

In a letter to APA president Leona Tyler, the fiery-tongued Wright said "your letter [explaining the board's reasons for staying out] has got to be the biggest attempt at a cover-up since another White House in Washington found itself in difficulty." CAPPS has been particularly annoyed at APA's worries about financial liability, since CAPPS has said it would assume all financial obligations. CAPPS is apparently prepared to do so: in two mailings to 35,000 psychologists, the group received an impressive 7,000 contributions totaling \$90,000 (CAPPS's lawyer Joe Nellis has estimated the cost of the suit at \$100,000).

Many feared a divisive and bloody battle at the APA's annual meeting in Montreal last month, where the council of representatives (made up of representatives from state psychological associations and the APA's 31 divisions) was scheduled to vote on whether or not they wanted APA to join the suit. There was surprise and some relief when a CAPPS member, sensing carnage and ultimate defeat, moved to table the motion. So CAPPS has now taken the stance of thumbing its nose at the APA governance and is moving

into the courts, confident of victory.

The fact is that CAPPS, despite its devoted constituency, could not have won over the council. The scientist types, on the one hand, take the attitude expressed by one board member: "They [the professionals] have a good case and a reasonable chance to win. But they shouldn't drag in the whole organization." As for the social activist people (represented by the division called the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, or SPSSI), the feeling seems to be that the grounds for the suit are too narrow and self-serving and that its success would not enhance access to treatment for really needy groups such as the poor and aged, the retarded, and alcoholics and drug addicts. One critic said the suit boils down to "Who's going to take care of the middle-class neurotics." There is also the fear that Ph.D. clinicians are moving toward adopting some of the less admirable characteristics of the American Medical Association: elitism, resistance to change, and an over-zealous regard for their own interests, possibly at the expense of those of the public.

The argument that competent, quali-

fied psychologists should be recognized as professionals free from the yoke of physicians is eminently reasonable. But to be recognized as such, psychologists have to make it clear who they are and who they aren't. This means that a good many competent health providers who don't hold Ph.D.'s will have to be thrown out of the boat—that is, they must be subordinated to the Ph.D.'s. The professionals are sorry about this, but they see no other way of gaining proper recognition for the health-providing sector of psychology.

The professionals in the APA are engaged in two other projects whose objectives are consistent with, but wholly separate from, the CAPPS suit. One, a project devised by the American Board of Professional Psychologists, is the development of a National Registry of Health Services Providers in Psychology, which would list all the licensed or certified psychologists in the country regarded as qualified clinical or counseling psychologists. (An estimated number is 16,000; about 4,000 of these are full-time clinicians, the rest are clinically trained but operate in that capacity only part of the time.)

The "health provider" definition is

Council of U.S. Academy of Sciences Expresses Concern

National Academy of Sciences (NAS) president Philip Handler has made public a cable to his opposite number in the Soviet Union expressing the "deep concern" of the NAS Council for the welfare of dissenting Soviet physicist Andrei Sakharov and warning that, if further measures were taken against Sakharov, "it would be extremely difficult to imagine successful fulfillment of American pledges of binational scientific cooperation. . . ." Handler's message is the strongest public expression to date of NAS concern over treatment of Soviet scientists and other intellectuals (Science, 6 April). The cable, addressed to M. V. Keldysh, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, is given in full below.

This will convey to the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. the deep concern of the Council of the National Academy of Sciences of the U.S.A. for the welfare of our foreign associate member Andrei Sakharov.

We have warmly supported the growing détente being established by our respective governments. We have done so in the belief that such a course would bring significant social and economic benefits to our peoples and generate opportunity for alleviation of that division of mankind which threatens its destruction by nuclear holocaust. We were heartened by the fact that the various agreements signed by our political leaders in Moscow

in 1972 and in Washington in 1973 gave so prominent a role to cooperation in scientific endeavors. We joyfully extended those intergovernmental agreements by the signature in 1972 and again in 1973 of protocols pledging the mutual cooperation of our respective academies in specific appropriate scientific areas.

Implicit in this prominence of scientific cooperation in our recent binational agreements was: (i) the recognition that science, itself, knows no national boundaries; (ii) the awareness that the world scientific community shares a common ethic, a common value system and, hence, is international; (iii) appreciation that mankind, the world over, derives deep satisfaction from our ever more profound understanding of the nature of man and the universe in which he finds himself. So true and important are these relationships that the national scientific communities of the world also share heroes; witness the rosters of foreign members of academies of science, including yours and ours.

But neither your country nor ours sustains its large scientific enterprise "for science's own sake." We also share a faith in the continuing truth of the historically demonstrated fact that the wise, humane application of scientific understanding constitutes the most powerful means available to our societies to improve the condition of man.

