

wouldn't be unreasonable."

Will the compromise work? Data bank director Koetzle says he will go along with the IUCr policy in applying the requested delays. But the cooperation of either journals or funding agencies will be required to force researchers to deposit the information in the first place.

Even crystallographers who claim to support the IUCr guidelines admit that their laboratories have not always deposited coordinates promptly—or at all. DNA researcher Alexander Rich of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was a cosigner of Richards' letter, but he acknowledges that some coordinates from his lab were not deposited due to oversight. "With active labs, not

everything gets nailed down," he says.

Slip-ups, innocent or otherwise, can lead to valuable information being lost forever. "I know of one case where they just never got around to [depositing the coordinates] and then they literally lost the numbers," says Helen Berman of Rutgers University, who participated in the IUCr commission. "It was a structure that other people were interested in." UCLA's Dickerson, while sympathetic to the notion that innocent oversight can occur, warns that there are repeat offenders, who hide behind the excuse of inadvertent error.

If journals don't formulate and enforce strict policies, the funding agencies may adopt their own remedies, Dickerson warns.

Marvin Cassman, acting deputy director of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, agrees. Although he said he knows of no cases so far in which nondeposition of coordinate data has influenced a decision on funding, he said it is conceivable that such considerations could have an influence in the future. But Cassman said he hopes things won't come to that. "[Crystallographers] are acting in a responsible way. There is a lot of debate going on. It's not a trivial issue. I really sincerely hope the scientific community will be able to come to some kind of agreement . . . because NIH has never really acted as a regulatory agency for this kind of thing, and I certainly hope that won't be necessary." ■ **MARCIA BARINAGA**

Help Wanted: Director, NIH

"This is not the time for the general to leave the battlefield to go back to the Pentagon," AIDS chief Anthony S. Fauci told *Science*. Fauci, at the top of the list of candidates for the directorship of the National Institutes of Health, has formally withdrawn from consideration in order to continue his basic research on AIDS.

Members of the NIH search committee who learned of Fauci's decision from *Science* expressed two consistent sentiments: "I'm very disappointed. I was sure Tony would take the job," said one, adding "but I have no doubt that he made the right decision."

Fauci's decision to stick with research now forces the Administration to face a troublesome question: Will someone else on the search committee's list take the job? Health and Human Services Secretary Louis Sullivan responded with a discernible pause when asked that by *Science* at a press breakfast last week. "Good people have a number of options," Sullivan said. "We will need to convince one of those people that the NIH director's job would be as challenging and rewarding as what they're already doing."

Those "good people," whose names have been sent to Sullivan unranked after a 3-month search, are William H. Danforth, chancellor of Washington University, St. Louis; P. Roy Vagelos, chief executive officer of Merck & Company; Philip Leder, chairman of genetics at Harvard Medical School; and Leon E. Rosenberg, dean of Yale University School of Medicine.

None of the four has as yet been told by either Sullivan or James O. Mason, HHS assistant secretary for health, that he is on the short list, according to the candidates. Nor, apparently, have people on the search committee's list of additional candidates. They include Institute of Medicine president Samuel O. Thier; Harvard dean Daniel C. Tosteson; and Bernadine P. Healy, chairman of the Research Institute at the Cleveland Clinic Foundation (*Science*, 8 September, p. 1046).

A Merck spokesman says Vagelos is not leaving. Leder says simply, "I am a working scientist with a very full research agenda." Rosenberg believes that the crucial element in the search is to find someone "who understands the importance of the NIH director's job and who has a real feel for the issues it faces." Thier has made a commitment to continue at the Institute of Medicine. Tosteson appears to be thriving at Harvard.

The NIH director's job, which ought to be the pinnacle in biomedical science, has lost a lot of its luster during the past

decade as the director's authority has been eroded. For instance, Congress had elevated the heart and cancer directorships to the status of presidential appointment, in effect giving these two posts independent power. Because each of the 11 NIH institutes' budgets is handled separately by Congress, the NIH director has little to say there. And, because the top NIH post carries no significant financial independence, the director lacks authority to take initiatives on his own.

As one observer noted, the only reason to accept the post unless its scope is changed is "as a genuine act of public service."

On that score, Danforth is at the top of the list. A member of a conservative Republican family that has made a fortune in the Ralston Purina company, Danforth is known to have a strong belief that public service is a duty. And he has good political connections, including his brother, U.S. Senator John C. Danforth, who is ranking minority member on the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Given his family wealth, Danforth may be the only NIH candidate who could readily afford to take the job, which pays less than \$100,000 and would entail real financial sacrifice for many of those on the list.

Money, of course, did not play a role in Fauci's decision to withdraw since he has been living with an NIH salary for more than 20 years and does not intend to leave the institutes at this point for more lucrative pastures.

Fauci has managed to lead a very productive research laboratory despite his administrative responsibilities at the allergy institute and has been in the public spotlight both because of his research and his role of AIDS coordinator for all of the National Institutes of Health. It was through this route that he came to know then Vice President George Bush during the past couple of years, leading Bush to make his now famous campaign declaration that Fauci is one of his heroes. Had Fauci decided to leave the lab, he would have been one of the few NIH directors in a quarter of a century to have real contact with the President.

The next step in the search process rests with Mason and Sullivan at Health and Human Services. For all practical purposes, the search committee appears to be out of the loop now, having fulfilled its mandate to submit a list of names—unranked—for the politicians to deal with.

It is said that the only one who can make a difference is George Bush himself. ■ **BARBARA J. CULLITON**