

vaguely defined disorder marked by violence and total unmanageability. Andy says all his patients suffer from "structural pathology" of the brain.

Finally (for the purpose of this article), there is the amygdalotomy. Fedio says this procedure was originally developed to curb epilepsy. Sweet and his colleagues are extending this procedure to people with diagnosable brain damage—who suffer outbursts of uncontrollable violence, but who do not necessarily have epilepsy. One problem is that the connection between violence and epilepsy is extremely murky. Furthermore, says Fedio, there is no concrete evidence that an individual's violent be-

havior is associated with the specific damage that has been located in his brain.

Many neuroscientists who believe some forms of psychosurgery are beneficial have heavy reservations about intervention to alleviate violence.

But since no one seems to know what to do about it, it looks as though some decisions are about to be made willy-nilly by the courts. One such case, apparently the first of its kind, is scheduled to be decided soon by a court in Detroit. It all began with a proposal by two doctors associated with the Lafayette Clinic, the psychiatric teaching hospital of Wayne State University. The

doctors, Jacques S. Gottlieb and Ernst A. Rodin, put together 3 years ago a "Proposal for the Study of the Treatment of Uncontrollable Aggression at Lafayette Clinic." The Michigan legislature subsequently appropriated \$228,400 for the research project, which was designed to compare the use of amygdalotomy and drug therapy on two comparable groups of patients. The subjects were all to be nonpsychotic, brain damaged males (because females have "more diffuse brain diseases") over 25, with I.Q.'s over 80, hospitalized for at least 5 years, who had been subjected unsuccessfully to all other known forms of treatment, who re-

## Briefing

### "Free Speech" Figure Wins Compensation

Berkeley physicist Charles Schwartz, who was suspended from a summer research job at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory (LBL) as a result of a "free speech" dispute in 1970, has won a court decision awarding him compensation for lost income. The Alameda County superior court judge's key finding was that "The evidence preponderates that the petitioner's status was changed with the consequent loss of salary because of his constitutionally protected political activities."

The decision covers the summers of 1970, 1971, and 1972. Schwartz was suspended briefly in the summer of 1970 by LBL director Edwin M. MacMillan (*Science*, 21 August 1970). The immediate cause of that suspension was two noon-hour seminars organized by Schwartz dealing with the interactions of science and politics. MacMillan determined that the seminars were held contrary to existing LBL policy, which limited such meetings at the Atomic Energy Commission supported laboratory to the discussion of technical matters.

Schwartz was originally suspended for 2 weeks and then finished out the summer at LBL. In 1971 and 1972 he was refused summer employment. A theoretical physicist, Schwartz is a member of the physics department at the University of California, Berkeley, with the rank of professor. After the suspension, he began a series of ap-

peals using the grievance procedures of the lab and the university, including the university's committee on academic freedom and the committee on privilege and tenure. The suspension was reduced to 2 days, and the lab's free-speech policy was criticized, but MacMillan's right to take the action was upheld. In September 1971, as a result of a new LBL committee report, the lab's policy on meetings was liberalized along lines advocated by Schwartz and others.

Last March, when Schwartz was refused summer employment, the American Federation of Teachers agreed to act in Schwartz's behalf in a suit charging that he had been fired for political activities protected by the Constitution.

Schwartz throughout has argued his side in a series of statements and press releases. In a representative statement issued after the court decision on 20 February, he said that, in addition to defending the principle of free speech, "I have been a spokesman for the politically radical views, seeing that the fruits of modern science and technology are too often being used in ways that are harmful rather than helpful for human society. I have been particularly critical of those institutions and those leaders of the scientific establishment that have been eager servants of militarism. For this outspokenness, the establishment acting through the Lawrence Laboratory, sought to shut me up by shutting me out."

The 20 February court decision leaves some things unclear. The final judgment on compensation will be

made after a further finding of fact. This could amount to \$10,000 according to Schwartz, but the decision specifies Schwartz is entitled to salary claimed "less any sums earned in mitigation of damages or which reasonably could have been earned." It is also possible that the lab will appeal the judgment.

Schwartz says the decision means that he has been "reinstated," but the judge noted that "This decision should not be construed as affecting future summer job placement opportunities for petitioner which may be dictated by budgetary considerations."

Schwartz has disputed the fairness of his removal from a list of "regular" summer employees, but a series of budget cuts at LBL could make the argument academic. Until a few years ago, university physics faculty at Berkeley could count almost automatically on summer employment at the lab. Employment at the lab declined from 2975 full-time equivalent employees in 1966, to 2545 in 1970, to 2110 as of 1 February. Another 200 jobs are to be phased out over the next 8 months as a result of general cutbacks by the AEC. Lab policy now requires that summer employees be engaged in substantial and continuing work at the lab throughout the year.

Schwartz says that at this point he has not decided whether he will apply for summer work at LBL. And lab officials, who say they are reluctant to comment while the case is still not finally settled, will say only that at present Schwartz has "no status" at LBL.—J.W.