script based upon the research they have conducted."

Kendler says this was a "one-sided" plan in that it gave Diehl a green light to publish without the clinicians' consent. Neither he nor Dewey accepted it, arguing that the diagnostic data should remain under Kendler's control. The MCV team learned that Diehl was preparing a manuscript for publication, although they didn't understand how Diehl was able to analyze the results without all the data. (Diehl says he copied some data contributed by colleagues while at MCV, and that as a co-investigator, he was entitled to take such paper files with him.)

With Diehl gone, a new molecular biologist, Richard Straub, arrived at MCV in 1993. By the summer of 1994, Straub had completely redone the analysis of chromosome 6, confirming Diehl's earlier finding. "We felt we really couldn't sit on it," Kendler says. "It was too important. ... We wanted to get the science out." So on 23 August 1994, the MCV team and Walsh faxed an announcement to "20 leading groups" in psychiatric genetics. It reported that "we are following up unpublished linkage results observed by Dr. Scott Diehl (while at MCV in 1992–1993)." In three pages, it sought to cover all the ground, listing positive results for linkage to schizophrenia and several genetic markers in the region 6p22-25. The MCV group staked out this turf again in a presentation at the International Congress on Schizophrenia Research in April.

Meanwhile, Diehl's manuscript—with co-authors including statistical analyst Lynn Goldin, a geneticist at NIMH, and some of Diehl's former MCV staff who accompanied him to NIH, including biologist Shengbiao Wang (first author)—was submitted to *Nature Genetics*. Kevin Davies, editor of *Nature Genetics*, says he was unaware of the controversy swirling behind the scenes. Today, he adds, the "most constructive" way to solve the problem is to entertain manuscripts from others who feel aggrieved. (Kendler and Straub are submitting their manuscript this week.)

When Diehl's paper appeared, it contained a big surprise for his former colleagues. The genetic marker that Diehl highlighted (D6S260), which gave the strongest evidence of linkage between schizophrenia and chromosome 6, is one that no one at MCV had ever heard of. "It isn't in our database," says Kendler, who marvels that Diehl was able to study it at MCV without telling his colleagues about it. Kendler wonders whether Diehl removed some biological materials or digital information from the lab and analyzed them elsewhere. Diehl strongly denies this. The initial research with D6S260 was performed at MCV, Diehl says, but "that marker had never been input into our computer system" because he had to leave in such a hurry. "We never had time" to enter the data, Diehl says. He claims he left information in the lab, but that the MCV team "never figured out what they had in hand."

Although the struggle over chromosome 6 goes on, many feel that the worst of the battle is over. According to NIDR's acting director, Dushanka Kleinman, the government has undertaken two fence-mending efforts. Diehl and his colleagues are considering sending a note to *Nature Genetics* to "clarify the authorship" issues. And NIH's top brass, under the guidance of Michael Gottesman, associate director for intramural research, is putting together a special panel to see whether NIH handled this case in the best possible way and whether it needs to change any of its policies.

–Eliot Marshall

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

O'Leary Takes Swipe at Bureaucracy

Surrounded by huge charts and graphs, Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary last week promised to cut more than $14 billion over the next 5 years from the Department of Energy's (DOE's) budget without jettisoning any research programs. O'Leary and a team of DOE officials want to slash the number of employees and sell off everything from DOE's power-marketing administrations to gold and highly enriched uranium. Almost 4000 jobs will be eliminated. In contrast, O'Leary singled out science and technology as favored missions: "We're cutting out the crap so we can do this work," she told reporters at a press briefing. The result will be a "dramatically different and rationalized DOE."

Chop shop. O'Leary would "cut out the crap" to save science.

O'Leary has little choice. In December, shortly after the Republicans won control of Congress on a promise to shrink government, the Clinton Administration floated the idea of eliminating DOE and several other agencies. To avert that fate, O'Leary promised the White House that she could make dramatic reductions. And while many of those Republicans still want to abolish DOE, O'Leary is betting that her plan is radical enough to quiet the critics.

Her proposal for the national labs incorporates many of the recommendations made in February by a panel led by Motorola Chairman Robert Galvin, although not Galvin's idea of privatizing them (*Science*, 10 February, p. 787). The plan is expected to save $1.4 billion, mostly by reducing personnel at the labs and at the DOE field offices that oversee them. O'Leary is also creating a lab management board to oversee the strategic direction of the labs, now set by individual lab directors. But the secretary reiterated her opposition to a recommendation by the Galvin panel to get Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory out of the business of designing nuclear weapons over the next 5 years. "I do not think it can be done" that fast, she said. "And we would need to do that very carefully."

O'Leary may gain support from an interagency panel of the National Science and Technology Council, chaired by DOE, which is looking at Livermore's future. Its report is due 31 October, but O'Leary says she would like it by September so that its advice can be worked into the 1997 budget request. One Administration official predicted its conclusion will bolster her preference for moving cautiously.

O'Leary's plan earned bipartisan praise last week from science advocates in Congress. Representative Robert Walker (R–PA), chair of the House Science Committee, called it "a vital and necessary step in reforming government and saving taxpayers' money." Representative George Brown (D–CA), the ranking minority member of the panel, said it was "a perfect example of how we can move to make responsible cuts without sacrificing more of our diminishing national science and technology capability."

But while the plan seems the epitome of fiscal austerity, congressional staffers and Energy Department officials say it will not relieve pressure to drop one or more of several proposed research facilities, including the National Ignition Facility at Livermore or the Tokamak Physics Experiment at Princeton University that are central to the U.S. fusion effort. The President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology hopes to complete a report this summer outlining fusion's future.

Congress still must hash out DOE's fate. Brown noted that O'Leary's plan "is not the last word from the department on savings," and Walker added that the secretary "has provided a useful first step, but reorganization is not the end of the walk." For DOE's research programs, that means waiting to see what lies around the next budget corner.

–Andrew Lawler