

forces has been a major source of criticism in Congress.

The need for increased funding for health care is evident. The El Salvadoran health ministry's budget reportedly has been cut by 75 percent in the last 2 years. Support of health care is provided under U.S. AID funds for emergency relief, but the funds are used to provide food and other needs as well. How much of the \$6 million earmarked this year for emergency relief goes into medicines, vaccines, and similar supplies is difficult to ascertain. Regular AID programs in maternal and child care, disease control, and health manpower training were mostly phased out after 1979.

Those who favor private initiatives to provide health care in El Salvador seem to agree that organizations like the Academy, IOM, and AAAS lack the resources and expertise to mount such efforts. Such organizations are regarded also as congenitally shy of such politically charged situations.

IOM president Robbins, trained as a pediatrician, was shocked by the recent report and says his first impulse was to explore formation of a consortium of scientific, philanthropic, and public agencies to provide medical assistance. The response to his overture Robbins describes as "not very encouraging." He says he was warned that, without significant "stabilization" in El Salvador, not much could be done.

For the moment, Robbins says he is doing what he can to make the situation described in the report known and he hopes that "those who can do something will take note of it." He also intends to discuss the issue with the IOM council.

Cornell biology professor Thomas Eisner, chairman of the subcommittee on science and human rights of the AAAS Committee of Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, had a similar reaction to the report. He says his initial impulse was to launch a fund-raising campaign among physicians and other health professionals to buy medical supplies. But Eisner says he learned that there would be "a real logistics problem. Who would take over in terms of distribution?"

The Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility is discussing with other organizations the possibility of sending a follow-up mission to El Salvador to inquire further into individual cases of human rights violations and to explore ways in which U.S. physicians and scientists might assist with medical supplies and medical education.

Finding a conduit for private aid from health professionals is a problem that

advocates of such aid recognize as formidable. The Pan American Health Organization appears to be a natural candidate, but PAHO, which operates several small programs of its own in El Salvador, is limited to providing technical assistance with its own staff and by charter does only those things requested by the host government. Also candidates are the International Committee of the Red Cross, which has been able to visit political prisoners and, thereby, presumably ameliorate their treatment; the Catholic Archbishopric; and Protestant church organizations which operate facilities for the large number of displaced persons. But in each case, political complications arise.

Cooperation with U.S. agencies could cause difficulties with the nongovernment sector trying to remain neutral in El Salvador, since such aid would be interpreted as political support of the Salvadoran government. Identification with activist political groups in the United States campaigning to end U.S. support for the Salvadoran government would antagonize that government.

In the developing canon of international law, health rights are not so clearly defined as some other aspects of human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1948 establishes two main categories. The first deals with political and civil rights, including, for example, freedom from torture and arbitrary arrest. Under the second category are guarantees of rights to adequate food, shelter, health care, and education. U.S. scientific organizations have been chiefly concerned with political and civil rights and have sought to intercede in behalf of fellow professionals whose rights have been violated. The forthcoming report of the delegation organized by the Committee for Health Rights in El Salvador will seek to set forth a rubric for health rights, including, for example, guarantees of the neutrality of patients and health workers.

The political labyrinth of El Salvador poses a special challenge to U.S. organizations concerned. Eisner describes it as a "new experience." Scientific organizations now fairly widely accept that scientific responsibility obliges them to assist their peers in trouble. But, as Eisner puts it, "Should it end there?" or does that responsibility extend to "people in the middle between two extremes who are suffering"? His personal answer is that the issue "transcends professional boundaries." Which, of courses, leaves the more difficult question of how to take effective action.—JOHN WALSH

Administration Relents on Social Science Funds

In its budget proposals for fiscal year (FY) 1984, the Reagan Administration has retreated from its earlier attempts to gut social science programs, according to an analysis of the budget figures by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA). "Social and behavioral science programs may no longer be receiving special attention, for better or worse, from the administration," says Roberta Balstad Miller, COSSA's executive director.

Two years ago, the Administration went through the budget with a fine-tooth comb and attempted to reduce or eliminate funding for social science research in virtually every agency. The FY 1984 budget, however, provides increases in some key programs and in particular provides support for a variety of large databases that social scientists have feared would be lost or the usefulness of which would be severely eroded.

This apparent change of heart follows loud protests from the academic community over the Administration's earlier actions, including a statement of concern from the National Academy of Sciences. COSSA itself, an organization consisting of ten professional societies and a score of research universities, was established to coordinate a response to the cuts.

According to COSSA's analysis, there is no consistent pattern in funding for the social and behavioral sciences in the FY 1984 budget. In general, however, social science research in those agencies whose overall budgets are set to grow—such as the National Science Foundation (NSF)—will get increased funding, while research budgets associated with programs that the Administration is squeezing, such as Head Start and social welfare, will be slashed.

