

will die"; another told a press conference that a patient had killed himself in discouragement over the proposed closing of a day treatment center; and a third asserted that staff reductions would soon make it necessary to place hospitalized children in straitjackets.

The Reagan administration was equally vitriolic. Reagan called the opposition's commercials "vicious," and prepared a television and radio spot accusing his opponents of "blackmail" and of conducting "a high-powered propaganda campaign." Reagan later laughingly dismissed the leading spokesman for the opposition as "a head-shrinker" who was "probably sitting there looking at the pupils of my eyes on television." Reagan's health and welfare administrator, meanwhile, charged that some opponents of the budget cuts were planning to sabotage patient care

in order to create "I-told-you-so" statistics to prove they had been right in saying that the budget cuts would be harmful.

Caught in the middle of the battle was James V. Lowry, the state director of mental hygiene, who told the legislature that, "from a professional standpoint," he could not recommend the level of care that Reagan sought to maintain in the mental hospitals, but who noted that "fiscal necessity may dictate undesired economies." Some California psychiatrists have charged that Lowry "sold out" to the Reagan administration by putting his obligations as a loyal administrator ahead of his obligations as a professional psychiatrist. They believe Lowry should have protested loudly against the cuts, and they lament the fact that Reagan was able to claim, somewhat misleadingly, that the

reductions had the "support" of Lowry. However, other participants in the battle believe Lowry pursued a sensible course by yielding to the inevitable and then working effectively within the administration to strengthen mental health programs in the long run.

Reagan Unconvinced

When the battle subsided, after roughly 4 months of intense struggle, the opposition forces had won over the people (to judge from opinion polls), most of the state's editorial writers, and a majority of the state legislature—everyone but Reagan, the man who counted. Though the legislature restored most of Reagan's cuts, the governor in turn vetoed most of the restorations.

As it turned out, however, the Department of Mental Hygiene did not suffer the grievous cuts that at first seemed likely. Reagan delayed closing various threatened facilities when local officials were unable to assume immediate responsibility for providing the services, and he approved additional funds and staff to meet a greater-than-anticipated patient load in the hospitals, as he had promised he would. These actions, coupled with a hefty pay increase and other factors, resulted in an increase in appropriations for the department as a whole in fiscal 1968—not a decrease as originally seemed likely. Within the department, the research institutes, the hospitals for the retarded, and local mental health programs all ended up with more money than they had the previous year, while the mental hospitals, the nub of the controversy, dropped from \$128.2 million to \$124.1 million—much less than the drop to \$111.1 million originally threatened. Bardach the political scientist, believes the mental hospitals lost out because the people they serve lack political influence. Lowry, the department director, believes the hospitals lost out because the violent attacks on the governor made compromise difficult.

What has been the impact of the cuts on the state mental hospitals, the institutions which suffered the most? "Generally adverse," according to a paper presented at the May annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association by Bardach and Alfred Auerback, a San Francisco psychiatrist who played a prominent role in the struggle. The department of mental hygiene's own surveys of ward nursing care, which are prepared by Aerojet General Corporation, using techniques of systems analysis, show that the level

Pentagon Policy on War Dissent

The Pentagon last week issued a policy memorandum laying down guidelines for dealing with university scientists conducting research for the Defense Department who are publicly critical of the Vietnam war. In recent weeks two defense research agencies have sent out letters to several mathematicians (Science, 20 September) questioning whether it is consistent for them to continue their basic research for the military in view of their publicly expressed attitudes on the war. The memorandum was signed by John S. Foster, director of defense research and engineering. The text of the memorandum follows.

SUBJECT: Consideration of Non-Technical Issues in Research Contract Management

Recent concern regarding the views taken on non-technical issues by the principal investigators under certain DoD contracts warrants our careful attention. In general, I believe we must be confident about the willingness of principal researchers to receive DoD support, consult on appropriate DoD problems, and bring to our attention any findings relevant to national security. Thus I ask you to take the following steps in instances where the situation is uncertain:

1. Review all such contracts for quality and productivity.
2. Do not emphasize non-technical issues in your evaluation of the desirability of terminating or renewing research contracts. These are subtle issues which require careful, consistent, and sensitive treatment. Clearly, some members of the R&D community have disagreed with governmental decisions while they contributed significantly to the country.
3. Request principal investigators to re-examine their intent and desire to receive continued DoD support. To ensure a consistent DoD-wide policy, please consult with the office of the Deputy Director (Research and Technology) in my office on any such written requests to your contractors.
4. Take all necessary actions to preserve our mutually beneficial relationships with the academic research community during this period when there are potentially divisive pressures.

/s/ John S. Foster, Jr.