Unhappily, as Sakharov and others have noted, appli-

important: most states have laws governing the practice of applied psychology, which means interviewing, counseling, educational and vocational testing, public opinion testing, personnel work, market research, and therapy. Almost all the 47 states with licensing laws require practitioners to have Ph.D.'s. But they do not license or certify psychologists according to specialty. Thus, an industrial psychologist or an educational tester can hang out a shingle and moonlight as a psychotherapist. Members of APA maintain that such abuses are very rare because the association's code of ethics prohibits psychologists from practicing outside their specialties. But they realize that insurance companies and government agencies, as well as the public, need more solid reassurance. The suggested standards for the registry would require continuing education of psychologists listed, and the authors believe that the registry would be a good selling point on Capitol Hill (in the health insurance issue) and tremendously helpful for insurance companies.

The APA is also setting up state review panels, to be supported by state

psychological associations, which would be similar to the federally mandated Professional Standards Review Organizations (made up of doctors to arbitrate on services and fees covered by Medicare and Medicaid). The APA's Professional Standards Review Committees, to be made up of consumers as well as psychologists, would advise insurance companies and government agencies on appropriate services and fees and would arbitrate disputed claims. They would also advise on exotic matters such as whether Masters and Johnson-type therapies deserve reimbursement.

In addition to demonstrating how responsible they are, clinical psychologists are also trying to show how worthwhile they are—by collecting hard data which demonstrate that the inclusion of outpatient therapy in any health delivery system dramatically reduces the use of medical services, including drugs, hospitalization (psychiatric or otherwise), and surgery.

Unfortunately, hard-nosed cost-benefit studies on the benefits of including outpatient therapy in a health plan are rare. And since the studies are all made of circumscribed populations, there is

no sure indication of benefits on a national scale.

The most striking example of the benefits of short-term therapy comes from Kennecott Copper Company. The study showed a 55 percent decrease in medical, surgical, and health services for people who entered therapy as part of the company's highly touted "Insight" program. Furthermore, there was a significant reduction in absenteeism and in such intangibles as interpersonal friction on the job. The Kaiser-Permanente prepaid health plan in California and the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care have reported similar results. These studies would seem to confirm a statistic that is well known by both physicians and psychologists: well over half of all visits to physicians are for psychological problems.

While it is obvious that mental health services should be part of any health system, it is not as obvious that psychologists in private practice are essential, which brings us back to one of the collateral issues raised by the CAPPS suit. The services provided by psychologists and physicians should be integrated, even though psychology deserves recognition as a health pro-

to Soviet Counterparts over Sakharov Harrassment

cation of scientific understanding has also generated the means for deliberate annihilation of human beings on an unprecedented scale. The industrialization process made possible by science can, if unregulated, occasion unwitting damage to man and the flora and fauna with which we share the planet. Indeed, by reducing death rates more successfully than increasing agricultural productivity, application of science may even have created the possibility of malnutrition on a huge scale.

If the benefits of science are to be realized, if the dangers now recognized are to be averted, and if the full life which can be made possible by science is to be worth living, then, in the words of academician Sakharov, "Intellectual freedom is essential to human society—freedom to obtain and distribute information, freedom for open-minded and unfearing debate, and freedom from pressure by officialdom and prejudice." Scientists will recognize this description of a vital, functioning society as a restatement of the ethos of science itself. Violation of that ethos during the period of Lysenkoism deprived the Soviet Union and the world of the full potential of the scientific genius of the Russian people.

Accordingly, it is with great dismay that we have learned of the heightening campaign of condemnation of Sakharov for having expressed, in a spirit of free scholarly inquiry, social and political views which derive from

his scientific understanding. Moreover, it was with consternation and a sense of shame that we learned of the expression of censure of Sakharov's contributions to the cause of continuing human progress that was signed by 40 members of your academy including five of our foreign associate members. This attack revives memories of the failure of our own scientific community to protect the late J. R. Oppenheimer from political attack. The case of Andrei Sakharov, however, is far more painful for the fact that some of our Soviet colleagues and fellow scientists are among the principal attackers when one of the scientific community courageously defends the application of the scientific ethos to human affairs. Were Sakharov to be deprived of his opportunity to serve the Soviet people and humanity, it would be extremely difficult to imagine successful fulfillment of American pledges of binational scientific cooperation, the implementation of which is entirely dependent upon the voluntary effort and goodwill of our individual scientists and scientific institutions. It would be calamitous indeed if the spirit of détente were to be damaged by any further action taken against this gifted physicist who has contributed so much to the military security of the Soviet people and who now offers his wisdom and insights to that people and to the entire world in the interest of a better tomorrow for all mankind.