

cisions on top level personnel changes.

If Califano's principle were rigorously applied, it would be reasonable to expect, say the critics, that directors of every institute of the National Institutes of Health who had been in the job for a few years would be replaced when a new HEW secretary came in. This would certainly be upsetting to NIH's research constituency and, at least under present conditions, would create a kind of job insecurity unlikely to enhance federal service for able administrators.

To an outsider, the distinctions between policy and operating jobs can seem finely drawn. The main question raised by critics of Califano's action is that of how far down into an organization the relieving of managers should go, particularly when the criterion for dismissal is the rather arbitrary one of time in the job rather than the accepted one of poor performance.

Califano's argument for flexibility is not implausible. Over a period of years, the head of a federal agency becomes identified with particular programs, appoints people to jobs, forms alliances, and strikes bargains. Not all decisions

work out brilliantly, circumstances change and the administrator, inevitably, is to some extent "locked in." It is hard for the veteran administrator in the federal bureaucracy to change direction himself and, perhaps more important, to get his agency to change.

NIMH does face fresh issues, a point made by ADAMHA head Klerman, who seconds Califano's rationale for the no-fault firing of Brown. Klerman says that the overriding issue for NIMH is the need for further integration of mental health services into the general health care system. The community mental health centers supported by NIMH have provided an alternative to treatment in state mental hospitals and made mental health services available more widely, but there has been criticism that the centers have been "separationist," in the sense that many centers chose not to cooperate closely with other public health care institutions.

Klerman also indicates that NIMH and its sister agencies in ADAMHA, the Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the National Institute on Drug Abuse, have tended to go their separate

ways and an effort will be made to achieve closer collaboration. Some observers are waiting to see whether the Califano rule will be applied to the directors of the alcohol and drug abuse institutes.

One of Califano's major priorities has been to prod the health agencies in HEW into preparing for the advent of national health insurance. President Carter has indicated that he wants provisions for substantial mental health care included in the program and Klerman says that NIMH will be expected to come up with practical proposals for mental health coverage.

The interest of President and Mrs. Carter in mental health problems is well known and there is a prevailing assumption that the Administration will launch a major mental health initiative after the President's Commission on Mental Health finishes its work this year. NIMH would play a leading part in such an effort.

As for Brown's firing, most informed observers are convinced that personalities as well as principles figured in the action. ADAMHA director Klerman,

## Briefing

---

---

### NIH Considers Animal Rights

---

The National Institutes of Health is gingerly inspecting the question of animal rights. Inspired chiefly by Christine Stevens of the Animal Welfare Institute in Washington, D.C., an in-house NIH group has prepared minor revisions to the animal use principles imposed on NIH grantees.

The ethics of animal experimentation was a question addressed in a recent speech by NIH deputy director Thomas E. Malone. Noting that the public's interest is shifting from animal welfare to animal rights, Malone said that "it behooves us to ask the same questions of ourselves—before they are asked of us. Does the potential good justify the use of an animal in an experiment? Will the research yield fruitful results which cannot be obtained by other means? Is the research necessary? Are we prepared to terminate an experiment whenever its continuation may result in unnecessary suffering to an animal? If the answers to these questions are 'yes,' then I for one have no difficulty in supporting the research."

Malone said he did not fear greater public scrutiny of science and scientists; if scientists fulfill their responsibilities to the environment, "then science has nothing to fear but much to gain from greater public interest and involvement in scientific endeavors."

The NIH's revised principles for animal use have not yet been published, but they have the support of the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science.

---

### A New Militancy in England

---

The animal rights movement in England has moved into the guerilla phase. Animal welfare has always played a large role in English sensibilities, particularly among the gentility and the intelligentsia. The cause is supported by numerous groups and by public figures such as novelist Brigid Brophy. Another writer, Richard Adams, author of *Watership Down* and *Shardik*, has chosen two experimentally altered animals as the central characters of his latest work, *The Plague Dogs*.

The conventional espousers of animal

rights in England have now been joined by a quite different group. Militant activists known as the Animal Liberation Front, they argue that a century of peaceful campaigning has gotten nowhere. They are prepared to go to jail for their beliefs, and several have done so.

Over the last 18 months the militants have conducted a campaign of violence and sabotage against laboratories and animal breeding plants. They have freed animals, damaged property, and even burgled the offices of their chief opponents, the Research Defense Society. A few days after the break-in the secretary of the society was telephoned by a man who said, "This is the Animal Liberation Front. We have your files. We think you're pretty sick people."

The front claims a hard core membership of 150 people organized into small bands of activists. It is probably too early to say whether its illegal methods will prove productive. One of its most successful bids for public attention was the freeing of beagles being used by Imperial Chemical Industries, the English DuPont, in experiments to test the safety of an artificial cigarette the company had developed. After a nationwide debate, the company abandoned its experiments.

Nicholas Wade