Rogers will leave these explorations to others. His preoccupation these days is with encounter groups in which other facilitators are trained and in which he feels he can have the most "impact."

In an interview with *Science*, Rogers said he is increasingly disinclined to associate himself with any organization or institution. "I feel a lot of institutions could fall apart and I wouldn't feel badly." There would be chaos, he acknowledges, but "also a lot of new and healthy things." For example, "It would be a marvelous thing for our high schools if compulsory education through high school years was abolished." If only those who wanted to learn had to go to school, that "would make education what it should be." Compulsory education "has run the course of its usefulness, and become a prison."

He has equally radical attitudes toward professional psychology. Not only does he have little faith in graduate education in the training of psychotherapists, he also has no faith in licensing and credentialing. "There are licensed incompetent psychologists and unlicensed incompetent psychologists," he says, proportionately just as many of the former as the latter. "The only answer I see," he says, "is people need to be educated as to what they ought to look for in therapy and not be guided solely by credentials."

Rogers, like many other people, thinks what is really wrong with psychotherapy is that "it's so expensive that it's primarily for the middle class. . . . The profession needs another whole direction." He thinks the only way to get help to the masses is to train lay people in empathy and listening skills. He is not so sure people can be trained to be "caring," but in his experience they can learn the other skills in a relatively short time. People could be trained in their communities and be available without charge. Although Rogers believes that his approach is effective with the seriously mentally ill as well as hard-core criminals, he acknowledges that because of manpower involved it would be extraordinarily costly. But problems could become more manageable if institutional environments were made more "therapeutic"—if ward personnel in mental hospitals, or any hospitals for that matter, were trained to listen.

What this amounts to is basically preventive (psychological) medicine. And where it should all start is in educational institutions. The ideas are there, and so is the knowledge about how to apply them. Why are they not more widely applied? "The fact that they're simple makes them very threatening," says Rogers. "The public's not ready."

But Rogers seems immune from disillusionment; on the contrary, his faith in the innately healthy strivings in human nature has steadily increased over the years.

He has been holding quite a few encounter groups to train facilitators in foreign countries in recent years, and he now thinks his popularity is greater in such diverse places as Germany, Japan, and Brazil than it is here. The reason may be that Rogers is now regarded as a conservative in the humanist movement, and his distaste for gimmickry makes him somewhat old hat in the U.S. where the movement has become increasingly antirational and fragmented into innumerable schools based on body therapies, mysticism, and so forth.

But in a country like Brazil, where CSP held giant training groups for facilitators last year, the political implications of Rogers' theories are keenly appreciated. (He has word, in fact, that his latest work will probably be banned in South Africa.)

Rogers' friends probably prize him most for—as they often put it—"giving people permission to be themselves." He has shown through his research that that's not only "okay" but it works; and through his life that, whatever his failings, it's okay to be Carl Rogers. Said the University of Santa Clara on giving him an honorary degree: "You have made it respectable to be human."

—CONSTANCE HOLDEN

Issue of Technology Transfer Is Snag for 1979 U.N. Meeting

The United States is perceived in the less developed countries (LDC's) as the major source and chief monopolist of science and technology. The LDC's are, therefore, understandably interested in U.S. policy for the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development (UNCSTD) scheduled for 1979. After a year of preparation, U.S. policy is far from formulated and, internationally, the general state of organization for the conference might be diplomatically described as disarray.

In the United States a major sticking point has been the terms for transfer of technology. Most relevant science and technology here is controlled by private industry, and industry has formed a virtually united front to defend proprietary rights against what it sees as a grab attempt by the LDC's.

Also up in arms is the segment of the scientific community concerned with development problems. The worry is that the U.N. conference will concentrate on technology transfer to the exclusion of broader consideration of the role of science and technology in development. These fears have been reinforced by recent seemingly unequivocal statements by the secretary general for the meeting that technology transfer policies will be the focus of the conference. This situation has prompted a serious discussion within the International Council of Scientific Unions of sponsoring a separate meeting to consider the substantive uses of science in development. The ICSU meeting would be intended to complement the U.N. conference, but some other nongovernmental groups, displeased with the shape the meeting is taking are even talking of a "counter meeting."

Perhaps too much ado should not be made over a U.N. meeting, since world conferences often amount, in more than one sense, to wastes of words. But the issue of economic inequality between LDC's and industrial nations has given rise to a division in world politics that has begun to rival in sharpness the dominating conflict between capitalist and communist countries. The U.N. and its specialized agencies have been the main forum for this new debate, which, because the LDC's are concentrated in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the industrial countries in the Northern Hemisphere, has come to be called the "north-south dialogue." That dialogue has heavily influenced the terms of discussion in several U.N. meetings on global problems in this decade—on food, population, water and deserts, for example—and UNCSTD is regarded by

many as a culminating conference and a possible showdown on one aspect of the north-south problem.

