speak. The callers threatened to "picket" if she was allowed to talk. When she encountered NCLC members, she says, they seemed very concerned about the late British psychiatrist J. R. Rees. Members of the NCLC staff say that Mead used to be associated with Rees, who wrote a book on psychological warfare and invented operational brainwashing techniques that, they say, are now in wide use.

Wassily Leontief, the Nobel prize-winning economist now at New York University, has also been denounced by NCLC. Leontief's politics are often viewed by his associates as left of center, but NCLC spokesmen say his economics are "corporatist" and similar to the economic policies of Mussolini.

Edward Teller is also no friend of NCLC's think tank, the Fusion Energy Foundation, even though Teller is a well-known champion of fusion research. Staffers at NCLC call Teller "a caricature of a right-wing Neanderthal," and say that their archenemy, Nelson Rockefeller, once called Teller "my own scientist."

One prominent East Coast scientist who has talked to NCLC's members about their views on fusion finds them extremely well informed. But he refused to be quoted by name on any matter connected with the group, "I'm physically afraid of them," he told *Science*. "I know of no other political grouping which reflects such intellectual depth and personal involvement but has such an air of unreality."

The concept of zero population growth and the Club of Rome, which sponsored the original "limits of growth" report, have been targets, too. Club of Rome member John R. Platt, of the University of Michigan, went to the American Orthopsychiatric Meeting in San Francisco last year to find NCLC handbills being distributed calling for his "indictment" under "Article Two of the Nuremburg Charter" for crimes against humanity. Similarly, *New Solidarity*, NCLC's biweekly, recently denounced Aurelio Peccei, President of the Club of Rome, for favoring "the essence of Rockefeller's fascist plans" to eliminate world population through "genocide."

Laboratory Violence

The NCLC's feelings about psychology has led in several instances to violence. Lerner and fellow NCLC research member Chuck Stevens told *Science* that "at least 20" members of their own group had been "brainwashed" by the CIA at one time or another. (In January 1974, the *New York Times* reported that NCLC member Alice Weitzman, who had "expressed skepticism" about the group, had been held involuntarily by NCLC members, who in turn claimed she had been "brainwashed" by the CIA. Weitzman tossed a note outside the window of a Washington Heights apartment where she allegedly was being held to get the attention of the police, and filed charges against six group members for unlawful imprisonment.)

Associates of Eugene Galanter, a Columbia University psychologist, say that his laboratory was forcibly entered, one of his students was manhandled and the laboratory was vandalized by NCLC members who had demonstrated against him on several occasions. A New York judge continued the case for 1 year, on the condition that the eight defendents stay off the Columbia campus in the meantime.

One psychologist who has dealt with the NCLC notes that the members' two outstanding traits are their almost robotlike language and behavior and their conviction that almost the entire world, led by the CIA and the Rockefellers, is arrayed against them. He characterizes these as "clear-cut hysterical symptoms"—an ironic diagnosis in view of NCLC's constant accusations that various scientists and world leaders are "hysterical" themselves.

Whether hysterical or no, many scientists and academics seem destined to have to deal with NCLC and its tactics for some time to come. A Brookings Middle Eastern affairs scholar was recently called several times by an unusually well-informed "reporter" who said he was with the International Press Service (IPS) but refused to give his name. A Middle East scholar at the Rand Corporation received a call from an IPS representative who claimed to have an authoritative report that war was breaking out in the Middle East and what could he learn about troop mobilizations? The Rand scholar said he thought a Middle East war highly implausible, and that in any event he didn't know anything about troop mobilizations. "But *I know* that you know," the caller reportedly insisted. It seems that NCLC, with its particular edge on truth, will be around for some time.—DEBORAH SHAPLEY

Military Medical School: It Survives Despite All Efforts to Kill It

A new military medical school that was opposed by virtually every major professional organization in the medical field and was criticized as "unjustifiably costly" by a high-level commission will almost certainly be built anyway.

The school—known as the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences—surmounted its last major congressional hurdle on 13 November when a House-Senate conference committee approved a military appropriations bill that included $64.9 million in construction funds for the new facility. Thus the school, which has been controversial from the beginning, appears to have survived the biggest threat yet to its continued existence.

The school was launched in 1972, almost single-handedly by F. Edward Hébert (D–La.), then chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Hébert had advocated such a school for some 25 years, and when he became chairman he promptly seized the opportunity to force authorizing legislation through Congress despite massive opposition from civilian medical schools, health-professional organizations, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Senate Armed Services Committee, among others. Even the Defense Department was lukewarm about the idea. But Hébert prevailed, and start-up funds were appropriated to found the school at a site in Bethesda, Maryland, on the grounds of the Naval Medical Center, close to the campus of the National Institutes of Health.

