

shock, isolation, and small group behavior-control techniques.

In 1977, Dr. West was exposed on the front page of the *New York Times* as being funded by the CIA to perform experiments in mind destruction using LSD, as part of the MK-Ultra project. In John Marks's book *The Search for the Manchurian Candidate*, West was exposed as a pioneer of LSD and mind control experiments funded by the CIA. Despite these and other damaging stories, West continues to be held in high regard among CAN's members, and is a frequent lecturer and oft-cited researcher. West is also an advisory board member of the AFF.

The *grande dame* of the Cult Awareness Network is Dr. Margaret Singer, who has frequently appeared for news media interviews in the wake of the Waco massacre. Singer, also an AFF advisory board member, got her start as an Army psychiatrist, studying Korean War veterans and prisoners of war. She worked in projects with Drs. Edgar Schein and Albert Biderman, both exposed in Marks's *The Search for the Manchurian Candidate* as running the parallel military MK-Ultra programs.

Rabbi Maurice Davis, another member of the CAN advisory board, works closely with Dr. John G. Clark of Harvard in arranging "deprogrammings." Davis was an early sponsor of Galen Kelly, and also helped create cult leader Jim Jones by arranging for an empty Indianapolis synagogue to house Jones's early activities. Jones later moved to San Francisco, where he founded the People's Temple. In 1978, after moving his followers to Guyana, Jones led them in a mass suicide after one of his followers murdered U.S. Rep. Leo J. Ryan. The resulting publicity propelled the anti-cult mafia into prominence. Patricia Ryan, the late congressman's daughter, is now the president of CAN.

Davis worked with the MK-Ultra program at the federal prison in Lexington, Kentucky with Dr. Harris Isbell, who was administering psychotropic drugs to inmates. One subject was kept on LSD for 77 days.

Another MK-Ultra figure of particular interest is Dr. Ewen Cameron, whose brainwashing and electro-shock experiments in Canada during the 1950s and 1960s were financed by the CIA. (The Canadian government recently compensated victims of Cameron's experiments for the damage they suffered at his hands.)

Cameron developed a technique called "deprogramming," using sensory deprivation, which was followed by "reprogramming." It is clear that Cameron's "deprogramming" techniques are a model for CAN "deprogramming" methods. Part of Cameron's technique was to play a tape with one message repetitively for up to 16 hours a day, first playing a "negative" message, followed by a "positive" command. If Cameron's methods remind you of the FBI's loudspeaker tactics used against the Koresh group in Waco, you are on the right track.

Are these the people that Representative Hughes wants to be running the Justice Department?

Will the U.S. keep its nuclear lead?

by Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Advanced nuclear reactor research and development is on the Clinton administration's chopping block for ideological reasons, a move that could cost the United States its nuclear lead. The proposed energy budget for fiscal year 1994 eliminates the advanced liquid metal reactor (called the Integral Fast Reactor) that is designed to run on recycled nuclear waste, parts of the space nuclear power research, the fast flux test facility, and the modular high-temperature gas-cooled reactor. There are \$200 million in cuts for 1994 and \$1.2 billion proposed for the following four years.

President Clinton called for these cuts in his State of the Union address, saying bluntly that his budget would end "programs that are no longer needed, such as nuclear power research and development." In his "Vision of Change for America," released Feb. 17, Clinton specified that the research and development (R&D) programs to be eliminated were "nuclear reactors that have no commercial or other identified application."

This phaseout of advanced nuclear research, coupled with a major influx of funding to "renewables," is euphemistically referred to by the Department of Energy (DOE) as "shifted priorities to meet the needs of a changing world." How such a shift is justified was explained to this writer recently by a DOE press spokesman: "It is the *public will* not to build new nuclear plants. . . . And if we're not going to build new plants, why should we continue pouring money into advanced nuclear reactors when the economic reality is against it?"

That the majority of the "public" in several recent nationwide polls has been *for* keeping nuclear power in America's future made no impression on this DOE spokesman. Nor did the economic fact that "renewables" (like solar or wind power) are inherently incapable of powering an industrial society. It was clear that the shift in the DOE was to "politically correct" environmental ideology, presented to the public in "greenspeak."

Congressional opposition

Congress may not go along with the DOE's "shifted priorities." At April 29 congressional hearings on the nuclear budget, Rep. Marilyn Lloyd (D-Tenn.) stated flatly that the

nuclear policy of the Clinton administration is "in direct opposition to the will of Congress." Lloyd, a strong supporter of science, chairs the Energy Subcommittee of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee that convened the hearings. She and others at the hearings pointed out that Congress had mandated the advanced nuclear programs in its 1992 National Energy Policy.

