which the program helps to finance.

The Appalachia program has been slow, however, to reach the people up at the "head of the hollow," the figurative term for Appalachia's legions of poor, illiterate, and unskilled. But it is now entering a new phase, and greater emphasis is being given to such things as child development programs, improvement of elementary and secondary education, and medical outreach programs.

A primary goal has been to give the region a "self-sustaining economy" affording enough good jobs to keep the ablest and most mobile elements of the population from leaving Appalachia. This goal is far from attainment. There is not the distress in the region now that there once was but the economy is still very sick and is kept alive by massive transfusions of federal money. A variety of new or expanded federal programs such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the War on Poverty, the aid-to-education programs, and the Appalachia program itself are pumping it in by the millions.

Appalachia is becoming a better place for industry to locate, what with the improvement of roads, vocational training, and the like. Yet the coming of even the smallest industrial plant to an area such as eastern Kentucky or southwest Virginia remains rare enough to be hailed as a marvelous event. The largest new plant to come to eastern Kentucky is the $5-million American Standard, Inc., plant at Paintsville, which now employs some 200 workers to make faucets parts and may eventually employ 450. When the plant opened last year the rush of job applicants attested both to the hunger of Appalachian people for work and to their regional loyalty. More than 6500 persons applied, and of these several thousand were Kentuckians who had left the state but wished to return.

Even though the migration of people from Appalachia has slackened, the 1970 census will show that in eastern Kentucky, the West Virginia coal fields, and other depressed parts of the region, the counties and towns generally have suffered population declines since 1960. In fact, even some of the cities and towns designated as "growth centers" have lost population.

The Appalachia program's most innovative feature lies not in what it has accomplished but rather in the mechanism established to allow effective federal, state, and local collaboration. This mechanism, which has excited interest as a promising manifestation of that shadowy concept called "the new federalism," is the Appalachian Regional Commission. ARC is made up of the governors of the Appalachian states and a representative of the president known as the "federal cochairman," who can veto any proposal brought before the commission, although he has never yet used this power.

One can best appreciate ARC by comparing it to the Area Redevelopment Administration set up during the Kennedy years. This latter agency, which had the mission of aiding depressed areas throughout the nation, smacked of the pork barrel. Its administrators were beset by political pressures from localities hungry for federal money and from those localities' representatives in Congress. As a result, projects were funded with scarcely more than a pretense of following well-thought-out development strategies. The Appalachia program is not wholly innocent of pork-barrel tendencies, but, in its case, political pressures usually can be deflected. ARC receives project applications only from the governors, who, with the help of their economic development offices, set funding priorities after reviewing the proposals prepared by the localities and the multi-county development districts.

A congressman who comes to ARC pleading for support for a project in his district is usually told to go see his governor. That generally ends the matter. "Congressmen quickly saw that they could claim credit for projects that we supported and escape blame for those that we did not," says a former ARC official who was with the program during its first years. "The governors, they liked the system too, because it gave them a real voice."

Authority to approve or disapprove projects for funding has been delegated to an executive committee made up of the federal cochairman, the "states' regional representative" (the stand-in for the governors in the daily operations of the commission), and the ARC staff director. The commission itself, which establishes project criteria, is not an operating agency and projects which it helps fund are carried out by other agencies. However, ARC has a professional staff of 63, and it provides technical assistance.

With an annual budget now approaching $300 million, ARC's annual spending is an important enough supplement to that of other federal and state agencies to give the commission real influence in the development process. For one thing, it functions as a broker between the federal and state and local governments. Several months ago ARC brought Kentucky's health, mental health, education, and welfare officials together with their federal counterparts to design a new child development program. It was discovered that the state officials had never before met together for program planning and that the same was true of the federal officials. ARC sees itself as a catalyst acting both vertically and horizontally, engendering pro-

Land Law Review Stirs Controversy

Leading conservationists reacted with disappointment to the report issued last week by the Public Land Law Review Commission. The 342-page report—complete with pictures, maps, and graphs—was the result of a 5-year, $7-million study and was the first comprehensive review of public land policy in the nation's history. The commission, set up by a 1964 Act of Congress, was made up of seven House members, six senators, and six presidential appointees, including Philip H. Hoff, former governor of Vermont, and Laurence S. Rockefeller, a well-known conservationist.

