Responsibility Research Center, which analyzes public policy issues for institutional investors. While the profit incentives are currently lacking to intensify industry efforts nationwide, Fenn says some companies are pushing efficiency harder because it is less risky than construction. "We see utility adoption of this strategy as a sign of good management," says Fenn. Managements that are not very interested in this, he adds, "are probably shooting themselves in the foot." ■ MARK CRAWFORD

ADDITIONAL READING

Energy Policies and Programmes of IEA Countries (International Energy Agency, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France, 1988).

Annual Energy Outlook [Office of Energy Markets and End Use, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy (DOE/EIA-0383[87]), Washington, DC 20585].

Designing and Evaluating DSM Rebate Programs: Analytical Tools and Case-Study Application (Alliance To Save Energy, 1925 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, April 1988).

NSF's Bloch Attacks Iowa State's Pork

When National Science Foundation (NSF) Director Erich Bloch spoke on the campus of Iowa State University (ISU) on 17 October, he stressed the need for Congress and the scientific community to rely on merit review rather than political gamesmanship in deciding what research to fund. Bloch cited a recent action by Congress to require the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to fund a new, $7.5-million research center, as an improper way to allocate scarce research money.

Bloch did not mention the recipient of the funds. ISU officials, however, knew his remarks were directed at the university and they have protested. ISU President Gordon P. Eaton has sent Bloch a six-page, single-spaced letter, stating that he was being unfair in portraying the appropriation for a "Center for Integrated Design, Nondestructive Evaluation, and Manufacturing" as a pork-barrel research program.

Eaton asserted that the appropriation is "the result of 12 months of discussion with NIST regarding how they, as an agency with a developing mission in the manufacturing sciences, might link up with the existing ISU Center for Nondestructive Evaluation." He said the university was not attempting to bypass a technical review process. NIST, he added, is not bound to give the funds to ISU.

ISU, however, previously failed to get NSF to fund the materials research endeavor as part of the agency's science and engineering centers program. Moreover, NIST officials told *Science* that their fiscal year 1989 budget request never included any funding for the project.

With the help of Representative Neal Smith (D–IA), a member of the House Appropriations Committee, the funding bill for the Department of Commerce was amended to provide $7.5 million for a cooperative materials research program. Although ISU is not designated by name, an appropriations committee aide told *Science* that the amendment was tailored for the university. ■ MARK CRAWFORD

Erickson Charge Dropped

James Erickson, the former director of malaria research at the Agency for International Development (AID) has won a partial victory in a long-running battle over his personnel record. Eighteen months after charging him with engaging in sexual harassment (*Science* 29 July, p. 521), AID on 3 November withdrew the allegation.

Erickson will be punished instead for the lesser offense of using bad judgment in that he had an affair with a contract employee who worked for his office.

In reducing a proposed penalty from 14 to 7 days without pay, AID official Robert Halligan wrote: "Having considered the record as a whole, I find that the evidence before me does not rise to this level of proof [required by U.S. regulations]. . . . Consequently, the charges of quid pro quo and hostile environment sexual harassment are withdrawn." ■ ELIOT MARSHALL

Soviets Invite U.S. Scientists to Planets

Following up on the U.S.–Soviet Space Cooperation Agreement, which was signed in the spring of 1987 and then extended at the Moscow Summit of June 1988, Soviet planetary scientists have officially invited their American counterparts to participate in all of their country's upcoming planetary missions. The invitation was announced on 10 November at the conclusion of a meeting in Washington between high-level Soviet scientists and officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

As a first step, four additional U.S. scientists were named to participate in the Soviets' upcoming Phobos mission to Mars, joining the six Americans who had already received informal invitations before the agreement was signed. Launched in July, Phobos is scheduled to arrive at the Red Planet in January 1989. In return, ten Soviets were named to participate in the U.S. Mars Observer mission, scheduled for launch in 1992. Three-member Soviet teams have also been invited to participate in next year's Magellan radar mapper mission to Venus, and in the Voyager encounter with Neptune in August 1989.

Looking further ahead, NASA and the Soviets also discussed a deeper U.S. involvement in the Soviet Mars 1994 mission, which is now in its planning stages. One NASA proposal, which aroused considerable interest, was to fly an infrared mapping instrument that had to be dropped from the U.S. Mars Observer. The instrument's $40-million development cost could be shared three ways, since the French national space agency, which has a long-standing collaboration with the Soviet planetary program, is also interested. And once developed, it could be duplicated and reused on future missions. ■ M. MITCHELL WALDROP

Britain to Boost Research Spending

The British government has announced that it plans to make a 16% increase next year in the funds made available to support research through the five research councils financed by the Department of Education and Science. It will be the first significant increase in the budget for basic science since the beginning of the decade.

No decision has yet been made on how the extra money, which will raise the joint budgets of the research councils from $1.24 billion in the current financial year to $1.44 billion in the year beginning 1 April 1989, will be divided among the councils. This will depend on advice provided by the Advisory Board for the Research Councils, which will report back to the government at the beginning of December.

However, the new money has been broadly welcomed in the scientific community, and is being seen as concrete evidence backing up recent declarations by various government ministers, including Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, that support for basic research is now an important government priority (*Science*, 4 November, p. 664).

The five research councils, covering science and engineering, medicine, agriculture and food, the natural environment, and economics and the social sciences, are the chief sponsors of basic research in Britain. They currently account for about 18% of the total amount spent by the government on research and development.

■ DAVID DICKSON