

In fact, Todaro says, the relationship with Bristol-Myers is so relaxed that the parent company doesn't necessarily have to know about every detail of Oncogen's research. "We're doing stuff on Alzheimer's disease," he said, adding "I don't know if they [Bristol] know about it. I don't even ask them. If it pans out, I will tell them. If it doesn't, a few people will have spent a year or two doing something that may lead nowhere. We've got an idea, we'll try it."

What lessons can be drawn from all of this for Genentech—and other companies that may be taken over in the future? The first is that takeovers aren't all bad. There is clearly an added dimension of security that may, in some instances, be quite good for research—even turning it toward more basic questions than it was possible to consider when the firm was independent.

Beyond that the picture is cloudy. Clearly, the emotional atmosphere that prevails after a takeover will depend heavily on the management style of the new owners and on the financial health of the subsidiary. But whether the post-takeover atmosphere is rosy or gloomy, in all these cases there does seem to be at least one common thread—a loss of the risky, entrepreneurial elation that drove the initial undertaking.

Indeed, there are those who fear that that process is already under way at Genentech. And they aren't all outsiders. One is David Martin, who, until he resigned from Genentech last November, was the longtime vice president of research and a person many feel was responsible for much of the risk-imbued creative atmosphere at Genentech.

Now a consultant to the firm, Martin says: "My concern . . . is that the people who have been responsible for the quality of science are going to feel this is no longer risky enough, no longer a challenge, and are going to leave anyway. Genentech has a group of remarkably talented risk-seekers. . . . The more risky something is, the more the adrenaline flows, and the more effective they are."

And yet Martin may be lamenting something that would inevitably have passed. After all, institutions grow up and the spirit appropriate to adolescence is no longer appropriate in middle age.

As a former Genentech employee put it: "A company ages like a person. It gets more mature—bigger, older, fatter. You can accept it or not. When you accept it, you can age gracefully. Genentech fought it. It was sort of like a frat house where people never graduate, or like a guy who reaches 50 and wears gold chains and his shirt half unbuttoned—it's grotesque. They should have said, listen, things will just be different as we get older."

■ MARCIA BARINAGA

NIH Goes "Extra Mile" on Gallo

In an unprecedented move, the National Institutes of Health has turned to the National Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Medicine for help in conducting an internal review of recurrent allegations against AIDS scientist Robert C. Gallo. *Science* has learned that NIH has asked the two organizations to nominate a slate of scientists who have no connection to the AIDS controversy or to Gallo to oversee the institute's own review of events leading to the discovery of the AIDS virus.

For most of his 30-year career as one of the National Cancer Institute's stars, Gallo has been a lightning rod for controversy, never more so than during the past 6 years when he has been the target of relentless accusations, often couched in innuendo, that he stole the AIDS virus from a French group headed by Luc Montagnier.

The most recent salvo came in December when Representative John Dingell (D-MI), provoked by a 50,000-word article on Gallo in the *Chicago Tribune*, wrote NIH a letter that could not be ignored (*Science*, 5 January, p. 19). The NIH, Dingell said, has not done a good job of investigating allegations against its scientists in the past. What, if anything, he demanded to know, was NIH planning to do in light of the *Tribune* article by reporter John Crewdson.

Former NIH director James B. Wyngaarden, now a deputy director of the White House science office, is among those who urged NIH officials to turn to outside observers in the hope that their oversight will preclude accusations that NIH is not entirely objective in its review.

For his part, Gallo supports the decision to name outside advisers. "I welcome this," he told *Science*. "These allegations have been going on too long. I have done nothing wrong and I have no apprehension or anxiety about the review. And, I'm confident that the only chance I have is the help of independent colleagues." Gallo's notebooks, correspondence, and other records have been in the hands of both NIH and French lawyers ever since the dispute about credit erupted in 1984. "There's nothing that hasn't been looked at over and over," says Gallo.

The NIH's top officials initially dismissed the Crewdson article as a rehash of a controversy that they think was settled by an agreement between the United States and France dividing the credit for discovering the AIDS virus between Gallo and Montagnier. But Dingell's letter, and the implicit threat of congressional hearings, drove NIH to launch an official review nonetheless, to be conducted under the institutes' Office of Scientific Integrity and coordinated within the National Cancer Institute by Richard Adamson. That review has now begun and Adamson is said to be going over the Crewdson article line by line. (Adamson will not talk with the press, or with NIH colleagues, about the investigation until it is complete.)

Now, NIH leaders have concluded that a strictly internal inquiry will not be sufficient to satisfy either Dingell or the scientific community that this time all the facts are in and no notebook page has been left unexamined. Acting NIH director William Raub, along with Joseph E. Rall, director of intramural science, have asked Frank Press, president of the National Academy of Sciences, and Samuel O. Thier, president of the NAS's Institute of Medicine, to nominate a slate of qualified observers to verify the independence and thoroughness of the NIH's own investigation. According to the current scenario, a jury of peers would then be selected from the NAS-IOM panel by James O. Mason, the assistant secretary for health. "We decided to go the 'extra mile' for the NIH's sake and for Dr. Gallo's," Raub told *Science*.

Press and Thier have agreed to propose such a panel with the stipulation that Mason confine his selection to that list and agree not to add anyone recommended by the government, which can be said to have a stake in the outcome because it is a signatory to the U.S.-French agreement.

Press and Thier, in consultation with their executive committees, are in the process of identifying individuals who are scientifically qualified to review the case, unconnected to Gallo, and willing to agree in advance to take the time necessary to do the job. If Mason accepts the NAS-IOM terms, a panel of potential jurors could be lined up within a couple of weeks.

Even so, Raub estimates that it will be a matter of months before the review is complete. "We'll be asking their advice on both the strategy of our review and the substance of the conclusions. We'll need some running room to do a thorough job."

■ BARBARA J. CULLITON