

Academy Creates Medical Institute

The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) has deflected a recommendation that it "spin off" a national academy of medicine by deciding to create a new Institute on Medicine to deal with the increasingly complex problems of medicine and health care. The Institute, planned to include eventually about 200 members on fixed terms, will be composed of the current 25-member Board on Medicine and persons in the medical and social sciences, NAS President Philip Handler announced. The Board, chaired by Walsh McDermott of Cornell University Medical College, had recommended to the NAS last year that a separate Academy of Medicine be formed, somewhat similar in its relation to the NAS as the National Academy of Engineering. NAS members, however, were reluctant to start an entire new Academy at that time but endorsed the Board's proposals for increased consideration of and research into policy questions related to medicine and health care. The Board subsequently recast its recommendations into a proposal for an Institute, and this plan was accepted by the NAS Council. The new Institute will report directly to the Council. The NAS at present has no other institutes—N.G.

AEC also suggested in a letter from Totter to Tamplin that, while the critique of Sternglass might well be published in a relatively popular magazine, such as *Environment*, the estimate of fetal mortality rates should be treated as a separate item and submitted to a refereed journal, such as *Health Physics*. Although Gofman and Tamplin believe the AEC was trying to interfere with Tamplin's right to publish, the AEC contends it was merely urging Tamplin to "correct several errors of fact and of interpretations."

A somewhat similar incident arose when Tamplin was invited to talk at a AAAS symposium last December. As a result of previous controversies the two scientists had agreed to submit their papers to lab officials in advance, so Tamplin turned in his paper on "Nuclear Reactors and the Public Health and Safety." He got it back with major portions crossed out. Gofman recalls that he stormed in to see May, the lab director, and announced: "This is the end of the Rad Lab as a scientific institution. From now on you can call it a scientific whorehouse." Gofman claims that May then told him, "Look, Jack, you're not being realistic. The lab is a fragile institution. It gets 98 percent of its support from the AEC. We can't take a chance on injuring relationships between the lab and the commission." The laboratory also told Tamplin that if he wanted to present his "personal opinion" on nuclear power (that is, the sections that had been crossed out), then he would have

to pay his own expenses. In a fit of outrage, Gofman called the chairman of the AAAS session, told him of the alleged "censorship," and said he would send a formal letter to the AAAS complaining about the censorship unless the lab reversed its stand. Ultimately the lab backed down and allowed Tamplin to present his "scientific paper" under laboratory sponsorship.

The only instance in which anything that Tamplin or Gofman wrote has been significantly changed involves the handbook on radiation dosage which was removed from Tamplin's jurisdiction last December. The handbook, which is used to predict dosage to humans that would occur from fallout or other releases of radiation into the environment, has heretofore contained a preface, written by Tamplin, which expresses the philosophy that such predictions should be based on "the worst situation that could develop." Now that the handbook is out of Tamplin's reach, both the preface and the handbook itself are being revised. Batzel, the associate director, says that the new preface will not only consider the "maximum credible situation," but also the "best estimate" of dosage that is likely to result from a nuclear event. Similarly, the tables, which now include only a maximum estimate, will be revised to include both a maximum and a "best" estimate, Batzel said. "You really need both," he explained.

In an effort to put the censorship charges into perspective, Batzel said that Livermore has given Gofman and

Tamplin "full use of the laboratory facilities in the publication of their scientific views." He said Livermore even modified its normal publishing procedure to accommodate the two scientists. In all, some 27,000 copies of 21 different reports by Gofman and Tamplin have been reproduced at laboratory expense. "We typed them, reproduced them, and mailed them out to their distribution list," Batzel said.

A fourth charge made by Gofman is that the laboratory had threatened to fire him for rebuttals he has made against his critics. Gofman suggests that the AEC has been out to get him for several months. He claims that back in December, when he was arguing with Livermore administrators over "censorship," he was told: "Look, don't worry about a little censorship, you should know what the AEC said we should do to you." There is no question that Gofman has been threatened with dismissal—the laboratory acknowledges that. But the lab claims Gofman was told he would have to leave if he continued to make "personal attacks" on individuals who disagreed with him. Gofman claims that he hasn't made any personal attacks and that "all the slander and insult starts elsewhere. . . ."

An Edge on Invective

It is hard to tell at this stage of the battle who started what, but Gofman may well be slightly ahead in the name-calling contest. He has accused Victor Bond, associate director of Brookhaven National Laboratory, of making statements "so filled with lies, half-truths, and deliberate distortions that I would consider them to represent criminal irresponsibility." He has described statements by Lauristan Taylor, head of the National Committee on Radiation Protection, as "fraudulent, hypocritical and incompetent." He has complained of the "fraud represented by the Atomic Energy Commission and its sycophantic hangers-on such as Dr. Philip Cohen" (of the University of Wisconsin Medical School). And he has described reactor supporters as "proponents of atomic murder." By Gofman's definition, those apparently are not personal attacks. What he does regard as slanderous are various comments allegedly made by Totter, the AEC's head of biology and medicine, in a taped interview with science writer William Hines. In a transcript of the interview made public by Gofman, Totter is quoted as saying that AEC staff members for some time "didn't