were in the political arena, or in a religious one, and somebody started talking like that, Jerry would look like a heretic."

A former National Security Council staffer, on reading the texts of the Wiesner-M.I.T. memos, retorted, "That's par for the course. . . . There was talk in the administration at the time of the Cambodia invasion of reassessing federal grants." The memos are "entirely plausible and consistent" with Administration attitudes. "I'm sure there are companion memoranda to those in the files, about other institutions."

Wiesner had the two texts relayed to him by telephone and commented, "I think it's outrageous, of course, to attack an institution for things I did as a private citizen, in the public interest, before becoming president of it." He said that he thought the Administration might consider him part of the Edward Kennedy "team", but that their principal unhappiness with him was probably over his role in the ABM debate. He confirmed that he had, nonetheless, remained a consultant to the now-defunct President's Science Advisory Committee at the invitation of both of Nixon's science advisers.

As to whether he had any evidence that the plan to cut off nondefense funds to M.I.T. was carried out, Wiesner said he had heard of an occasional research administrator saying that he could have considered a given proposal, "if only it didn't come from M.I.T.," but that he knew of "no overt action taken to punish M.I.T."

That the Nixon White House, apparently unhappy with one of the nation's most prominent scientific figures, should have tried to cut off funds to his institution as a reprisal, is not unprecedented. President Lyndon Johnson, riled by some scientists' opposition to his Vietnam policies, was said to have gone over the budget figures to pencil out items he thought should not be funded (see *Science*, 5 March 1971). But both Wiesner and Eisenhower's Science Adviser George B. Kistiakowsky stated last week that, to their knowledge, nothing of the sort transpired when they served in the White House.—DEBORAH SHAPLEY

APA: Psychiatrists Reluctant to Analyze Themselves

"Know thyself" is a primary aim of modern psychiatry, but an attempt to apply this ancient imperative to the principal organization of American psychiatrists—the 22,000-member American Psychiatric Association (APA)—has been the casualty of a Byzantine closed-door struggle involving some of the most influential members of that increasingly troubled and questioned profession.

More than a year ago, the APA's board of trustees enthusiastically approved a study of conflicts of interest in the practice of psychiatry. The purpose of the study was to examine allegations that psychiatrists employed by community, military, and penal institutions often serve the interests of the institution, not the patient; treatment, it was argued, is designed to maintain the status quo and suppress behavior disapproved of by the institution, such as refusal to accept authority. A staff was selected, a grant obtained, and work was slated to begin in January 1973. Six months later, the staff had been "dehired," and the study, though officially alive, was put on a slow course to an uncertain future.

The about-face was caused by a combination of political, professional, and psychological factors, but it primarily underscores the profession's heightened sensitivity to recent charges that, in addition to its therapeutic role, psychiatry is sometimes used as an instrument of social control.

The group which suggested the project was originally appointed by the APA trustees not to examine American psychiatry, but to study the Bukovsky papers—diagnostic reports which purportedly documented the use of psychiatric facilities to suppress political dissent in the Soviet Union. In 1971, the International Psychiatric Congress had failed to take any position on the charges, claiming that they had no procedural basis on which to act. In response to pressure from critics, such as journalist I. F. Stone, the APA trustees appointed last spring a special committee, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Use of Psychiatric Institutions for the Commitment of Political Dissenters. The committee was chaired by Raymond Waggoner of the University of Michigan Medical Center and included the Honorable David Bazelon, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia—an esteemed jurist with expertise in the fields both of psychology and the law. After examining the documents, the committee issued a rather innocuous statement together with a minority report written by Bazelon and signed by two other committee members. The Bazelon statement argued that the ad hoc committee was mistaken in confining its observations to the Soviet Union. He suggested that American psychiatry should "stop sweeping its own problems under the rug and conduct an in-depth inquiry into the use of psychiatric discipline in the institutions of our own society." The statement was endorsed overwhelmingly by the board, and the ad hoc committee's life was extended for another year to carry out such an investigation. Thus the APA walked blithely into the snare of turning back on itself a weapon originally launched against a quite different target.

"We became very excited about the study," remarked Bazelon during a recent interview. "We thought our investigation would illuminate many of the problems and help American psychiatrists faced with conflicts of interest within institutions." Work on the project began almost immediately after the trustees' endorsement. Although Waggoner chaired the ad hoc committee, Bazelon was its prime mover. Funding was arranged (from the W. T. Grant Foundation), advice was sought from prominent sociologists throughout the nation, and a research team was selected. The team consisted of Donald Light, an assistant professor of sociology at Princeton; Joseph Perpich, a young psychiatrist then working for Senator Edward Kennedy's health subcommittee; and Franklin Chu and

Sharland Trotter, both of whom were completing a study for Ralph Nader on community mental health centers.