Despite the importance assigned the conference within the United Nations, preparations have encountered more than the usual quota of conflict and delay. No site for the meeting has yet been chosen. Invitations from Austria, Mexico, the Philippines, and the United States are being considered, and the decision is expected to be made in the General Assembly session which has just begun. The U.S. offer appears to pose a dilemma for many LDC officials who recognize that the United States is a key source of science and technology, but feel that voting publicly for a U.S. site for the meeting might appear to be truckling to the American monopolists. U.S. officials seem to be acting on the assessment that strong lobbying for holding the meeting here might backfire, and they are not pushing.

There was some delay in picking a secretary general for the 1969 meeting, but the choice early this year of Joao Frank da Costa of Brazil appeared to satisfy the contending constituencies. Da Costa is a career diplomat, not a scientist or a development specialist, but he was credited with doing a good job as chairman of a U.N. committee concerned with science and technology for development and was generally regarded as able and knowledgeable on the subject.

However, friction between da Costa and the director of the U.N. Office of Science and Technology, Klaus-Heinrich Standke, soon escalated into a feud, which is said to have hobbled preparatory work on the conference for some months. The issues initially were territorial and bureaucratic, and tension was perhaps inevitable. Other conference secretary generals have had their troubles establishing working relationships with headquarters. The two men had been on good terms previously, but the conflict soon became personal and public. Da Costa rather undiplomatically included criticism of Standke in speeches. And Standke had his say about da Costa in the U.N. corridors. The conflict apparently culminated in a budget squabble in the spring, after which it is said to have cooled.

On the U.S. side, the problem has not been institutional infighting, but an unsteady start, attributable, in part at least, to the change in administration. The government got off on the wrong foot last November when it convened a "national

Briefing

Cooking up a Nutritional Lobby

Last April, cattlemen were horrified when a consumer group infiltrated the White House and celebrated Food Day by serving a vegetarian meal to lip-smacking big shots.

This month the same group, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, held a day-long nutrition conference that culminated in a Senate office building reception featuring cottage cheese sandwiches, carrots, and orange juice.

What does it all mean? It means that good nutrition is finally gaining some political sex appeal after languishing for many years in the pallid province of school dieticians.

The conference marked a new initiative by CSPI which is shifting its nutrition focus from grass-roots activities to forming a coalition to bring preventive medicine into national health policies. The group, with the backing of Senator Edward Kennedy (chairman of the Senate health subcommittee) and Senator George McGovern (chairman of the select committee on nutrition) will spearhead a "media approach to health education," says Richard Klarberg of the American Health Foundation, to train the public away from fat, sugar, salt, and smoking. The group will also concentrate on bringing about regulatory and policy changes in the government—for example, says CSPI's Mike Jacobson, the Food and Drug Administration might be induced to require the sugar and fat content of foods to be prominently labeled, and the Department of Defense could switch to whole wheat bread and skim milk.

"We gave up on Washington during the Nixon and Ford years," says Jacobson. "Now there are people to talk to in the Administration."

VA Hospital System Under Scrutiny

Last June, the National Academy of Sciences recommended that the Veterans Administration hospital system be phased out and that its services be integrated with the rest of the nation's health services.

This month the VA issued a thick report detailing why it thinks this is a bad idea. The two documents supply fuel for what will undoubtedly be a prolonged and heated debate over the future of the VA system.

The congressionally mandated Academy study has taken 3 years and $6 million to complete. "As far as we are aware, this is the first comprehensive evaluation of a large health care system in the United States," wrote committee chairman Saul J. Farber of New York University School of Medicine.

Basically, the investigators found that the VA system, set up after World War I, has become outmoded. It was "set up as a hospital system, not as a total health care system"—now it is overbuilt and overbedded, and many veterans are hospitalized who would be better off in intermediary facilities or as outpatients. For example, "More than half the patients in VA psychiatric beds do not appear to require hospitalization." The committee contends that with National Health Insurance coming down the pike, and in view of the fact that 80 percent of the problems the VA deals with are non-service-related, a separate system for veterans is no longer appropriate. It therefore recommends that the VA system be phased in with insurance programs, become a part of the community and regional health planning, and eventually merge its services and facilities with non-VA programs.

The VA, while accepting some recommendations, is thoroughly opposed to dismantling the present structure. At a press conference, VA administrator Max Cleland pointed out that the veterans served by the system are different from the population as a whole: most do not have insurance; they tend to be older (half are World War II vets); single, poorer, and beset with problems requiring long-term care. Cleland contended that even with National Health Insurance, the system would provide services the veterans couldn't get elsewhere, and at lower costs.

Cleland said eliminating the system would be "tragic," and that the NAS had not shown why such action was needed or how it would benefit veterans.

