

therapy, patients did better with therapy alone than with drugs alone. The last finding, she says, needs confirmation. In general, the most effective approaches were those in which both drugs and therapy were used. Like Parloff, Weissman thinks it would be a boon to have more standardized manuals of practice. Few schools of therapy do.

The most ambitious attempt to conduct a clinical trial of psychotherapy is just getting under way now at NIMH. It exists at present only as a proposal which must clear two peer review panels before it wins funding. Designed by the NIMH staff, it would cost about \$1 million and provide for research, at half a

The evidence is strong that people suffering from nonpsychotic depression may be helped.

dozen centers, on two types of psychotherapy in treating depression on an outpatient basis. One type, interpersonal therapy, is the creation of Weissman and Gerald Klerman, head of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. The other, cognitive therapy, was created by Aaron Beck at the University of Pennsylvania.

Although the designer of the test at NIMH was reluctant to discuss details, the project is clearly intended to be the largest and most carefully controlled trial of psychotherapy ever undertaken. The pilot phase alone will take 3 years. Its chief purpose will be to discover whether it is possible to conduct a standardized test of human behavior on such a scale.

Many psychologists are uneasy about the NIMH project, partly because they fear it will siphon off research money from other worthy experiments, and partly because the results of the test will have rather narrow use. It remains to be seen whether the peer groups will go along with the plan.

The record suggests that some forms of therapy can lay an undisputed claim to efficacy in treating mental illness. The evidence is strong, for example, that people suffering from nonpsychotic depression or moderate anxieties may be helped. But beyond generalizations of that kind, little has been demonstrated in a way that satisfies the demand for hard scientific proof of effectiveness.

—ELIOT MARSHALL

China Gets a Satellite Station

During Defense Secretary Harold Brown's recent visit to China, the Chinese Army Deputy Chief of Staff and the American entourage are reported to have joined at a banquet in some hearty toasts of "Down to earth, bottoms up." The reference was to a statement made earlier by the Chinese Vice-Premier that "China and the United States should do something in a down-to-earth way so as to defend world peace against Soviet hegemonism," such as its recent invasion of Afghanistan.

During the visit, the Defense Department announced that one of the first down-to-earth activities will be the sale to the Chinese of an American resources satellite receiving station, a facility that probably would not be sold to the Russians. Though it is being sold with safeguards against the diversion to military use of its computer and tape recording equipment, the station—as a piece of advanced technology with military potential—still represents a risk of sorts for the Americans. As such, the Defense Department's approval of the sale marks a significant liberalization of its policies toward technology trade with China (in direct contrast to the Administration's recent embargo on such trade with the Soviets).

Christopher Phillips, president of the National Council for U.S.-China trade, has indicated that although similar sales will not receive blanket approval in the future, "there will be increasing approvals on a selective basis of dual-purpose [military and civilian] technology." Already, he told *Science*, the Administration has supported sales to the Chinese of several items of potential military use, including seismic equipment for petroleum exploration that might be diverted to antisubmarine warfare; navigational equipment for a Boeing 707 that is superior to anything the Chinese had previously; and an infrared scanning system for land survey aircraft that could also prove valuable in military planes. Phillips is not a critic of these decisions (indeed, his job is to promote trade with the Chinese), and simply offers them as examples of a more liberal Administration attitude to-

ward the Soviet's southern neighbor.

The satellite receiving station, which will cost the Chinese about \$10 million, is equipped to receive direct transmissions from the LANDSAT 3 survey satellite now circling the globe, and from the LANDSAT D satellite to be launched within 2 years. Although the images taken by these satellites have a potential reconnaissance value (the LANDSAT D photographs objects as small as 75 feet in diameter), the program is run strictly for civilian use by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA will permit the station to receive transmission only when the satellite is directly over Chinese territory. And photographs from the satellites, whether of Chinese or other lands, must be made available to any country that requests them.

At present, the Chinese can purchase these photos from a data center in South Dakota, but the turnaround time is occasionally as long as 6 months; the chief advantage of owning a station is to get instant analysis. The photos are useful for estimating crop production and exploring for oil, gas, and minerals.

A Defense official notes that even though the station's computer might be useful in high-speed defense calculations, some safeguards—such as visitation rights—will be extracted in a detailed agreement to be negotiated by NASA later this month. The Chinese are said to be tough negotiators on such assurances, which is one reason the Defense Department has been less generous with approval in the past.

Nader Assails ETS

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) of Princeton, New Jersey, has come under renewed fire from consumer advocate Ralph Nader for making unsubstantiated claims that its standardized college-level exams measure aptitude and predict success. On 14 January, Nader released a 550-page report on ETS, which contains some of the same accusations made before by his group and others (*Science*, 14 September 1979). Flanking him at a press conference were representatives of the Parent-Teachers Association, the National