Meanwhile, the APA was beginning to experience second thoughts. The ad hoc committee first became aware of the APA's uneasiness last fall. Several APA trustees commented that the study was too broad. Others expressed opposition to the selection of Chu and Trotter as field researchers, because the recently issued Nader report had convinced many that both candidates were antipsychiatry. (In essence, the Nader report criticized the health centers for being overladen with bureaucracy and committed to traditional approaches at the expense of new forms of treatment.) The ad hoc committee defended its choice on the grounds that Chu and Trotter were only members of a team which was to be closely supervised by the committee members. Nevertheless, while proclaiming their faith in the ad hoc committee, the APA trustees instructed Waggoner to reconsider selection of staff. Perpich and Light were asked for specific proposals to control any bias Trotter and Chu might have.

The ad hoc committee met again, reviewed its staffing decision, worked over the study proposal, and voted to begin work in January with the team they had selected.

Committee chairman Waggoner was questioned about this decision when the trustees met again last December. "By that time," says committee member Harold Visotsky of Northwestern University, "the situation was precarious. The issue had become the APA's trust and confidence in its committee." Waggoner told the trustees that he could not continue as chairman of the committee, unless the board trusted his judgment about who should be hired to conduct the study's research. One trustee moved that the board express confidence in the work of the committee, but instruct it not to employ Chu and Trotter. Waggoner warned that if this motion passed, he would resign as committee chairman. The motion was carried by a vote of 9 to 6, and, as promised, Waggoner quit. Tempers had flared that morning, and, over lunch, several trustees tried to assuage the injuries from insults exchanged during the morning session. An APA vice president indicated to Waggoner that he would try to get the vote rescinded so that Waggoner could continue as chairman, if Waggoner promised to attempt to convince the ad hoc committee not to use Chu and Trotter. Waggoner so promised and agreed to resign if he could not get the committee to reconsider. On that basis, the morning's motion was unanimously rescinded.

The discouraged ad hoc committee met again and, after considerable discussion, voted to ask the board to reconsider its prior actions toward Chu and Trotter, on the grounds that the board had been "wrong, unfair, and unofficial."

Waggoner and Visotsky met with the board in February. Waggoner again asked that either the board show confidence in the committee and allow it to control the study and its staff, or the trustees should disband the committee. After lengthy and heated discussion, which unlike standard board meetings was not tape recorded, the trustees voted to disband the committee and requested the APA's Council on Research and Development "at its pleasure to appoint a task force to consider this whole matter."

Among the reasons for this action was the trustees' dislike of the approach they believed the study would adopt. They challenged the use of what was termed an "advocacy" rather than a "scientific" method of investigation. William Barton, APA medical director, said recently, "The trustees wanted a 'scientific' report. We, as scientists, disagree with the lawyer's adversary system in this kind of a study. It is too important to relegate to a dilettante group." Visotsky claims the issue was really one of semantics. He contends there was no basic difference between Bazelon's advocacy and Barton's scientific approach: "They were both blind men examining the same elephant." According to Visotsky, the word "advocacy" put the trustees on guard. "Scientists," he said, "don't like to be studied by advocates."

Despite these disagreements, the basic issued seemed to be the selection of Chu and Trotter as members of the research team. "The trustees thought we were out to destroy psychiatry," said Frank Chu. "The Nader report had just been released, and it did not make us the most popular people in the field."

Many board members attacked the report and its authors during the discussions. "That report," said Barton, "contained serious errors. Several professionals connected with community mental health centers claimed they had been misquoted in the Nader report."

Admitting that there may have been valid reasons to question the team, Waggoner took issue with those who criticized it because of the Nader study. "The Nader report's recommendations were not particularly radical; I made 75 percent of them myself years ago," he remarks.

Visotsky is more critical of Chu and Trotter's report, but nevertheless contends that the board never really discussed the Chu-Trotter issue rationally, since it never met with or questioned the two researchers. "The board," said Visotsky, "was responding to the rumored content of the Nader report."

Bazelon also defends the two against charges that they were not "objective." "Everyone has biases," said Bazelon; "the real issue in scientific or adversary studies is whether these biases can be identified and controlled." Members of the committee insist that adequate safeguards were planned for control of bias.

Members of the ad hoc committee and the board of trustees disagree about the underlying causes of the controversy. Barton claims there was just an honest disagreement about how to approach the problem, but not about whether the problem should be ap-

Science Writing Prize

The National Association of Science Writers has awarded its Science-in-Society journalism award to Robert E. Gillette, staff writer for News and Comment, for a series of six articles on nuclear reactor safety (*Science*, 5 May; 28 July; 1, 8, 15, and 22 September 1972). According to the citation, the articles "skillfully explored and illuminated the Atomic Energy Commission's policies and lack of candor on safety issues, without sensationalism and with outstanding clarity about abstruse technical issues."