Whether or not the Academy recommendations are adopted, the system is surely in for some changes in response

meeting" to start the process of forming policy for 1979. More than 700 people concerned with development, a majority from industry, turned up for what they expected to be a small conference at which they would be asked for their views. Instead they got a speech from Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and a day of panel discussions. What was made clear in comments from the floor was that industry was intent on hanging on to its proprietary rights. U.S. industry seems particularly sensitive about LDC acquisition of mining, refining, and manufacturing technology which would give LDC's an advantage in competing with U.S. companies in world markets. At the meeting, industry representatives expressed suspicion that the State Department was trying to co-opt industry into a giveaway.

The meeting seems to have acted as a catalyst for those with misgivings in the scientific community. Rockefeller University president Frederick Seitz, who has been active in the upper echelons of the advisory apparatus on development, wrote a letter to President-elect Jimmy Carter at the end of the year deploring U.S. failure to integrate science and technology into our foreign relations with developing countries. He made the point that the United States had not fully grasped "the more sophisticated views of the leaders of some less developed countries," and was not taking advantage of "our own and other industrial countries' experience in adapting modern technologies to different cultural settings."

In January, AAAS president Emilio Q. Daddario and four past presidents of the association wrote Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance expressing concern that the position taken in official U.S. preparations for the 1979 conference appeared to place "disproportionate reliance on the transfer of proprietary technology held by private industry." The letter urged cooperative action in using nonproprietary science and technology and greater emphasis on "creating needed technology which does not now exist and in strengthening capacities for scientific research and the use of scientific method."

Vigorous lobbying has also been done in recent months by groups who advocate consideration of "appropriate technology" sometimes called alternative technology, in any formulation of any U.S. science and technology policy for development. These groups were strong-

Briefing

to the nature of the 29 million veteran population. The majority of vets are now between 35 and 54 years old; by 2000, the need for intermediate and chronic care facilities will have become severe, for, barring a major catastrophe, more than 30 percent of them will be over 65.

Mental Health

The President's Commission on Mental Health has issued a preliminary report that emphasizes community-based care for the mentally handicapped and recommends that mental health coverage be included in National Health Insurance. "The time has come for mental health care to become part of a broader effort to deal with human needs," says the 20-person commission headed by first lady Rosalynn Carter.

The 23-page report observes that the pattern of mental health services has changed dramatically over the past two decades. In the 1950's, 75 percent of those treated for mental and emotional problems were treated as inpatients; the proportion is now down to 25 percent. Average duration of hospitalization has been cut almost in half. Community mental health centers and de-institutionalization of mental patients has brought the primary locus of care to communities. Many more nonmedical personnel such as social workers and counselors are supplying services. The number of people served has risen sharply, and so have costs—from $1.7 billion in 1955 to $17 billion in 1975.

Most of the report's recommendations are aimed at bolstering community-based care and making services more uniformly accessible to the elderly (whose suicide rate is double their proportional representation in the population), poor, and minorities.

Recommendations include:

1) Encouraging the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the states to put more low-income housing at the disposal of the handicapped, including retarded people and ex-mental patients.

2) Putting more emphasis on mental health training of community workers and those serving minorities.

3) Putting more flexibility into eligibility requirements for facilities qualifying for reimbursement under Medicaid and Medicare (both of which programs are "biased toward inpatient care").

The report notes that many services to emotionally disturbed people are hidden in the nation's medical bill—for example, 1975 saw $245 million spent on prescriptions for two leading tranquilizers. To try to ascertain the most economic way of delivering mental health services, it urges that HEW analyze the impact of insurance programs that include mental health coverage; also it wants assessments of the costs of specific mental health services in various settings. Further, the report recommends establishment of an interagency coordinating committee to see how government programs not primarily concerned with mental health can benefit the mentally disabled.

Speaking of money, the commission asks that current levels of training money for alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health workers be sustained. It also seeks a 20 to 35 percent increase for research in alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health. (The Office of Management and Budget wants to phase out training money for mental health professionals in favor of training primary care providers in mental health services; the proposed budget contains no increases for research.)

The commission asserts that a lot more people than is commonly believed are in need of help. Although the common estimate of people in trouble (not counting the country's 6 million retarded) is about 10 percent of the population, the commission says it is more like 15 percent. According to a National Institute of Mental Health study done for the commission, the figure is even higher—25 percent of the population may be in need of help either for long-term problems or situational stress that significantly impairs their lives.

In its conclusion the report emphasizes that one of the main impediments to improving services is the "stigma of mental illness," and the "misunderstanding and fear surrounding mental and emotional problems," that prevents people from acknowledging problems or seeking help. At a press conference, Rosalynn Carter said removing the stigma was "our most important recommendation."

The final report is due next April.

