Publicity and political pressure generated by a small cadre of his patients have kept him in business, though it is by no means certain that he will win out in the end.

There is some dispute as to whether former NHLI officials Theodore Cooper and Donald S. Fredrickson* ever told Henkin of the 1973 decision to phase out his study—Henkin claims he did not receive, or even know about, an official memo on the decision until February 1974, although he says Fredrickson did talk to him in the summer of 1973 about closing the clinic. In any case, as late as spring of 1974, the patients who were coming to the taste clinic had not been told of its demise. Therefore, on 3 May NIH officials sent a letter to Henkin's 485 current patients. It said in part, "Since these studies have become so far removed from the primary mission of NHLI, the decision was made on July 10, 1973, to phase them out during the following year. . . . Therefore, all patients admissions and outpatient appointments after June 30, 1974, are cancelled. Unfortunately, we are aware of no physicians who are doing similar work in this area to whom we could refer you."

It was a harsh-sounding and startling letter to Henkin's patients, many of whom had come to be devoted to him for his attention and concern even if his therapy did not always restore their lost taste. Chief among these was Valerie Bennett-Levy of Surrey, England, by appointment purveyor of nosegays to Her Majesty the Queen. Mrs. Bennett-Levy was incensed. She began writing letters and carrying her cause in person to individuals she thought could help. She saw NIH director Robert Stone. When she got no satisfaction from him, she went to the assistant secretary for health

* Cooper is now Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Fredrickson is president of the Institute of Medicine–National Academy of Sciences.

Briefing

NIH: Help Wanted

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) needs some leaders. Not only is there a vacancy in the director's office because of the recent firing of Robert S. Stone, but there are vacancies in the top spots in the individual institutes as well. Experience from the last few months shows just how hard it is to get anyone to be an institute director.

When Theodore Cooper resigned as director of the National Heart and Lung Institute in April 1974, a search committee to find a successor was convened with dispatch. Now, 9 months later, that committee is meeting again. It had decided on three candidates. All three said no. So, the heart institute is back where it started.

Before Ruth Kirschstein was named director of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences last spring, the job was offered to others. They were all outside scientists; they all turned it down. Kirschstein came from within the ranks of NIH. Members of the search committee, who did not know her very well, said she was the most qualified of the candidates from within government. And she is a woman. Outgoing NIH director Stone said he was determined to appoint a woman or a black to the job if he could find a qualified one.

The new National Institute of Aging needs a director. It has for several months. Vacancies are expected in a couple of other institutes as present directors retire or decide to leave government.

The only outside scientist of national reputation to take an institute directorship recently is Norman Kretchmer, who left Stanford University after 15 years to head the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

The main obstacle to getting a good person to come to NIH is money. A director makes $36,000 a year, which is invariably less than what candidates make elsewhere. According to Stone, anyone coming to NIH from a top medical school position will probably have to take a cut of at least $15,000 to $20,000. Often it is more. To compound the problem, an institute director gets none of the perks that his or her counterpart in a university receives, such as help with college tuition.

The present atmosphere at NIH and in Washington generally is not one to entice people away from university jobs either. Most people are not anxious to take a cut in pay in order to acquire monstrous bureaucratic problems. Until Richard Nixon resigned, his occupancy of the White House was yet another barrier to the recruitment of scientists who were, generally, anti-Nixon. And Robert Stone himself was not the sort of person who, by force of personality, could draw people away from their jobs. And now Charles C. Edwards has quit as assistant secretary for health, the person with whom the NIH director must work most directly in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Uncertainty about who will fill his post makes recruiting at NIH just that much more difficult.

At the moment, things do not look too good. NIH needs help.—B.J.C.

Fusion Advocates Tell Off Teller

Edward Teller has often been criticized as a hawk and a hard-liner, but recently his critics have found new subjects to address. At several of Teller's public speeches, members of the U.S. Labor Party, a small socialist group, have denounced him for being a friend of Nelson Rockefeller and accused him of sabotaging fusion research. Labor Party members think that Teller is part of an AEC conspiracy to suppress the fusion program.

The charge is particularly curious, since Teller is usually seen as a strong advocate of controlled thermonuclear fusion research, and support for that research has approximately doubled in the last 2 years. But the Labor Party wants to see a plan styled after the Manhattan Project, which would expand the present AEC effort 50-fold and divert the emphasis at most, if not all, of the existing military, aeronautic, and space laboratories to fusion research. The party, which is a highly sectarian Marxist-Leninist group, predicts that ecological catastrophe will destroy human civilization by 1990 unless such a crash plan is pursued. "Fusion, at this point in history, is the cornerstone of the socialist program," the party newspaper, *New Solidarity*, said recently.