The biggest increase comes in NSF, where social and behavioral science programs would receive \$40.7 million, a 12 percent increase over FY 1983. But even that increase will not be sufficient to restore funding to the pre-Reagan level of \$52.4 million.

Much of the increase in NSF's social science budget will go to the maintenance of several large data-

bases that COSSA has sought to protect. The money is therefore welcome, but, notes Miller, "the other side of the coin is that there is not much of an increase left for research."

In general, COSSA's analysis shows that funding for social and behavioral science research was cut in the Office of Human Development Services in the Department of Health and Human Services, the Policy Development and Research budget in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the clinical training budget in the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). NIMH's research budget was increased by 12 percent, however, and there were large boosts in the budgets for research on alcoholism and drug abuse.

—COLIN NORMAN

Primate Centers Brace for Protests

Proponents of animal welfare are planning major demonstrations at federal primate research centers across the nation on 24 April to protest alleged abuses of primates. Leaders of animal welfare groups are promising peaceful marches, but officials at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which funds the primate centers, are uneasy that the large crowds expected will become unruly.

The demonstrations are being coordinated by a new group called the Mobilization for Animals, a coalition of about 100 groups in the United States and abroad. The marches are likely to attract much support, given the publicity about the recent conviction of Maryland researcher, Edward Taub, who was found negligent in his care of laboratory monkeys. (The Court of Appeals of Maryland recently decided to consider an appeal filed by Taub and will hear the case in May.) Taub's former lab assistant, Alex Pacheco, who brought the abuses to the attention of authorities, is a leader in the coalition.

Demonstrations are to be held at four of the seven primate research centers, located in the Boston suburb of Southboro; Atlanta; Madison; and Davis, California. Marches in cities overseas are also planned to coincide with the U.S. protest.

Fliers advertising the marches paint a gory picture of animal research. "The animals cannot speak, cannot defend themselves, cannot stop the torture. . . . Help us bring this blood-drenched age to a close," one pamphlet appeals. Information distributed by the group gives the impression that there are many good alternatives to animal testing, such as mathematical modeling and tissue culture, for a wide variety of experiments. Scientists vigorously dispute this point.

The group is demanding several changes in the way primate research is conducted. It wants access to primate centers to ensure proper care of animals, membership on committees at primate centers and NIH, and elimination of duplication in primate research. It is also calling on NIH to close down the centers located in Beaverton, Oregon, and Covington, Louisiana, because of their allegedly poor track record in animal care, according to Don Barnes, a group spokesman. (The seventh center is located in Seattle.)

NIH director of primate centers, Leo A. Whitehair, says that all the centers are "on the alert." The coalition, he



Animal abuse charged

says, has promised to conduct orderly demonstrations, "but there are bound to be radical elements." He says the centers will depend mainly on police protection. But Whitehair downplays NIH's concern. "No one's lost any sleep over this."

Of greater concern to Whitehair and other NIH officials is the animal group's effect on upcoming budget hearings on Capitol Hill. Animal welfare organizations in general have developed much more political savvy during the past year and are expected to lobby heavily. The NIH primate centers program was allotted \$18 million for fiscal year 1982.

—MARJORIE SUN

Some Haunting Words on Arms Control

A senior strategic analyst at the Stanford Research Institute reviled the field of arms control a few years back. "I can't think of any negotiations on security or weaponry that have done any good," he said. "In a democracy, these negotiations tend to discourage money for defense programs. The public says, 'why increase the military when we're negotiating with the Russians?'"

The analyst said that he thought arms talks could be held anyway. "We are willing to have a real reduction in nuclear weapons," he said. But such negotiations would be unlikely to result in success. "My policy would be to do it for political reasons." This would be a "sham." But the subterfuge might be successful if a diplomat was dispatched overseas, "very low key," and the arms talks then went unmentioned. "If anyone brings up the subject," the analyst explained, "you can say, 'we have a guy over there.'" In this manner can U.S. allies and the American public be placated.

The analyst is Kenneth Adelman, who was 34 years old when he made these remarks to Ken Auletta, a columnist at the *New York Daily News*, in 1981. A month ago, President Reagan nominated Adelman to be the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) in Washington. When these remarks were subsequently called to the attention of the Administration, ACDA released a statement that "Adelman does not recall having said anything of the sort and those quotes certainly do not reflect his thinking."

Auletta replied that "there is nothing to discuss here. He said what he said and I printed it." Senator Alan Cranston (D-Calif.), who brought the interview to the attention of his colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on 16 February, said that "if these quotes are accurate, it seems to me that they are so serious as to disqualify Mr. Adelman." President Reagan's immediate response was to reiterate his support. "I think he is eminently qualified for this," Reagan said. "All of his experience indicates it."

—R. JEFFREY SMITH