

Blasingame's proposal was immediately attacked by Ritts and by two of the institute's scientific advisers. The burden of Ritts's argument, as developed at that meeting and subsequently, was that the institute would inevitably be swallowed up by the university, and that a university affiliation might endanger some of the original aims of the institute—such as freedom from the pressure to teach, publish or solicit individual grants. Ritts told *Science* most of the dangers he foresees could be warded off by a vigilant director, but he is convinced the institute, which depends heavily on donations from doctors, from pharmaceutical companies, and from the AMA itself, will die of financial malnutrition if it becomes identified with a particular university rather than the AMA. The AMA is talking in terms of an annual budget of \$2.5 million once the move is completed, and Ritts questions whether donors will have much stomach for contributing to a facility at a school that is not their alma mater. If the AMA ultimately has to abandon the institute, he says, the university would presumably take over the institute's new building (which is expected to cost some \$2 to \$3 million), and inherit some institute talent.

The haste of the decision to move, and the ensuing struggle between Ritts and Blasingame, provoked opposition to the plan at all levels of the AMA. One influential doctor who played a big role in establishing the institute told *Science* he is "very unhappy" about the move. The institute's laboratory heads at one point signed a memorandum unanimously opposing the move. And one scientist, Clyde Goodheart, has announced he will resign rather than go to the university. "I just don't get along in an academic setting—I find it boring," he told *Science*. A few scientists are even convinced the move is a Machiavellian plot to get rid of the institute.

Despite the initial misgivings, the proposed move seems to have won general acceptance in recent weeks. Observers credit this partly to the adroit maneuvering of Blasingame ("he's another LBJ") and of Charles L. Hudson, chairman of the AMA's research foundations partly to a superb impression made by Beadle, and partly to assurances that the move will mean nothing more than a "change of address" and will not involve any form of subjugation to the University of Chicago or any change in the basic concept of

## Euratom: A Cut for Cooperation

*Brussels.* The Council of Ministers of Europe's Six took a drastic step recently when they cut Euratom's 1968 budget in half, but they still face difficult decisions on long-term policies for the nuclear research organization.

A Euratom commission proposal for an \$82-million budget was turned down, and the council approved \$40.7 million for the coming year. The action was the culmination of a long period of bickering over budgets, which reflected the member nations' differing conceptions of Euratom's proper scope.

Halving of the budget was achieved by suspending all association agreements under which the community helps support national R & D projects in the member countries. The action was taken primarily on the insistence of the Italian government, which has felt it was not benefiting from association programs in proportion to its contributions. The French joined the Italians in pressing for suspension, from rather different motives. With a flourishing nuclear development program of its own, France has been unenthusiastic about association agreements, particularly where advanced reactor projects are concerned, and has favored a research role for Euratom. The Germans and Dutch, by contrast, have backed a broad-gauge Euratom and have supported extension of the association agreements for another year. Belgium and Luxembourg reportedly took a middle position.

How seriously the suspension will affect work in progress depends on the willingness of individual countries to take over the portion of financing for which Euratom was formerly responsible. Nuclear fusion research, a thriving program, has been based almost entirely on association agreements. Nearly all of Euratom's \$3-million-a-year biology research program is financed the same way. The balance of Euratom research could be upset; many projects, however, are expected to be kept going.

The council-approved \$40.7-million budget will permit Euratom's own four research centers to remain open and its personnel to be kept largely intact. The agency's "in-house" scientific resources may be brought to bear on technological problems—including nonnuclear ones—which the Six now seem disposed to attack. The European Economic Community science ministers at the end of October agreed to coordinate research policies in certain fields—data processing and telecommunications, transportation, oceanography, metallurgy, environmental problems, and meteorology. The door appears to be open to Euratom's development of a diversified research program.

Nothing concrete has been done, however, to give Euratom a master plan to follow after the current 5-year program expires on 31 December. The agency has been living on a month-to-month budgetary basis. The compromise assures Euratom another year of life and time to make plans for the longer term. Suspension of the association agreements, however, must place the fate of a truly coordinated European program of nuclear research in doubt, especially in such an industrially sensitive field as reactor development. Some observers see the association agreements being replaced by programs in which participation is voluntary. Such international arrangements—in space research in Europe, for example—have not proved brilliantly successful. Unless minds and national positions change significantly, it is likely that emphasis in Euratom will be more on research, less on development.

Needed most now is a policy decision from the council which will make it possible for Euratom to make long-term plans. At its recent meeting the council called for recommendations from the committee of permanent representatives—the EEC ambassadors—which has its own advisory group on atomic affairs. So, in addition to the injury of the budget slash, Euratom suffers the insult of having others propose its fate.

—JOHN WALSH