Gillette received the prize for physical science reporting. The prize for life science reporting was awarded to Victor E. Cohn of the Washington *Post* for articles on sickle-cell anemia. The prizes, which are being given for the first time this year, consist of $1000 and a medal.—N.W.

proached. Several members of the committee disagree. According to Visotsky, the study got "hung up" on Chu and Trotter, but the issue was really whether the board trusted members of the committee with such a potentially explosive study. Bazelon and others go one step farther. In a recent speech Bazelon said, "Our committee agreed that what we experienced was the ranks of organized psychiatry defensively drawing together; there was to be no scrutiny, even by *insiders*—even they might be foxes guarding the henhouse." In addition, Bazelon feels that many board members feared the project might have been the first step toward asking some of these "ultimate" questions: What is psychiatry? What can it do? What are its boundaries? "The very idea of exploring the *raison d'être* of one's profession is understandably threatening." He was warned, he said, at the project's outset that not often did a powerful and entrenched professional establishment undertake a seriously self-critical examination. Barton, on the other hand, insists the committee was not disbanded because of fear of "self-analysis." Rather, he contends the study was not approved because of sound methodological objections to the committee's approach and staff.

Barton turned the study over last February to the APA's Council on Research and Development, with the instruction: "You will want to get a firm grip on the tail of this tiger." Members of the council are now writing to universities in their areas, requesting research proposals. In the fall, the council hopes to begin oral interviews of applicants. The council will farm out the study in traditional APA fashion. In any event, there is little chance that an APA-sponsored study of conflicts in institutional psychiatry will get under way before 1974.—JUDY MILLER

Judy Miller is a free-lance journalist working in Washington, D.C.

AAAS in Mexico: Inter-American Goodwill but Little Press Coverage

This summer, in cooperation with the Mexican government's National Council of Science and Technology, the AAAS marked its 125th anniversary with a special meeting in Mexico City, the association's first in Latin America. For the occasion, News and Comment asked Edward Edelson, a science writer for the New York Daily News *who has covered previous AAAS meetings, to review the Mexico City gathering from a reporter's point of view. A second article by Robert Gillette of the News and Comment staff will elaborate on the objectives of the meeting and on the difficulties of organizing a major international conference.*

With the exception of one notably sore point, officials of both the AAAS and the Mexican government's Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACYT) came away from their 2-week meeting on "Science and Man in the Americas" sounding rather happy. A primary purpose of the meeting was to improve communications between U.S. and Latin American scientists and, in this regard, the gathering seemed to fulfill most of the hopes of each organization.

The one cause for complaint on both sides was press coverage. While the AAAS meeting customarily attracts more than 300 journalists from most major newspapers and magazines in the United States, the Mexico City meeting drew perhaps a tenth that many. Jorge A. Vargas, one of the CONACYT executives most closely involved in planning the meeting, said the Mexicans were "deeply disappointed" that the turnout was so small and that such major newspapers as the Washington *Post* and the *New York Times*, which usually are at the AAAS convention in force, were not represented at all.

Vargas, the Mexican science agency's man in charge of U.S. relations, put the blame squarely on AAAS officials for not assuring better press coverage. For their part, AAAS executives stressed such factors as the distance most American reporters had to travel in order to cover the meeting, the reluctance of many editors to assign reporters to a meeting in a foreign country, and the lack of availability of either advance papers or a meeting program until the day the conference began. The meeting, however, did attract Mexican reporters in considerable numbers.

The joint AAAS-CONACYT meeting differed from the traditional AAAS conference in several respects. The demonstrations by radicals that have provided an unfailing source of news copy from AAAS meetings in past years were conspicuously lacking this time. About ten representatives of Scientists and Engineers for Social and Political Action (SESPA), a group that has led the previous radical protests, did make their appearance shortly after the conference began. After negotiations with CONACYT, the SESPA representatives were allowed to set up a literature table, unlike their fellows who were denied space at the AAAS meeting in Washington, D.C., last December.

But even with their table and room, SESPA's stay was not entirely trouble-free. Members complained of minor harassments by the building staff, and at one point six members were arrested for distributing literature and were held at the Mexican immigration office, where deportation, although never clearly mentioned, was certainly in the air. Eventually, however, the SESPA people were released and were left reasonably alone until the end of the meeting. For reasons of their own, the "Science for the People" attendees kept a low profile; there were no interruptions of sessions or other demonstrations against controversial speakers. The SESPA explanation was that there were no "war criminals" at the Mexico City meeting, but the fact that the Mexican police were far from sympathetic appeared to have something to do with the lack of action.

As far as the substance of the meeting went, Vargas said that CONACYT's hope of improving communications