American College of Neuropsychopharmacology, and the Committee on Problems of Drug Dependence, to review Okamoto's published work. The committee has not yet finished its assessment, but Killam calls her work "impeccable," and "a shining, crystal example of how to do science."

In the meantime, the university mounted a response. In August 1987, a letter was drafted by a committee consisting of officials from the medical college and from the main campus in Ithaca, and it was sent out over the signature of Gregory Siskind, associate dean for sponsored programs at the medical college. It defended Okamoto's work, but stated: "The research . . . that required the use of the cat model has essentially been completed. New and important information has been obtained. Some has already been published. The remainder will soon be published in appropriate scientific journals. The research on drug addiction that will be pursued in the future by this laboratory requires the development and use of new methods and experimental systems that do not involve cats." Colleagues say Okamoto did not see the letter before it went out.

The protesters claimed victory and several congressional offices, including Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D–NY), sent letters to their constituents saying that the research had ended. Two months later, however, Okamoto applied for renewal of her grant. The protocol was reviewed and approved by Cornell's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, and the application was cosigned by Siskind.

Okamoto requested funding to develop an experimental model using rats instead of cats. But she also proposed to continue cat studies, investigating the effect of barbiturates on sleep cycles, using doses so low that no overt signs of withdrawal are produced.

A peer-review committee at NIDA approved the cat studies with a very good priority rating of 124, according to one source. However, it concluded that the proposed development of the rat model was not so well thought out and recommended that it not be funded. The decision was approved in July by NIDA's advisory council.

When the protesters heard that the cat studies had been funded for another 3 years, they raised hell. NIDA and Cornell got another spate of congressional queries. At that point, says Siskind, "it became an issue of institutional credibility, not an issue of animal rights." Siskind and Shires—who became dean in October 1987, after the original Cornell letter went out—met with Okamoto, and it was agreed that the grant would be declined. According to Shires, Cornell will support Okamoto from university funds at the same level as the NIDA grant, while she develops a new program.

The central question in all this is why did Cornell indicate in its letter that cats would not be used in the future? According to Siskind, that was not the intent, "but it is easy to see that it could be misinterpreted that way." He says "we thought we were leaving the door open if she wanted to do some more of the [cat] studies." Shires likens the letter to "a horse built by a committee that came out like a camel."

Because the cat research described in the renewal proposal differed from the earlier studies, and because it did provide for development of an alternative model, "we didn't think [the proposal] was inconsistent with anything we had said," Siskind says.

NIDA is not at all happy. In a letter to Siskind dated 28 October, which was copied to Shires, Cornell president Frank Rhodes, and Austin Kiplinger, chairman of the university's board of trustees, Schuster said, "I am disturbed that the productivity of public funds that we have invested in this project has been compromised." Pointing out that NIDA funds more than $1-million worth of research at Cornell, Schuster warned, "It is my responsibility to ensure that other research projects formally sponsored by Cornell and funded by NIDA will not be terminated for non-scientific reasons."

In a letter to Representative Bill Green (R–NY), Frederick Goodwin, head of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, NIDA's parent agency, said "we have learned from hard experience that the chances for effective drug abuse treatment improve with the extent of our knowledge about the underlying biological processes. In the light of this, it is particularly unfortunate that Dr. Okamoto's research will not be continuing." ■ **COLIN NORMAN**

Science After the Election

The transition from the Reagan to the Bush Administration got under way the day after the election, when President-elect George Bush named James A. Baker III as his choice for Secretary of State. It was the first of many similar announcements expected over the next 2 months, as Bush prepares what he says will be a sweeping change in the Administration's top political appointees. The transition period will also see an array of outside groups offering advice to the next president (see accompanying box).

Just how far Bush will reach into the subcabinet ranks in making personnel changes is not yet clear. But it should be noted that at least two posts that have direct responsibility for basic research programs—the directorships of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health—have traditionally not changed hands during a change of Administration.

Erich Bloch, the current director of NSF, pointed out to reporters last month that he has a 6-year term of office that extends until 1990, and he said he has no intention of changing jobs in the "foreseeable future." As for NIH, although the director's term of office is open-ended and he serves at the discretion of the President, the only time the incumbent was removed immediately after an election was in 1974, when Robert Marston was fired in the housecleaning that took place between the first and second terms of President Richard Nixon. That episode prompted a loud outcry from the scientific community.

One post whose status will change, if Bush lives up to a preelection promise, is that of the President's science adviser. In a speech delivered on 25 October, Bush promised to elevate the job from the lowly position to which it has sunk in the past several years to the rank of Assistant to the President. He also pledged to make his science adviser a "an active member of the Economic Policy Council and our national security planning process," and to appoint a Council of Science and Technology Advisers (*Science*, 4 November, p. 665).

At the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, there will be some changes next year in the Senate lineup that will affect committees with jurisdiction over science and technology. The major changes will be in the Senate Appropriations Committee. The chairman, John Stennis (D–MS), did not seek reelection, neither did William Proxmire (D–WI), chairman of the subcommittee that writes the budgets for NSF and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and Lawton Chiles (D–FL), chairman of the subcommittee that writes NIH's budget. In addition, Senator Lowell Weicker (R–CT), the ranking Republican on Chiles's subcommittee and a longtime supporter of NIH, narrowly lost a bid for a fourth term. Because most of the contenders for the Appropriations Committee chairmanship are also competing for the job of Senate Majority Leader, the lineup is unlikley to be settled until after Congress returns in January.

