

his wife held stock. He also acknowledged that he received illegal payments from the company to paint his house and pay off a second mortgage.

The Salahuddin case was the subject of congressional hearings in May before Representative John Dingell's (D-MI) subcommittee on oversight and investigations (*Science*, 11 May, p. 676). At the time, Salahuddin declined to testify on Fifth Amendment grounds, but other testimony then revealed that Salahuddin misinformed Gallo about his association with Pan-Data when questions were first raised in 1985.

In a presentencing report, the U.S. attorney for Maryland, who prosecuted the case, recommended that Salahuddin be fined \$12,000—roughly the sum Pan-Data illegally paid him. The U.S. attorney also urged that Salahuddin be sentenced to 1750 hours of public service. It is possible that he will be able to spend these hours in the laboratory, working weekends on human herpes virus 6 on which he is expert.

Salahuddin, who was forced out of the National Institutes of Health, is now working at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles.

Social and Anti-Social Science

Social scientists were shaken by recent comments made by W. Glenn Campbell, the conservative economist from the Hoover Institution whom President Bush has nominated to the National Science Board. In published remarks, Campbell suggested that social scientists were already getting more money than they needed.

In an interview with the *Peninsula Times Tribune* of Palo Alto, California, Campbell said he was opposed to raising the National Science Foundation's social science budget: "I think they get enough money now." In another interview with the *Stanford Weekly*, Campbell took a swipe at econometric

studies, which he considers a waste of money because they rely on "unreal assumptions to reach silly conclusions." He was traveling on a steamboat in Europe last week and could not be reached for further comment.

Choosing his words carefully, Howard Silver of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) said merely that Campbell's remarks "caused concern." As COSSA's executive director, Silver has been campaigning for years to get NSF to give the social and behavioral sciences more respect—and money. While funding for other sciences has increased almost 120% in the past 8 years, he says money for the social and behavioral sciences has remained "static."


But Silver says that, Campbell notwithstanding, there are signs that change may be in the wind. Two major groups—the American Psychological Association and the American Sociological Association—this summer called upon NSF to create a



W. Glenn Campbell

Stanford University

new directorate for the social and behavioral sciences. Representatives Doug Walgren (D-PA) and George Brown, Jr. (D-CA) introduced a bill (HR 5543) that would do just that. And the NSF has put together a 20-member panel to examine the entire structure of the present Directorate of Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences. The biologists, Silver says, dominate the scene, and they don't realize yet how much the behavioral scientists resent that situation. The panel's report is due out next year.



Richest U.S. Science Prize. Paul C. Lauterbur, a researcher at the Center for Advanced Study at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and James E. Burke, former chief executive at Johnson & Johnson, last week became the first ever winners of the Bower Awards for science and business.

The new awards are part of the Benjamin Franklin National Memorial Awards program and will recognize a top scientist and a business leader who "embody the practical, entrepreneurial, and humanitarian spirit of Benjamin Franklin." Lauterbur's award is for his role in developing nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy and using that form of spectroscopy as an imaging tool in medicine. Burke wins the Bower business prize for his "innovative leadership" at Johnson & Johnson. The prize is a result of a bequest of \$7.5 million by Henry Bower, a Philadelphia chemical manufacturer.

Here's a hint: try to win the science prize. The winner gets a 2½-inch gold medal and \$290,000 in cash—the largest amount attached to any U.S. science prize. The winner of the business award just gets the medal.

Academy Tries No-Fault Defense

A plagiarism charge filed against the National Academy of Sciences by nutritionist-litigationist Victor Herbert last February has evoked a massive response. On 6 September, the academy lobbed back an inch-thick, 27-tab cannonade prepared by two of the academy's staff attorneys and three hired guns from the prestigious Washington, D.C., firm of Steptoe and Johnson.

The academy is seeking to have the case dismissed—not on some high moral ground saying it did nothing wrong, but on the (possibly) legally acceptable grounds that it was only following government orders.

Herbert accused the academy of publishing, without permission, his copyrighted work in its tenth edition of the *Recommended Dietary Allowances*. The panel of scientists originally assembled to prepare this bible of nutrition had gotten bogged down in a spat in 1985, and the academy settled it by rejecting everything they wrote. Then, in 1989, the academy published a rewritten version, including Herbert's chapter. In the interim, however, Herbert

had copyrighted his material and he demanded the academy pay a fee of \$300,000. Getting no satisfaction, he sued (*Science*, 2 March, p. 1022).

Normally, the academy likes to proclaim its independence from the federal government, but in this case, its lawyers are taking the opposite tack: "NIH/NIDDKD [the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases] mandated and controlled the academy's revision of the unapproved 1985 draft for inclusion in the tenth RDAs. NIH/NIDDKD's deep involvement in the process and the insistence that the unapproved 1985 draft be used left the academy with no discretion to pursue an alternative course. . . such as instituting a completely new effort, and indicates that the government implicitly authorized or consented to the actions taken by the academy." Or, more simply: the academy had no choice but to publish what NIH told it to publish. Therefore, if Herbert has a complaint, he should sue the U.S. government, not the academy.

A hearing date of 17 October has been set to consider the academy motion to dismiss Herbert's suit.