Another cornerstone of the Labor Party's ideology is that Nelson Rockefeller and Rockefeller interests direct U.S. policy on a fascist course. So

Charles E. Edwards, and to his deputy, Cooper, who had been involved in the initial decision to halt the study. HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger heard from Mrs. Bennett-Levy, as did members of Congress. Soon Representative Paul G. Rogers (D–Fla.), Senator Warren G. Magnuson (D–Wash.), Senator William L. Scott (R–Va.), and others were in the act. She got other patients to write to their congressmen. In all, 40 patients wrote to 47 members of Congress, who wrote to Weinberger on Henkin's behalf. She took her troubles to the *New York Times* which aired them in print. So did the Washington *Post*.

Henkin's supporters characterized his clinic as the only one of its kind in the country and said he was the only person who offered them any hope. Henkin added to his own cause by telling people he was on the verge of discovering the basic mechanism of taste.

It soon became apparent that NIH was not going to get rid of Henkin easily. As a commissioned officer in the Public Health Service (PHS), Henkin could not be thrown out of the corps. But he could be reassigned, and he was—to the PHS hospital in Norfolk, Virginia, where he was to be a "ward physician." Then, on 19 June, Edwards called for an investigation of the controversy and delayed the closing of the clinic and Henkin's banishment. Letters went out over Weinberger's signature assuring congressmen and others that the "scientific basis, clinical significance and statistical validity" of Henkin's work in taste and smell would be reviewed.

Thereupon, the NIH named three of its scientists who were neither associated with Henkin nor the heart institute to assess the quality of Henkin's work. David W. Alling, William Bunney, and Vincent T. DeVita, Jr., reviewed 50 of Henkin's papers, both published and unpublished. They talked

Briefing

Teller, who is a member of Rockefeller's private planning group, the Commission on Critical Choices for America, as well as a member of the original Manhattan Project, bears the brunt of both accusations.

But Teller isn't upset by the denunciations and still seems ebullient at age 66. "What a delight," he says, "no longer to be criticized for being the father of the H-bomb."—W.D.M.

House Committees Endorse Controlled Energy Growth

The national bandwagon for controlled energy growth has picked up two important passengers on Capitol Hill. In a report issued jointly on 21 December, the House committees on Science and Astronautics and on Government Operations urged the Ford Administration to set a goal of holding the nation's annual growth in gross energy demand to 2 percent a year, a target endorsed in recent months by a wide variety of policy studies, including the Federal Energy Administration's Project Independence report (*Science*, 1 November).

Cooperative activities of this sort between committees are unusual in Congress and suggest a measure of enlightened urgency.

The 133-page report provides a compact survey of views on possible means of achieving controlled energy growth (if or when the economy revives enough for growth to begin again), and it also takes a swipe at the voluntary approach emphasized by the Nixon and—thus far—Ford administrations. Noting that since 1971 there have been at least five presidential messages and four executive orders deploring the energy situation and shuffling organization charts, the report says, ". . . the messages barely mentioned the idea of conserving energy, and none offered any meaningful program besides voluntary acts." Among a number of suggestions, the report calls for greater emphasis on R & D that would help reduce energy demand and a prompt review of tax and regulatory policies for their effects on energy consumption.

Entitled "Conservation and Efficient Use of Energy," the report is based on hearings held by the Science and Astronautics subcommittee on energy and the Government Operations subcommittee on conservation and natural resources, whose chairmen are, respectively, Representatives Mike McCormack (D–Wash.) and Henry S. Reuss (D–Wis.).—R.G.

RFF Gets a Big Financial Boost

Resources for the Future (RFF), a pioneer environmental research organization established in 1952 by the Ford Foundation, has recently been assured of adequate resources for its own future. On 31 December the Ford Foundation, which hitherto has supplied about half the annual RFF budget of $3 million, announced a $12-million, 4-year grant to the organization. This is the largest grant the foundation has yet made for environmental studies, and it was made at a time that Ford has announced a severe retrenchment in its grant program in coming years because of a sharp decline in the value of its assets.

Charles J. Hitch, former comptroller at the Department of Defense under Robert McNamara and now president of the University of California, will become RFF's new president as of 1 July. He succeeds Joseph L. Fisher, who in November was elected to Congress from a northern Virginia district.

Accompanying the change in management and budget is RFF's intention to alter its course somewhat in the direction of research "focusing on the public policy implications" of resource and environmental problems—that is, it intends to become more "relevant." Up to now, RFF has concentrated mainly on factual analysis of resource issues, and some of its work has been regarded as too academically remote to weigh directly on environmental decisions. The staff of 30, now dominated by economists, will be expanded somewhat to include heavier representation from other disciplines.

RFF, however, prides itself for noticing problems before they have become widely recognized. Among future research projects it plans are examinations of problems in land management and food and ocean resources, as well as "a more sober look at neo-Malthusian limits-to-growth theory."—C.H.