

fairs which France had earned for itself.

In practical terms, Euratom's problems had loomed so large that other Community scientific programs had been largely ignored. These other programs have traditionally been small scale and scattered. Community activities are restricted to those prescribed in the three basic treaties, and these treaties reflect the atmosphere and the perceptions of the 1950's. It is possible to initiate new activities—research on environmental matters, for example—but each new program requires that the Council be consulted in detail and give approval, and this is inhibiting.

In January, the Council finally approved a "Common European Community Research and Technology Policy." This was based on commission recommendations which followed a document reflecting Dahrendorf's own views made public in the spring of 1973 which in turn included some ideas developed from proposals made by Spinelli.

Under the policy, two new entities were to be created, a Committee for Scientific and Technological Research (CREST) and a European Science Foundation (ESF). The stated purposes of these two organizations exceed the power and resources currently accorded them. CREST is charged with coordinating all aspects of national research policy where military secrecy is not involved. Dahrendorf's own description of his hopes for CREST in a lecture at the University of Southampton in Britain last November reflects his modest immediate expectations for CREST.

Co-ordination of national policies is an important element of European progress. CREST, in its early stages, will in fact not even try to create a unified position on the basis of the information it assembles, let alone suggest decisions which would be binding for member states. But by putting information about national subsidies for certain areas of research on the table, asking questions, trying to get a picture of the real situation of science budgets and their developments, listening to arguments brought forward in member states and the like, CREST will add some colours to the horizon of information in which decisions are taken in the member states. In doing so it may well create gradually a common horizon of information and thus a common atmospheric condition for science policy decisions. Indeed, the point may come at which it is only a small step from the exchange of information to the voluntary co-ordination of action, and it would not be the first time that in the European Community voluntary co-ordination becomes the forerunner of a general readiness to make common decisions.

What NIH Needs Is a Party

The NIH needs a shot in the arm, something to revitalize its dampened spirits, according to its friends who, for many months, have been worried about rumors that NIH is going downhill.

There are reports that the intramural program is being financially starved. There are stories that many of NIH's brightest scientists are thinking of leaving because they are not able to recruit new people under the federal government's stringent hiring freeze.

And there are indications that some of the country's highest-ranking scientists and politicians are wondering whether it might not be perfectly all right to allow NIH to diminish in scope and stature. There are those who believe that the money that goes to the intramural program should be spent in private institutions (their own), and that there is no necessity for the government to maintain NIH as a research center of intellectual excellence when there are places on the outside competing for funds. There are those who might be content to see NIH become simply an administrative center, a body without a mind.

It is no surprise that scientists who treasure the special intellectual and research qualities of NIH are outraged by the mere hint of such heresy. It drives them to NIH's defense. "The intramural program sets the scientific tone of the entire extramural program. . . . Should the intramural program in Bethesda be allowed to deteriorate, the whole NIH effort will suffer," declares Sidney Udenfriend, one of NIH's most stalwart supporters.

Udenfriend is director of the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology in Nutley, New Jersey, and an alumnus of NIH where, for many years, he was head of clinical biochemistry at the National Heart Institute. He has decided that what NIH needs is a party. What he has in mind is a homecoming to which the thousands of men and women who have studied and worked at NIH over the years would be invited to honor their alma mater.

Udenfriend has taken steps to arrange such a reunion. With the consent of NIH director Robert Stone and DeWitt Stetten, the deputy director for science, Udenfriend has sent letters to more than 25 NIH alumni asking them to serve on the reunion committee. "I think you will realize how important this event can be to the future of the NIH," he wrote. "The type of homecoming I have in mind will include widespread publicity and participation of leaders in Congress and the press. It should contribute to an improvement in the morale of the staff in Bethesda and emphasize to our national leaders and to the American public the significant training role of this great Institute." No one turned him down.

The homecoming is scheduled for next spring, 19 and 20 April. "We chose that weekend," Udenfriend says, "because it comes at the close of the federation meetings in Atlantic City. We don't intend to make this an expensive affair so we decided to pick a time when a lot of our alumni will be in the area anyway."

The exact format of the reunion has not been decided—Udenfriend welcomes suggestions—but it is likely to emphasize NIH's past scientific accomplishments. [Many of them were catalogued recently by NIH scientists trying to explain to Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Caspar Weinberger why it would be a bad idea to charge Clinical Center patients, each of whom is a research subject, for hospitalization (*Science*, 23 November 1973)].

Another likely feature of the reunion, designed to save money and promote friendship, is a "take an alumnus home to dinner" program in which present NIH scientists would be encouraged to offer some modest hospitality to their visitors.

As yet, no decision has been made about whether there will be a homecoming king and queen but, if there are, you can bet they will be chosen by peer review.—B.J.C.