

three ADAMHA institutes were replaced, a flood of internal allegations of corruption leaked to the press, and the mechanism of basic research financing was redesigned to do away with potential conflicts of interest between donors and recipients of grants. Califano stood behind the effort of the new administrator of ADAMHA, Gerald Klerman, to create a grant approval system like the peer review process used at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) (*Science*, 11 May 1979).

Califano made few changes in the other institutes. He retained President Ford's appointee, Donald Fredrickson, as director of NIH, and made the somewhat unorthodox decision to name a nonphysician, Donald Kennedy, to head the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). That choice proved to be a solid, although short-lived, success. Kennedy recently quit to become provost of Stanford University.

The same week that he was being hustled out of HEW, Califano had the department publish a set of revised "health research principles," designed to help budget planners in deciding how to allocate a limited amount of money among competing areas of basic research funded by HEW. Later this year, in October if the schedule is kept, NIH is supposed to produce a document explaining how these very broad principles will be put into practice. That will be a controversial decision, and, with Califano gone, it may not be made for some time.

When *Science* asked Califano about his accomplishments, he did not stress the details of his managerial improvements but spoke instead of the familiar big themes of this Administration. He said that he thought he had done important work as an educator in insisting that people see health care as a booming and profitable industry, and that they rely more on themselves to practice preventive care at home. In out-of-town speeches, he said, he invariably cited two sets of statistics, one giving the inflation rate for hospital costs, and the other giving the declining rates of inoculation in the United States against childhood diseases. He cited with pride a speech made early in his term, at the convention of the American Medical Association in 1977. It was the one in which he told the physicians that their profession was part of "a big business . . . a very costly industry . . . virtually noncompetitive . . . poorly distributed" and unfair to the poor.

When challenged about the preachiness of his style, as in the antismoking drive, Califano replied: "What do you do

when every responsible doctor is saying that cigarettes are the number-one health problem in the nation? It's not a matter of telling people what to do. We live in a consumer society. The tobacco industry spends \$800 million a year on cigarette advertising; you see it everywhere. What tools do I have to get the message out?" Tobacco industry lobbyists, he claimed, even tried to "knock out" an appropriation for a limited amount of antismoking education proposed by HEW. Califano felt he had no choice but to speak up himself. He considered it part of the job to proselytize on other health issues, he said, such as alcoholism, teenage pregnancy, and childhood inoculations. "You have to say it 19 different ways so the cab driver understands. . . ."

Califano believes that he made another contribution in opening up decisions on important health care and biomedical research issues to public scrutiny. He specifically mentioned the review of the swine flu vaccination problem and the decision to issue guidelines for research on recombinant DNA, both of which benefited from having nonspecialists in on the action. The precedent for involving the public in scientific decisions has been established at HEW, Califano said, and it will endure.

Finally, Califano claimed to have brought talented people to the department and set a high standard of performance. He was particularly proud of the officials appointed to HEW's ten regional offices. One of them, the director of the Chicago region, was appointed over the objections of Representative Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.), who had asked to have a personal friend named to the post. Califano's refusal to do so caused problems for HEW's hospital cost control bill, which was stalled for a time in Rostenkowski's health subcommittee. Califano said that, despite these problems, he would not do anything differently today. He added that Rostenkowski's candidate for the Chicago region was the same man who won a contract for snow removal in Chicago from Michael Bilandic, the ex-mayor. Bilandic was defeated last year because of his inept and allegedly corrupt handling of snow removal.

Califano's greatest disappointment, was his inability to get major health legislation through Congress. He conceded that he had underestimated several things: "the financial power of the hospital industry," and "the extent to which closing hospitals is like closing post offices" in terms of injuring local pride, and "the length of time necessary to mount a major educational campaign."

(Continued on page 672)

Sex and Science

Affirmative action has done very little to neutralize sexism in science, according to Anne Briscoe of the Association for Women in Science (AWIS). In fact, she said, it was not until the mid-1970's that the proportion of women in most fields had climbed back to the level achieved in the 1920's.

Briscoe, testifying at a hearing held by Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), said that most women are still "triple A's"—assistants, associates, and adjuncts. She said affirmative action goals are being ignored, bypassed, and unenforced—"in academia and the government, affirmative action has neither diminished sexism nor lowered any standards nor created reverse discrimination. . . ." She stated that "only in industry has there been any increase in the employment of women, this being at the entry level." This, however, does not mean a great deal since women comprise 1.9 percent of the scientific work force in the private sector.

Briscoe remarked that the most noteworthy improvement in the status of women has been in consulting positions: the proportion of women on public advisory committees related to research funding rose from 2.9 percent in 1971 to 20.5 percent in 1977. This, she said, was the result of a lawsuit by AWIS and other women's groups against the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Eleanor Smeal, president of the National Organization for Women, testified that the fact that 90 percent of physicians and health administrators are men "has had devastating effects on women's health care and their participation in the medical professions." She said that only 3 percent of dentists are women, even though women are well suited for the profession because they have small hands and dentistry permits flexible hours for women who also have families to tend to. "I think we could probably take over the profession if we were allowed to," as has been the case in Scandinavia. She said the same generalization applied in the field of obstetrics and gynecology.