Then, earlier this year, a series of blows threatened the life of the fledgling institution. First, Hébert was deposed as chairman of the armed services committee, and while he remained a popular senior member of the committee, his influence was somewhat diminished. Next, the Defense Department trimmed back plans for the

school by ordering it to focus initial energies on producing medical doctors while postponing the original ambitious plans to train nurses, dentists, and many other varieties of health professionals as well. Then, in the most threatening move of all, the Defense Manpower Commission urged that the school be "terminated" because it would cost too much and would be "inflexible" and unable to respond to changing needs.

The commission argued that it would be far cheaper to attract doctors to the military through scholarships and bonus pay; it recommended that the school be abandoned even though several million dollars had already been spent to get it started. Since the commission had been created by Congress for the specific purpose of analyzing military manpower needs, its recommendations were expected to carry substantial weight. What's more, a study by the staff of the House appropriations subcommittee agreed that it would be significantly more costly to obtain doctors through the new school than through an expanded scholarship program.

But the momentum behind the school proved too great for the opponents to overcome. They came very close during floor debate on authorizing legislation in the House, where an amendment to delete the authorization for the school lost by a narrow 221 to 190 vote on 28 July. That loss took some of the vigor out of the opposition, however, and when the appropriations bill was voted on in the House, a similar amendment lost by 255 to 161.

In vain, opponents of the school argued that Congress should listen to the advice of its own manpower commission; should avoid "throwing all this money down a rathole" when it could be better spent in the civilian medical schools; should not increase the number of medical schools at a time when health authorities believe we may already be producing enough doctors; and should not "build memorials" to Hébert.

Backers of the school argued that it should be continued since start-up funds had already been appropriated and spent; a president, dean, and board of regents had been appointed, and the school was set to open in September 1976. They also cited cost figures generated by the school itself which indicated that the institution would be cost-effective. Although backers acknowledged that it would cost the Defense Department less to use scholarships than to build a new school, they argued that the total cost to the government would not be much different, since the scholarship students at civilian schools would be partially subsidized by federal funds from the budgets of civilian agencies.

Perhaps more important than any rational argument, however, was the surprise appearance of Hébert, who left the hospital bed where he was recuperating from an accident to mingle among his colleagues and lobby for the school. One opponent said many congressmen who had voted to deprive Hébert of his committee chairmanship were unwilling to further slap him down by killing his pet project. "They said it would kill him," he explained.

A final effort to terminate the school was made in the Senate on 6 November. An amendment to delete the construction funds was defeated, but then Senator William Proxmire (D–Wis.) got an amendment approved which would have delayed spending those funds for 90 days while the comptroller general prepared a supposedly definitive opinion on the cost-effectiveness of the university as compared to the scholarship program. However, even that delaying action failed when House conferees later refused to accept it and Senate conferees willingly abandoned it.

Proxmire's office is talking about yet another attempt to kill the school, perhaps through some form of budget rescission. But the success of such a maneuver would seem unlikely.

The new school is expected to graduate some 165 doctors annually. Its president is Anthony R. Curreri, former associate vice-chancellor for health sciences at the University of Wisconsin; its medical dean is Jay P. Sanford, former chairman of the department of internal medicine at the Southwestern Medical School of the University of Texas; and the president of its board of regents is David Packard, former deputy secretary of defense. Almost 1000 persons are said to have applied for eight chairmanships in the basic sciences.

In future years, the school, insulated and hidden within the mammoth military budget, may become one of the best-heeled medical institutions in the country. In the opinion of Senator Gary Hart (D–Colo.) it is "a little acorn which will grow into a big, and certainly unneeded, oak tree."

—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

Hazel Henderson: Nudging Society off Its Macho Trip

Who's the handsome blonde woman in the Pucci skirt, carrying on from the speaker's podium in emphatic but well-modulated British tones about corporate obsolescense, society's "Cartesian trip," the second law of thermodynamics, and the "decline of Jonesism"?

That's Hazel Henderson, one of the most voluble, eloquent, and increasingly visible of America's spokespersons for social and economic change.

Henderson, who has helped set up a half-dozen citizen activist organizations, has of late been moving in on the world of science policy. She is the only woman on the advisory council of the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA); she is probably the only non-college graduate on the Committee on Public Engineering Policy of the National Research Council; and she has just been invited to be on the policy advisory committee of the National Science Foundation's Research Applied to National Needs program.

In other words, she has no difficulty working within the system. She simply grabs the available handles and turns them into levers. She is one of those who refuse to be categorized by discipline—indeed, she doesn't have one—who prefer to see themselves as synthesizers of ideas and as advocates not so much of ends as of process. There is an end, of course, which is to see the country undergo a transition into a decentralized, small-technology, resource-conserving, labor-intensive, environmentally sound, recycling, low-growth, democratic society.

The label Henderson is most comfortable with is that of "futurist." "Individual disciplines have become a positive straitjacket," she says, "which is why I like to be in the company of people who call themselves futurists. They've all transcended some discipline—the old disciplines are really not describing reality very well."