Over on the House side, the only major change with relevance to science and technology is expected to be in the chairmanship of the appropriations subcommittee that writes the budgets for NSF and NASA. Edward Boland (D–MA), who has served in the House for the past 36 years and chaired

the subcommittee since 1971, did not seek reelection. The next in line for the subcommittee chairmanship is Representative Robert Traxler (D–MI).

In addition to electing various officials to represent them, voters in several states also participated directly in the legislative process by approving or disapproving various initiatives on the ballot. Among them were the following:

■ **AIDS testing and reporting.** In California, the electorate said yes and no to AIDS measures dealing with the contentious issues of mandatory reporting and mandatory testing.

Voters strongly opposed Proposition 102, which would have forced physicians and others to report the names of people who were infected with the AIDS virus. This was the third time such a requirement appeared on a California ballot. Unlike the previous two attempts, which were sullied by their connection to political oddball Lyndon LaRouche, the most recent effort was cosponsored by Representative William Dannemeyer (R–CA), the conservative congressman who has failed to get a similar proposal through the U.S. Congress, and Paul Gann, California's popular crusader against taxes, who was infected with HIV during a blood transfusion in 1982. In a turn that surprised many, the measure also had the support of California Governor George Deukmejian. The proposition, though, was opposed by the California Medical Association and most public health officials, as well as AIDS researchers and advocates for AIDS patients. The proposal was defeated by a margin of 66% to 34%.

California voters did, however, approve Proposition 96, which will allow the courts to order mandatory testing of some criminal suspects for HIV. The measure was authored by the sheriff of Los Angeles County.

■ **Research on tobacco-related illness.** Again in California, where placing propositions on state-wide ballots has become a way of life, voters approved a tax hike of 25 cents for each pack of cigarettes. Proposition 99 is expected to generate $600 million in added revenues, which will go to support health education on smoking, treatment for uninsured patients, and research into tobacco-related illnesses. The $30 million for research will be doled out by the California legislature.

■ **Nuclear power.** Voters in Massachusetts turned down an initiative that would have shut down the state's two nuclear plants and foreclosed construction of future nuclear reactors. The measure was defeated by a margin of two to one.

■ COLIN NORMAN

William Booth contributed to this article.

Sic Transit Gloria Transition

One thing President-elect George Bush will not lack this fall is advice. During the 10-week interregnum between the election and inauguration, deep thinkers of all kinds will come knocking at his door offering expertise and guidance. Among the groups waiting to brief him are half-a-dozen claiming special insights on science and technology.

The transition is a slow-moving rite of passage, one that perhaps makes less sense now than it did in the 18th century, when officeholders had to trek to Washington by horse. Some argue that it is still useful as an educational cramming period for the new Chief Executive.

But in this case it seems less crucial than in others. The President-elect already has a grasp of bureaucratic protocol through his involvement in the Office of Management and Budget. He has a solid cadre of workers which has been on location in the White House for 8 years. But Bush and his staff are about to be reeducated.

On 9 November, Bush named two staffers to head his transition team and take the incoming advice. They are Craig Fuller, his former chief of staff, and Robert Teeter, a campaign strategist. James Baker III, Bush's campaign director and former Secretary of the Treasury, will be the new Secretary of State. C. Boyden Gray will be the White House counsel and Sheila Tate will be the transition press secretary. Chase Untermeyer, a former assistant secretary of the Navy and the nominal transition chief until last week, will serve as White House personnel director.

According to an authoritative count taken by *National Journal* reporter Kirk Victor, well over 30 groups are mobilized, white papers in hand, to provide transition briefings to whomever they can corral. A sample of those with a technical flavor are:

■ The National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. "Brief, readable" reports will be coming forth in the next weeks, according to an Academy staffer, and they will contain "actual recommendations." Staffers will also provide briefings to the transition team. The four topics chosen for this high-priority treatment are: science advice to the President, AIDS research, space policy, and threats to the global environment.

■ The Carnegie Corporation of New York will offer some specialized advice on how the President should solicit science advice. Its Council on Science, Technology, and Government, cochaired by William Golden of the AAAS and Joshua Lederberg of Rockefeller University, will turn over its report in mid-November. After reading a science policy speech given by Bush in the last days of the campaign (*Science* 4 November, p. 665), Golden says, "It looks like the patient got our prescription." In that talk Bush promised to involve the science adviser in drafting the budget, among other things. Now, Golden says, the question is: "Will the patient take the medicine?"

■ The White Burkett Miller Center at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, has also put together a report on science advice to the President. That effort was cochaired by former national security adviser Brent Scowcroft and former Cornell University President Dale Corson. It went to the transition staff 2 weeks ago.

■ The Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has begun putting out a series of advisory papers to the President-elect on international economics, space policy, foreign affairs, and national security policy. In a press conference on 10 November, CSIS President David Abshire stressed the need for "immediate" action to avoid "an executive-legislative gridlock." He was particularly eager that the President reach a quick understanding with Democratic leaders on priorities in the defense budget. It is equally important to develop a strategy for conventional force reduction talks to begin in Europe next spring. CSIS urges the creation of a new post at the White House: assistant to the President for international economic affairs.

■ The National Academy of Public Administration has released a study, chaired by former Comptroller General Elmer Staats, on how to run the White House more efficiently. Although it urges the President to reduce the proliferation of special advisers and executive councils, it makes exceptions for science and economic policy.

■ The National Space Council, an advocate of vigorous space exploration and development, will add its work to the growing mountain of policy papers on this topic. "We're going to put it into the hands of whoever is designated to receive it," says staff chief David Brandt.

■ ELIOT MARSHALL