

and people who can't take much time off from the job. Work is also being done with groups of inorgasmic women, which combines women's movement consciousness-raising with new sexual awareness. This program is part of a major trend in the field—an effort to make responsible sex therapy available to the needy and not just those who can afford the exotic prices charged by

private practitioners. The main schism in the field, in fact, is not so much the matter of correct approaches to dysfunction, but between private practitioners and those who work in connection with institutions. The academics think the private operators are too often ill trained and high priced, and they look askance at fancy brochures sent out to advertise treatment programs and seminars.

Another approach that deserves mention is that developed by Ted McIlvenna, a clergyman, sexologist, and psychologist at the National Sex Forum in San Francisco. This organization takes an educational approach, says McIlvenna, in the belief that sex problems should not be regarded as pathological but as manifestations of negative attitudes and misinformation. So the

## Briefing

---

---

### House Renounces Major Reform of Committees

---

The House of Representatives has renounced the opportunity to make the first major change in committee jurisdictions in 28 years, with many liberal congressmen defending the status quo as determinedly as the most resolute conservatives. Congressmen of all stripes and the various lobbying groups with whom they identify have, in effect, united to resist changes in the familiar pathways of influence and power.

In early 1973 the House established a "select committee on committees" chaired by Representative Richard Bolling (D-Mo.). This past April, the Bolling Committee, made up of 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, issued its final report, and many members found it threatening. For one thing, it would have confined each member to service on a single major committee, whereas many now serve on two important committees. For another, the report called for consolidating jurisdictions in several fields—notably, energy, environment, transportation, health, and research. This would mean much reshuffling among committees, with some faring much better (or worse) than others.

After several days of floor debate, the Bolling proposals were rejected by the House on 8 October in favor of a gentle alternative put forward by a Democratic Caucus committee headed by Representative Julia Hansen of Washington. By and large, this has left committee jurisdictions unchanged. There are two major exceptions however.

One is that the new Committee on Science and Technology to be established next January will have a jurisdiction broader than that of its predecessor, the Committee on Science and Astronautics. The old committee has had

jurisdiction over the National Science Foundation, the National Bureau of Standards, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and certain emerging areas of interest such as technology assessment.

The new committee will retain all the above and will acquire from 4 other committees—Interior, Commerce, Public Works, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries—all R & D programs related to civil aviation, environmental protection, and energy (except nuclear energy). It would also be empowered to exercise special oversight over any nonmilitary R & D activity, regardless of which committee may exercise legislative jurisdiction. The other major jurisdictional change is that the old Public Works Committee will become the Committee on Public Works and the Environment, with jurisdiction over urban mass transit, civil aviation, and inland waterways.

The Committee on Energy and the Environment proposed by the Bolling Committee would have assumed jurisdiction over programs now scattered among the Interior, Public Works, Commerce, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Atomic Energy committees (the last being a joint Senate-House committee). It drew fire from all sides, and not least from such lobbying groups as the Sierra Club and Environmental Action.

Ironically, one of the two Bolling Committee members who actually drafted the reform proposals was Representative Paul Sarbanes (D-Md.), who in 1970 defeated Representative George Fallon, then chairman of the Public Works Committee and one of Environmental Action's "Dirty Dozen." Although establishing an Energy and Environment Committee could be a step toward rationalizing energy and environmental programs, the environmental lobbyists felt—perhaps with reason—that such a committee would quickly fall under the sway of the energy industry.—L.J.C.

---

### Congress Passes Energy Reorganization

---

The Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, which abolishes the Atomic Energy Commission and sets up separate agencies for energy research and nuclear regulation, was passed by Congress just before the Columbus Day weekend. President Ford was expected to sign the act almost immediately.

The final version emerged after a long Senate-House conference tussle starring Representative Chet Holifield (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, who played the blocking role. He resents the de-emphasis of nuclear power the reorganization involves, and was particularly antagonistic to a section in the Senate bill that would have compelled the new Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to make financial aid available to some intervenors in nuclear licensing and other regulatory proceedings. The reimbursement scheme, which had broad support within Congress, would have allowed the five-member commission discretion to decide who was eligible for financial assistance and how much each would receive. It was designed to mitigate the "David and Goliath" relationship between intervening citizens' groups and utilities.

Also defeated in conference were two related amendments offered by Senator Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.) that would have broadened accessibility of information to concerned citizens. One would have lifted exemptions to the Freedom of Information Act as they apply to information on safety systems and their component parts. The other would have allowed intervenors to obtain relevant studies and reports in particular licensing proceedings. Disgusted with the conferees' inability to reach compromises

National Sex Forum has developed a multimedia blitz weekend program for "sexual attitude restructuring." Anyone can come (it costs \$75 per couple). They sit around on pillows and are subjected to simultaneous slides and movies accompanied by running explanations from a staff member. Every possible sex practice—including bestiality, sadism, masturbation, and prac-

tices of other cultures—is depicted and discussed at length. That is "desensitization." Viewers go home somewhat appalled, says McIlvenna, but then they sleep on it and end up thinking "so what." So they come back for "resensitization" the next day, where with more movies and talks they find out how good and normal sexual expression is. Individuals and couples can then come back and work out a program to cope with their particular problems.