The commission's report recommended several major changes in the way public land is managed. It called for a coordinated land policy to replace the disjointed series of statutes and laws, which have governed policy in the past, and for a reassertion of congressional primacy and a curbing of executive powers over land management. It also recommended a revision of procedures to aid commercial interests and urban expansion, the establishment of environmental guidelines for use of land, and the creation of a new Department of Natural Resources by combining the Agriculture Department's Forest Service with the Department of the Interior.

Despite these and 350 other recommendations, representatives of the Sierra Club, the National Wildlife Federation, and the Wilderness Society characterized the report as superficial and criticized it for failing to face up to many of the serious issues facing the government in its land policy.

Timber and Mining Sections Criticized

Particular criticism was leveled at sections of the report dealing with use of public land for timbering and mining. The report recommended, for example, that "public lands that are highly productive for timber be classified for commercial timber production as the dominant use" and that "mineral exploration and development should have a preference over some or all other uses on much of our public land."

Thomas Kimball, head of the National Wildlife Federation, said "I intensely disagree with the report's recommendations on timber and mining. It's incredible to think that the commission could come up with a report so favorable to private interests." Kimball faulted the makeup of the commission, which he described as "dominated by advocates of special interest groups." Included in the 19-man commission were 12 congressmen from western states, where development of land is often considered more crucial than conservation.

The conservationists found a few praiseworthy items in the report. Recommendations for a coordinated land policy and for government retention of most of the land it now owns (one-third of the United States) were both lauded. But for the most part, conservationists found more to condemn than to praise.

In his letter of transmittal to President Nixon, the commission's flinty chairman, Representative Wayne Aspinall (D.–Colo.), said the report represented the consensus of a wide range of views. But he noted that "the absence of a member's separate views does not necessarily indicate that there is a unanimity on details."

Indeed, unanimity on details was far from complete. In addition to several written objections to specific sections of the report, general criticism of the favoritism shown to industry was voiced privately to *Science* by two of the commissioners. Yet all members of the commission signed the report (which does not of itself change any laws), and even the most critical conservationists conceded that it paves the way for congressional action on badly needed land law reform.

Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior Committee, said that it will be at least 6 months before such action can be initiated.

—THOMAS P. SOUTHWICK

NEWS IN BRIEF

• **PITZER RESIGNS:** Kenneth S. Pitzer, 56, resigned last week after 1½ years as president of Stanford University. In his letter of resignation, he stated, "Entirely too much of my time has been devoted to matters of an administrative or even of a police nature." He said that he welcomed "the prospect of a more scholarly life at a less hectic pace." Pitzer, a well-known chemist, taught at the University of California for 24 years before becoming president of Rice University in 1961. He took over the Stanford presidency on 1 December 1968.

• **BLACK DOCTORS:** Meharry Medical College has received a $1-million grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation of New York. The grant will be used to increase the number of full-time faculty members over the next decade so that the college may triple its student enrollment, which is currently 500. Meharry is the only predominantly black, private medical college in the United States; it has graduated about half of the black physicians and dentists now practicing.

• **AMA ABORTION STAND:** The American Medical Association (AMA) has voted for the first time in its 123-year history to consider abortion a "medical procedure" and to allow doctors to perform abortions for social and economic reasons as well as medical. The new policy calls for consultation by two physicians other than the patient's doctor and for performance of the operation in an accredited hospital by a licensed physician. No doctor or hospital should be compelled to perform abortions, the AMA said. The president of the 6000-member National Federation of Catholic Physicians Guild has called upon Catholic doctors to resign from the AMA in protest against the new policy.