As representatives of nuclear science and industry testified April 29, the proposed cuts would jeopardize this nation's electricity supply and potential for economic growth, and would remove the United States from world nuclear leadership. In addition, the phased-out reactor projects are designed to burn plutonium from weapons, it was pointed out, thus curbing "proliferation"—one of the administration's goals. The testimony also demonstrated that the eliminated programs had definite commercial applications.

The Clinton administration's energy budget was not about cutting the deficit, said Illinois Republican Harris W. Fawell. In fact, he said, the DOE civilian programs would see an *increase* of \$1.15 billion—16.6% above the budget in fiscal year 1993. This budget "does not cut the deficit. . . . What it really does is kill the long-term nuclear option."

Close the nuclear fuel cycle

Fawell argued that the nation needs the Integral Fast Reactor (IFR), a \$110 million per year test facility designed to demonstrate that nuclear waste can be transformed into usable reactor fuel. A joint project of Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois and the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (called Argonne West), the IFR began its three-year demonstration to burn actinides (long-lived reactor waste) this February, but will have to shut down if funds are cut. The IFR was strongly supported at the hearings by Idaho Senators Craig and Kempthorne, Idaho Congressman Crapo, and Idaho Gov. Cecil D. Andrus.

Andrus, an environmentalist, said that he was "greatly concerned" about the storage of spent fuel, and that the IFR gives the "hope of a solution to the nuclear 'waste problem' " that can be demonstrated soon. The governor challenged the administration to fully fund the IFR and thus "accomplish what previous administrations did not—to actually do something about nuclear waste while showing a responsibility for the environment that has not been demonstrated in the past."

"A success with the IFR will mean that we have a way to get rid of a blight and, at the same time, create electricity as a by-product. The sale of electric power could pay the entire bill for waste elimination or at least a substantial part of it," Andrus said.

What effect will the IFR shutdown have? Dr. Charles Till, associate director of the Argonne lab, testified that it will cost the United States "billions and tens of billions of dollars" to reproduce in the future the scientific and engineering capability that will be terminated this year if the Clinton administration's nuclear budget is not revised. The

Argonne-Idaho complex is one of the finest laboratories in the world, he said. When that intellectual leadership is dispersed, it won't be possible to put it back together again. "There will be no place left in this country that does this kind of work."

The administration had suggested that the testing could be done in other countries, like Japan and France, but as Till pointed out, it was actually the other way around: "We've been the host for scientists from other countries."

Giving up nuclear leadership

A repeated theme of industry and scientific representatives was that the United States will be removing itself from nuclear leadership at a time when the rest of the world is going nuclear. As pointed out by Woodrow A. Williams from General Electric's Nuclear Energy division, 18 new nuclear plants will be ordered in Asia in the next four years, which could represent \$45 billion in work and 100,000 U.S. jobs if the United States retains its lead in nuclear technology. Now is not the time to "send a signal that the United States is moving away from nuclear leadership," Williams said, because those reactor contracts will go to Japan or Europe. The United States will lose the export market if it does not build and certify the next generation of nuclear plants, including advanced light water reactors.

One of the promising advanced reactor concepts eliminated by the DOE is the modular high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor. The latest design, the direct conversion gas-turbine modular helium reactor or GT-MHR, is the subject of a joint development agreement signed on April 1 by Russia and the San Diego-based company General Atomics. Linden Blue, General Atomics vice president, described to the Energy subcommittee the advances of the GT-MHR (such as its 48% thermal efficiency compared to the 34% of conventional reactors) made possible because of recent technological breakthroughs in gas turbines, heat exchangers, and supercomputers. Russia recognizes the "safety virtues" of this design and wants this to be its "second generation nuclear reactor," Blue said.

The testimony of Ed Davis, president of the American Nuclear Energy Council, an industry group, summed up the theme of all the testimony. Like the Carter administration, the Clinton administration is putting forward proposals that are not based at all on science, Davis said. "The science argues for nuclear."

The emphasis on environmentalist rhetoric as opposed to science is evident at the DOE, which now has anti-nuclear environmentalist leaders.

The author is managing editor of 21st Century Science & Technology magazine. Its Spring 1993 issue features "The Dangers of Not Going Nuclear" and a pull-out postcard to send to President Clinton urging him to fully fund advanced nuclear R&D.