Constance Holden

ly represented at a recent meeting of nongovernmental organizations to discuss initiatives the NGO's should take individually and collectively in relation to U.S. participation in the conference. The meeting in Washington on 20 September was sponsored by the AAAS, Overseas Development Council, Transnational Network for Appropriate/Alternative Technologies (TRANET), and Council for International and Public Affairs.

If the November meeting was a setback, the impression is that the government is pulling itself together. Conference preparations were given a focus and a base in the State Department with the appointment of Ambassador Jean Wilkowski as U.S. coordinator for the conference. Wilkowski is a career foreign service officer with an economics background and experience in trade negotiations. She has had considerable experience in less developed countries, including service as ambassador to Zambia. Although she is neither a scientist nor a development expert she appears to have made a favorable impression on the "development community." Her main job will be to elicit and to help reconcile the views of industry, labor, academia, and government agencies in formulating a U.S. position, and then to deal with other countries, both LDC's and industrial countries, in the steeplechase round of meetings which will lead up to the conference.

Wilkowski has a small but competent staff and appears to command the attention and support of her superiors in the State Department hierarchy. Her position is strengthened by the appointment as head of the U.S. delegation to the conference of Notre Dame president Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, this era's man for all seasons and subjects.

Wilkowski's central task is preparation of a "national paper" setting forth the U.S. position for the conference. A problem for Wilkowski and others working to ready national papers is that the question of what ought to happen at the conference is still an open one. The principal U.N. document on the subject, providing the guidelines for national papers and a statement of the conceptual background for the conference is so general as to leave in doubt what the focus of discussion will be.

There seems to be little doubt, however, of da Costa's interpretation of the agenda, and his views have caused alarm among scientists not only in the United States but in LDC's as well. At the Pugwash Conference in late August in Munich da Costa caused consternation by saying that the "substance of science" would not be a main concern at the 1979 conference. Rather, the meeting would concentrate on the policies involved in technology transfer.

Ambassador Jean Wilkowski

Da Costa's priorities may disappoint scientists, but given the political background of the conference they hardly seem surprising. The LDC's by now have developed a system of consultation and collective action in the United Nations which makes them effective in the bloc politics which have evolved in the world organization (*Science*, 27 September 1974). The LDC coalition, still called the "Group of 77" although its membership has grown to over 100 countries since the group was formed, is identified with the demand for a "New International Economic Order," a term now familiar enough to be referred to as the NIEO.

The Group of 77 demands are based on an analysis of international financial and trade relations that holds that the western countries got an early jump on industrialization and that this condemns the LDC's to a permanent state of dependence. The NIEO is equated with LDC demands for aid, trade, and financial concessions from the industrial countries and "structural" changes to redress the economic balance for the LDC's. In respect to science and technology, the LDC's insist that the industrial countries' hold on R & D be broken and that technology be transferred to LDC's on much more favorable terms.

The LDC's insistence on discussion of the NIEO and the industrial countries' preference for discussing discrete, manageable issues—which the LDC's regard as divide-and-rule tactics—has led to a virtual impasse in the north-south dialogue. The Law of the Sea Conference seems to have run aground as a result of disagreements on economic and technological issues. And the recent Conference on International Cooperation in Paris disappointed the fairly modest hopes for progress on north-south issues that were held for it. The north-south question was even included in an uncharacteristically gloomy assessment of prospects on major international problems by U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, who is usually a fount of ex officio optimism.

Although the road to wherever UNCSTD is held is likely to be a rocky one, the omens are not all bad. There is an effort within the United Nations to insulate the meeting from the extended discussion of economic and financial demands made under the aegis of the NIEO. There is a feeling among U.N. officials that confrontation at the conference could result to long-lasting damage to international science. And many in the LDC's who feel they can't get along with the Americans on science and technology also concede that they can't get along without them.

On the American side, some positive points may be made. UNCSTD may well spur the reevaluation of development theory already in progress in the United States and elsewhere. The assumption that development is to be measured only in terms of economic growth and increase of gross national product is being closely scrutinized. Not only are the merits of appropriate technology for development being argued, but new scenarios for development aimed at meeting "basic human needs" are also being devised.

The new U.S. Administration seems receptive to the fresh look at development. The President has called for a shift in U.S. aid to help "the poorest of the poor," and some enthusiasts have seen a chance that the Administration may decide to launch an effort on the scale of the Marshall Plan or the Apollo program to help the LDC's. However, since foreign aid has been out of fashion for some years and the budgetary latitude for such ambitious programs is very uncertain, it is premature to think in such terms in attacking the north-south problem.

Wilkowski and other officials have sensibly taken the tack that the most important thing about the conference will not be the event itself but the 2 years of preparation, and negotiation and mutual education which precedes it. The stakes are very high and, although the frustrations are likely to be equally high, it appears to be a good time to make the effort.—JOHN WALSH