• **CIVIL LIBERTIES OF STUDENTS:** Students should be allowed to participate in "an effective capacity" in deciding policy on all matters affecting their education and student life, according to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). A new 48-page pamphlet published by the ACLU gives guidelines for student rights on such subjects as freedom in the classroom, campus publications, personal freedom, disciplinary procedures, and student records. The pamphlet, "Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities," is available from the ACLU at 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10010.

• **CAMPUSES AND POLITICS:** The American Council on Education (ACE) has issued guidelines, approved by the Internal Revenue Service, on campus participation in politics. Under the Internal Revenue Code, institutions are denied tax exempt status if they engage in "substantial" legislative activity or participate or intervene in a political campaign. The ACE suggests, however, that rearrangement of the academic year to allow students and faculty to participate in political campaigns is permissible so long as the year is not shortened.

• **AID TO CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES:** The Supreme Court has agreed to rule on a case questioning whether the federal government may make construction grants to church-related colleges and universities. A group of Connecticut taxpayers contend that such grants, given under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, violate the First Amendment guarantee of separation of church and state. A federal district court had ruled earlier that the grants were legal so long as the facilities were not used for sectarian instruction or worship. The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the issue some time next year.

• **MANNED SPACE FLIGHT STUDY:** The major recommendation of a panel of experts in space biomedicine which met last summer to explore problems of infectious disease in manned space missions, was that a preflight quarantine be instituted to (i) permit acute disease to express itself, (ii) prevent contact and infection of the astronauts by the general public, and (iii) permit cross-contact of flora and exchange of microorganisms among the prospective spacecraft crew. This recommendation and others are contained in *Infectious Disease in Manned Spaceflight: Probabilities and Countermeasures*, available from the Printing and Publishing Office, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20418.

ductive new collaboration between different levels of government and between agencies at each level of government.

At the national party conventions of 1968 the Appalachian governors urged that a federal-state mechanism of the ARC type be adopted for use nationally in coping with problems of "rural decline and central city deterioration." This proposal, which would provide for the United States to be divided up into development regions on the Appalachian model, will be on the agenda at the National Governors' Conference at the Lake of the Ozarks this August, with the Appalachian governors again pushing it. The Appalachian Regional Development Act itself expires next year. But support for the program within the region is strong and there is not much doubt but what it will be renewed, either in its present form, or perhaps with various parts of Appalachia fitting into a new national complex of development regions.

In his State of the Union message in January, President Nixon called for a "national growth policy." ARC is a mechanism of a kind which the president and his domestic affairs council will be aware of as they look for ways to develop and carry out such a policy. The president spoke of "vast areas of rural America emptying of people and of promise" and of central cities suffering violence and decay. He said that government decisions on the locations of highways, airports, and the like must be made with a "clear objective of aiding a balanced growth for America."

John D. Whisman, ARC's states' representative for the past 4 years, proposes that an Office of Regional Development be established in the Executive Office of the President. Federal representatives on all new regional commissions which might be created would report to that office, just as ARC's federal cochairman now reports to the President. Unless the new regional commissions were given substantial funds, however, their influence probably would be as slight as that of the six regional commissions (for areas such as New England, the Ozarks, and the Upper Great Lakes) that report to the Secretary of Commerce. These commissions, set up at the insistence of congressmen who had felt that Appalachia was getting favored treatment, together have a budget one-sixth the size of ARC's.

Whatever its value as a prototype for regional development programs, ARC has not yet dealt with two fundamental problems of its own region—the evident need for tighter control of strip mining and for a "severance" or production tax on coal. ARC has been suspect from the start in the eyes of people such as Harry Caudill, the Whitesburg, Kentucky, attorney (and author of *Night Comes to the Cumberland*), who seeks to have Appalachia throw off its subservience to outside economic interests. When the Appalachia legislation was being formulated, Caudill and others wanted it to provide for studies that might lead to publicly owned hydropower and mine-mouth power systems. But their proposals were successfully opposed by the electric utilities, railroads, and other corporate interests.

