

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 overlaid 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 An APA vice president indicated to Waggoner that he would try to get the vote rescinded so that Waggoner could continue as chairman, if Waggoner promised to attempt to convince the ad hoc committee not to use Chu and Trotter.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

## 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.

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-