The National Sex Forum makes its own films which it distributes to hundreds of institutions, including medical schools, here and abroad. The use of films, both pornographic ones and ones depicting sexual anatomy and activity, has become standard fare in training, education, and therapy. They are used widely in medical schools, where courses on sexuality, unusual a half a decade ago, are now routine. They are particularly useful in changing people's attitudes toward sex, a function which a recent survey showed is probably the primary goal of sexuality courses in medical school. Most doctors are not only unskilled in confronting a patient's sex problem, but many are too uptight about the subject to try. James Maddock, who runs the human sexuality program at the University of Minnesota medical school, suggests that physicians have particularly high anxiety levels when it comes to sex because of the type of personality that is drawn to doctoring. Many have "obsessive compulsive" personalities which make it difficult for them to deal with an emotion-laden and ambiguous subject that requires a tolerant, sensitive, and, above all, relaxed approach. They also find it difficult to explore the subtleties of sex relationships when they are keyed up to making daily life-or-death decisions, he notes.

Harold Lief, who heads the 6-year-old Center for the Study of Sex Education in Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, is a pioneer in sex education for medical students. In the early 1960's, he says, only three schools offered any instruction in sexuality. In 1968 there were 30. Now, according to a survey he recently completed with his colleague David Reed, 106 of the country's 112 medical schools teach it, and in 60 percent of these the courses are required as part of the core curriculum. Medical students overwhelmingly favor such courses, the survey finds, and are even more enthusiastic about them than faculty members. The content of the courses includes instruc-

tion on normal sexual behavior, its variations and deviations, sexual disorders, psychosexual development, and treatment of disorders, including rudimentary counselling skills. Half the schools invite spouses or "significant other partners" to attend with the students. While sex instruction is particularly relevant to the fields of gynecology and psychiatry, new emphasis is also being placed on counselling people partially disabled by disease (diabetes, for example, can produce impotency), heart attacks, operations, or advanced age. A cardiac patient, for example, is no longer vaguely told to "take it easy," but is treated to a frank discussion of safe levels of exertion. Old people also stand to benefit. Despite Masters and Johnson's affirmation that sex can enhance life up to the last minute, a recent study of doctor-patient relationships showed that most physicians felt inadequate when it came to dealing with sex and the senior citizen, that most of the doctors regarded it as "unimportant," and even gerontologists agreed that for old people it was "just a memory."

Of all the sex projects springing up across the land, one of the newest, and most ambitious sounding, is the research, therapy, and training program being set up at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. The impetus has come from Stanley Yolles, head of the department of psychiatry there and former head of the National Institute of Mental Health, where, before his departure several years ago, he unsuccessfully sought to establish an in-house sexual research project. Yolles has been gathering together an interdisciplinary team of educators, clinicians, and researchers with the object of establishing an "international academy of sex research," a mecca for sex researchers from around the world. At present, according to Joseph LoPiccolo, head of the sex therapy and research unit, Stony Brook is one of very few places where research is being done on new behavioral techniques for alleviating sexual dysfunction. LoPiccolo is well known in sex circles for his explorations of the potentials of masturbation. His innovations include a detailed program of masturbation for inorgasmic women, and a routine, involving pornography and masturbation, that has enabled homosexual men to respond sexually to their wives. (To LoPiccolo's surprise, these men, rather than learning to favor women as sex partners, learned instead to become firmly bisex-

---

## Briefing

on any of these issues, Metcalf refused to sign the conference report.

Most of the other differences in the House and Senate versions were resolved in the Senate's favor. These included provisions to prevent a pro-nuclear bias in the new Energy Research and Development Agency (ERDA), to promote energy conservation and environmental protection in ERDA, and to tighten safety regulation (for instance, the NRC will have to make public immediately any safety-related "abnormal occurrences" at nuclear power plants).

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (JCAE) will be losing much of its sway on energy matters. In the House, ERDA (with the exception of its atomic energy component) will be overseen by the expanded Committee on Science and Astronautics, to be known starting next January as the Committee on Science and Technology. In the Senate, jurisdiction may be scattered among several committees. The NRC will be under the jurisdiction of the JCAE.

Passage of the energy act comes on the heels of President Ford's announcement that Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton, who once briefly headed the White House Domestic Council's energy committee during the days of revolving energy czardoms, will head a new national energy board and serve as "overall boss" of the nation's energy program. Thus it appears, assuming the era of continuous shuffling and reshuffling of energy policies is past, that the framework has been laid for the country's 10-year, \$20-billion plunge toward "energy self-sufficiency."—C.H.

---

*Erratum:* A "briefing" pertaining to the law suit in the taconite pollution case which appeared in the 18 October issue of *Science* referred incorrectly to Solicitor General Robert H. Bork's part in the so-called "Saturday night massacre" of last year. Bork dismissed the special prosecutor, Archibald Cox, but he had no role whatever in the dismissal of Attorney General Elliot L. Richardson and his deputy, William D. Ruckelshaus.