Adoption of a severance tax could bring the Appalachian coal field region a measure of the economic self-sufficiency that has thus far eluded it. A bill by U.S. Senator Lee Metcalf (D–Montana) would establish a 5 percent federal severance tax on all minerals—with the states allowed to claim a total rebate by adopting severance taxes of their own. This measure, now stuck in the Senate Finance Committee, would allow Pennsylvania and West Virginia each to collect over $45 million a year and Kentucky to collect more than $26 million. There are also bills in Congress to have federal authorities oversee state regulation of strip mining, regulation which is now plainly inadequate. These too languish in committee.

While the ARC staff has recognized the need for federal or state severance taxes and for better regulation of strip mining, it has been leary of pressing either of these controversial issues. Now, however, ARC has studies under way which *may* lead the commission to advocate severance-tax and strip-mine control legislation, possibly combined in a single package. Part of the proceeds of the tax might be assigned to such things as land reclamation and public purchase of those coal lands zoned against strip mining. Given ARC's prestige regionally, and even nationally, its endorsement of such measures could have an influence.

In sum, the Appalachia program has provided a test of a promising new mechanism for a joint federal, state, and local attack on regional development problems. But, up to now, that attack has not reached to two gut issues—issues which cannot be avoided much longer without leaving ARC open to charges of a shameless dereliction of duty.—LUTHER J. CARTER

Los Alamos, Livermore, JPL Studied

Special committees at two California universities have recently examined their ties to government-supported laboratories and have determined that closer control by the campuses is imperative.

A Study Committee at the California Institute of Technology has concluded that it should maintain its ties with the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) provided the scope and style of work is "appropriate to a university-affiliated laboratory, and meaningful interactions with the campus exist." Similarly, a special committee at the University of California has recommended that the university assume substantially more control over the operation of two weapons laboratories, the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, California, and the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory at Los Alamos, New Mexico.

Caltech has managed the Jet Propulsion Laboratory for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) since 1958. JPL, which is located a few miles from the Caltech campus at Pasadena, has been responsible for research, development, and engineering for unmanned spacecraft and has controlled lunar and planetary flights of these craft. JPL has also designed, built, and operated the Deep Space Network, a series of three tracking stations designed to monitor Mars, Venus, and other deep-space probes. For fiscal year 1968–69, expenditures at JPL were $144 million; by comparison, Caltech's campus budget was $32.6 million.

The Study Committee's report suggests that a faculty committee be established to give advice on policy matters at JPL and that the faculty be involved in long-range planning for JPL. Caltech divisions should consider more JPL staff members for visiting or part-time faculty appointments, the report says. The Graduate Study Committee should develop policies for graduate students who wish to do thesis work at JPL, and undergraduates should be more readily employed.

The Study Committee recommended that the laboratory open its guarded buildings and grounds to all persons with Caltech identification (this recommendation has already been implemented); publication and information policies should be as open as possible, and classified work should not be permitted. (JPL now has one task that is entirely classified; several others incidentally involve some classified information.)

The report also suggests some changes in JPL's work. The Study Committee declared that JPL should work on only a few missions at one time; that it should diversify carefully, choosing work closely related to Caltech's competence; that the basic research program should be strengthened, with more discretionary authority given to JPL management; and that nonspace projects be modified to focus on one or two areas.

Some of the recommendations require administrative or faculty action; others need NASA approval. The Caltech trustees apparently need not act.

The University of California laboratories at Livermore and Los Alamos are operated for the Atomic Energy Commission; most of their work is devoted to research and design in the area of nuclear weaponry. Last year the operating budget of the laboratories was $224.5 million, as compared to an operating budget for the nine university campuses of $678 million.

The Special Committee (with one dissenter) supported the university's war weapons research, but declared that "the Laboratories contribute too little to the welfare of the University." The committee felt the university should increase its administrative control over the laboratories, shape their policies, and increase the educational functions of the laboratories. If these steps are not taken, the committee said, the university should terminate its relations with the laboratories.

The Academic Senate will meet next fall to consider the report. Any faculty action will be advisory to the Regents.—NANCY GRUCHOW