peptides, they were bought commercially, so no personal acknowledgment was required, but it is customary to indicate the source of such materials so that others can replicate the experiment. The Scripps group in their article leave the impression that synthesis of the peptides—not a negligible skill—was performed in-house: "We chemically synthesized part of the R protein," they say, whereas in fact a chemist at Peninsula Laboratories did so.

The Scripps group did offer Doolittle a coauthorship on their paper, but emphasize that they did so only on account of the computer search he undertook. They did not tell him the paper described use of the synthetic antigen method, or show him a copy of the manuscript. Doolittle declined the offer, correctly supposing it was just the computer search that they wished to recognize. Whether they should have acknowledged the conversation about Walter's work is a question that depends in part on how much help the information was to them. In favor of an acknowledgment not being necessary is the fact that the information was volunteered, not solicited.

"We think we are fairly generous acknowledgers," comments Lerner. "We are not going to thank Doolittle for an idea he didn't give us. Verma has been abundantly acknowledged—he is a coauthor on two of our papers even though all he did was provide us with two clones. As for the synthetic antigens, peptides can now be synthesized by machine. We designed those peptides and synthesized them in every way except for doing what the machine did."

By not telling Doolittle of their own approach, however, the Scripps group gained an advantage which Doolittle sees as unfair. From that moment, as he puts it, "These people knew they were in a horse race and I didn't. Wherever the idea came from, they knew we would be publishing soon and because of that, their work went astonishingly fast. That was the other thing that gave me pause—how could they have done the work so quickly? As a result, it was very hasty work experimentally, and they got the wrong answer."

Lerner sees nothing remarkable in the speed with which his experiment was conducted. But it does so happen that the experiment is thought by some virologists to be incorrect, at least in its major premise that the R protein of Moloney virus is a new gene product consisting of some 96 amino acid units. "Lerner didn't find anything new; there is no R protein," says Oroszlan. According to

(*Continued on page 628*)

AID Science Funds Emerge in New Guise

Two years ago Congress voted to establish an Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation (ISTC) to foster technological links between the United States and developing countries. But the institute, which was enthusiastically endorsed by prominent members of the scientific establishment, was promptly killed when the Senate refused to appropriate any money for it. Recently, however, elements of ISTC have been resurrected in new guises.

A reorganization under way in the Agency for International Development (AID) will create a new high-level Bureau for Science and Technology, which will administer AID grants to universities in the United States and abroad. It will also be the focal point for coordinating and supporting AID's research and development activities.

The director of the new bureau will be none other than Nyle Brady, the man who was chosen to head ISTC before it foundered in the Senate. Brady, whose nomination is now pending before the Senate, was formerly director of the International Rice Research Institute, the Philippines-based research center that spearheaded the development of high-yielding varieties of rice.

Aficionados of the workings of the foreign aid bureaucracy point out that Brady will rank above other AID bureau chiefs, for he is the only one to hold the title of senior associate administrator.

Another direct descendant of the ISTC proposal is an unprecedented arrangement under which the National Academy of Sciences will receive a $36 million grant from AID to support science and technology in developing countries. About half the grant, which will extend over a 5-year period, will be used to fund research and development projects in developing countries. The arrangement was finalized last January. Funds for the grant are coming from the office of the science adviser to the administrator of AID. When Congress decided not to fund ISTC, it added some $12 million a year to AID's budget for science and technology and gave the science adviser discretion over how the additional money should be spent. The grant to the Academy will account for the bulk of this new fund.

The Academy's program will be conducted by the Board on Science and Technology for International Development (BOSTID). According to John Hurley, BOSTID's deputy director, the funds will be used to support research and development in such areas as nontraditional food crops and fast-growing tree species. BOSTID itself has expressed the need for such studies in past reports to AID.

The grant represents a major new departure for the Academy, and the arrangement was agreed to only after considerable internal discussion in the governing council. For the first time the Academy will be taking on responsibility for managing a large government program, thereby relinquishing some of its vaunted independence from the federal bureaucracy.

—Colin Norman

Triage Applied to British Universities

British universities are digesting the bad news about government funding over the next 3 years. The universities, which depend on the treasury for the bulk of their budgets, face cuts of upwards of 11 percent in operating funds by the 1983–1984 academic year and enrollment reductions of 3 to 5 percent. An estimated 3000 academics could get the sack. Although budgets at all 47 universities will be reduced, the pain will be shared unevenly. Ten institutions face relatively slight cuts. At the other end of the scale, a luckless five will suffer reductions of from 17 to 27.5 percent in annual funding. Most are scheduled for cuts at more or less the average 11-plus percent.

While the universities are publicly financed, the distribution of funds is made by the University Grants Committee (UGC), a peculiarly British institution originally designed to bolster university autonomy. The 20 members of the committee, most of them academics, are appointed by the minister of education. The UGC is technically an advisory committee, but its advice is always followed. Its deliberations are not public, and its members

0036-8075/81/0807-0626$01.00/0