Someone scrounged fluorescent desk lamps for the panelists, and the show went on.

Critics and advocates alike now seemed a bit less bashful, and some indications emerged that even members of the Club of Rome differ on the usefulness of the Meadows model. Alexander King of Great Britain, the director of science and technology of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, said it was "clear that this is not a decision-making model," and that substantial refinements were needed. But Eduard Pestel, encouraged by the way the model's projections paralleled events between 1900 and 1970, averred that "policy decisions can now be derived from what has been worked out. There is no need to wait to start action."

Similarly, Lester Brown, an agricultural authority with the Overseas Development Council, thought the model was a "remarkable achievement." Stewart Udall, former Secretary of the Interior, dropped in to toss a few bouquets on behalf of environmentalists like himself. "You have made us respectable," he said.

And one panelist, ABC radio commentator Edward P. Morgan, weighed in with the view that there would be negative reaction to the book, but that it would come mostly "from reactionaries and older folks." As an antidote, he suggested that "it's up to us, the news media, to mount a basic education program here." On the other hand, Antonie Knoppers, the president of Merck and Company pharmaceuticals, urged caution by the Club of Rome until the many assumptions on which the global model is built have been better verified, or at least made generally known. "The masses will look at these diagrams and believe them, but I feel it's dangerous to speak of projections 50 and 70 years ahead. If we feed the decision-makers half-baked conclusions we can do great harm."

out charge to 12,000 selected world

And finally there was Aurelio Peccei, the Club of Rome's urbane and silvery haired progenitor, explaining why he'd done it all in the first place.

For 2 years, club members had plodded quietly from Moscow to Rio, from Stockholm to Washington, seeking out political leaders and appraising them of the dangers ahead:

> Our message was received with sympathy and understanding, but no action followed. What we needed was a stronger tool of communication to move men on the planet out of their ingrained habits. This is the reason for the M.I.T. study and the book. Its conclusions are preliminary, but it is a key which permits every layman to enter the labyrinth of the fantastic problems towering over mankind.

Just to make sure everyone gets the key, the book will be printed in half a dozen languages and will be sent without change to 12,000 selected world leaders.

It's difficult to tell how this whole affair is viewed by the academic community at M.I.T.—probably the best source of perspective at this point. A few selective inquiries reveal something less than breathless excitement, however, and not just among disgruntled economists. Perhaps the most enlightened assessment of the week comes from this senior scientist at M.I.T., an acquaintance of both Forrester and Meadows, who asked not to be named:

> I happen to like Dennis Meadows. He's a nice fellow and very bright, if he doesn't go off the deep end. I find their work fascinating, but I'm not about to tell a congressman to base his career on it. . . . What they're doing is providing simple-minded answers for simple-minded people who are scared to death. And that's a dangerous thing. And there's a sense of naiveté here too. . . . it's not that *they* want publicity, or a grant, but they want to save the world. This messianic impulse is what disturbs me.

Thus ends the first but probably not the last act of a remarkably successful venture in the mass marketing of neo-Malthusian economics. In the next episode, with a little luck, some television producer might be persuaded to put aside the threadbare theme of the hero surgeon and try his hand at a pilot run featuring a brilliant team of computer experts obsessed with a passion for relevance, equipped with the world's most prodigious electronic brain, an IBM 2001. . . .

—ROBERT GILLETTE

Decline in Funding Detailed

Federal support to universities and colleges dropped by $227 million—to $3.2 billion—between fiscal years 1969 and 1970, and academic science funding bore $193 million of this cut. This debilitating downturn in science funding is chronicled in a dry compendium of facts and figures issued by the National Science Foundation [*Federal Support to Universities, Colleges and Selected Nonprofit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1970* (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402), $1.25 a copy].

Federal support of higher education in 1970 represented the lowest level of funding since 1966 and the first decline in actual dollars since 1963. Much of the decline may be attributed to a shift in government policy from giving direct grants for construction to subsidizing interest charges on loans from nongovernmental sources. Under this policy, the Office of Education's construction grants fell $175 million in 1970. Nevertheless, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of which the Office of Education is a part, remained the source of 64 percent of all federal obligations for colleges and universities in 1970. The Department of Defense (DOD) and the National Science Foundation together supplied another 20 percent of the federal total.

Academic science funding in 1970 fell by $193 million, or 8 percent, compared with a reduction of only $33 million (or 3 percent) in nonscience funding. Still, some institutions made the best of a falling market. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology became the first institution in history to receive in excess of $100 million from the federal government, cornering 17 and 20 percent, respectively, of the total allocations by DOD and NASA to academic science. The University of Cincinnati's federal support was increased by 263 percent, which raises it from 71st to 9th place in the league of federally supported institutions.

The ratio of total federal support to the number of degrees awarded (bachelor's or higher) amounted to $3,715 per degree in fiscal 1970. The regional variations of this figure ranged from high values of $24,555 and $7,447 per degree, respectively, in such underdeveloped areas as Alaska and Washington, D.C., down to a low of $1,576 per degree in Maine.—N.W.