The hearings, on "women in health and science," also publicized the difficulties divorcées and widows have in

getting health insurance. They were held in connection with Kennedy's health insurance plan and a bill, the "Women in Science and Technology Equal Opportunity Act," he introduced last year, which would give the National Science Foundation \$25 million to encourage women to go into scientific and technical professions. It would also supply money for legal services for alleged victims of discrimination.

Grappling over Air Bag

The air bag issue has blown into the news in recent weeks as the Department of Transportation (DOT) and consumer groups have been lobbying to defeat an anti-air bag amendment that Representative John Dingell (D-Mich.) seeks to attach to the DOT appropriations bill. The matter will now not be resolved until September because the House did not get to the bill before adjourning on 2 August.

The air bag is one of two types of "passive restraint" safety systems—the other system being unavoidable seat belts—that will be required by law in most cars by 1983. Dingell's amendment would prevent DOT from spending any money for compliance on passive restraint systems for another year. Although the measure would not have significant practical consequences, DOT has chosen to try to beat this one back because, according to an official at the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA), "it's an important symbolic issue." He said congressional ambivalence about the air bag was causing "consternation" within the industry, which is on the verge of investing millions in the air bag. "We decided to fight this one so Congress will give a clear signal to auto makers."

Dingell has been arguing for the compliance delay because he claims more safety testing is needed before air bags can be acceptable. In particular, he cites a recent General Accounting Office report that says air bags are not very effective in other than frontal crash situations. On 31 August he called a press conference to display a film of a test crash in which the air bag burst. Air bag supporters say Dingell is bending over

backward to distort the evidence and that the experiment shown in the film had no relevance to technology that would actually be used.

Although Dingell's district contains Dearborn, home of Ford Motor Co., a Dingell staffer says auto makers have not been lobbying against air bags. In fact, everyone says auto makers have agreed they will be able to provide them as an option by 1983 (they would be essential only in large cars with three-passenger front seats where the middle passenger could not be protected by an automatic belt).

NHTSA, at any rate, is hot for air bags (a *Wall Street Journal* editorial called it "blind fervor"). Director Joan Claybrook calls them "the most tested safety system and the most important technological safety advance in the automobile industry." NHTSA estimates they would cut the annual highway toll by about 9000 deaths, which is about the fatality reduction that has occurred since the introduction of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

R & D Institute Passed

After an unexpectedly rocky ride through the Senate, the Administration's proposed Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation has passed both houses of Congress. It will come into existence on 1 October.

The institute is supposed to promote development and cultivate indigenous scientific and technical talent in developing countries by responding to research grant requests from Third World governments and institutions. The emphasis is on helping countries develop their own technology base. The final bill authorizes \$23,750,000 in new money, which will be augmented by \$66 million drawn from programs now located in the Agency for International Development (AID). The appropriations hurdle is yet to be jumped.

The institute has been represented by its Administration promoters as a concrete goodwill offering that American delegates can present when they go to Vienna this month for the U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development (UNCSTD).

Although creation of the institute has had wide support, it has its critics. Some say new initiatives can be han-

dled within AID; others say an even more autonomous new organization is necessary. A staffer on the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, which handled the measure, says certain critics doubt that the formation of the institute will impress developing countries at the U.N. conference. Some regard it as a small-gauge "package of tricks" that implicitly dismisses the large and fundamental issues that developing countries want to address at the conference—such as the role of multinational corporations in the Third World, and issues of patent policy and transfer of proprietary technology. The United States has spent \$3 million preparing for UNCSTD, but State Department officials have indicated that many of the topics Third World nations want to address at the conference should be reserved for discussion at the periodic U.N. Conferences on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). Thus the creation of the institute, according to critics, rather than being hailed by developing countries, may be cynically dismissed as an attempt to foreclose discussion of larger issues.

The institute, which beat out a competing proposal by Senator Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill.) for a more autonomous entity, pretty accurately reflects the organization favored by its chief advocate, presidential science adviser Frank Press.

Ralph Smuckler, director of the planning office for the institute, says it is not intended as the answer to development, it just offers a cooperative route for stimulating indigenous research and development and for technology transfer. He says it also offers a new way of working with what are now called middle-income countries—those that have outgrown the need for aid and are looking for joint projects.

The institute will join AID and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation under the umbrella of the new International Development Cooperation Agency. The IDCA was created under the Administration's reorganization powers and is a vastly thinned-down version of a plan the late Senator Hubert Humphrey had promoted to pull together all the government's development activities. The head of IDCA, Tom Ehrlich, formerly of the Legal Services Corporation, was confirmed by the Senate on 1 August.

Constance Holden