consume lecithin, which Growden supplies in a milk shake, the amount of choline in the blood rises and more choline is delivered to the brain. In a doubleblind crossover study, Growden and his associate Suzanne Corkin found that only 4 of 13 patients showed any improvement when given lecithin and even those patients improved on only one of a battery of psychological tests. "The cholinergic hypothesis remains persuasive," Growden says. "It may be that we have not found the right drugs. Perhaps we should combine drugs to simulate acetylcholine receptors and to increase acetylcholine synthesis. Perhaps we should also stimulate somatostatin."

Of course, the fact that Alzheimer's disease patients seem to make too little acetylcholine does not mean that there is a single cause of the disease. As Drachman points out, it could mean that the acetylcholine-producing neurons are the most vulnerable to a variety of insults. One such insult could be a lack of brain glucose, which itself could have numerous causes; another could be a slow virus infection. Another, suggested by James Austin of the University of Colorado, might be a change in brain microtubules which could produce the neurofibrillary tangles. Others include oxygen deprivation and exposure to toxic metals such as aluminum.

But even if Alzheimer's disease has multiple causes, it may have a single effective treatment. Consistent neurochemical findings are an important first step in devising a rational treatment, the conference participants agreed. "I want to stress my optimism in this area," Davies concluded.—GINA BARI KOLATA

Astronomers Look to the 1980's

Their latest 10-year plan should give them a united front for the coming budget wars

Now that the Reagan Administration has proposed its first round of budget cuts, it seems that funding for the physical sciences will emerge relatively unscathed. Still, the next few years promise to be stringent ones for all the sciences.

One discipline, however, astronomy, seems in a stronger position to defend its needs than most. With fortuitous timing the Astronomy Survey Committee of the National Academy of Sciences, under the leadership of George B. Field, director of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, has just finished hammering out the discipline's priorities for the decade ahead. Its report is due out this summer after academy review and approval.

The academy has sponsored 10-year reports in other fields, of course, but the astronomers and astrophysicists are especially excited about theirs. Between the 21-member Field committee itself and all its subsidiary panels and working groups, some 200 researchers were able to take part. That is a significant fraction of the 1000 or so active research astronomers and astrophysicists in the United States, one observer notes; thus the report will represent a wide consensus. This, in turn, should make it easier for NASA or NSF to sell a particular project on Capitol Hill: the agency can say that the whole community is behind it. Moreover, the report will rank each priority without regard to the federal agency that will manage it. "And that kind of list is something the Office of Management and Budget is very interested in," says Field.

This kind of thinking isn't really as wistful as it might seem. The 1970's were relatively good years for federallyfunded astronomy; many astronomers attribute this largely to the influence of the Field committee's predecessor, the Greenstein committee of 1972.

Chaired by Jesse L. Greenstein of the California Institute of Technology, the committee produced a report that was short (about 150 pages), clearly written, and very specific in identifying and ranking its priorities. It, too, represented a community-wide consensus, and most of the projects it recommended have since been implemented. These include the Very Large Array near Socorro, New Mexico; the Multi-Mirror Telescope atop Mount Hopkins in Arizona; the three Earth-orbiting High Energy Astronomical Observatories; and the \$750 million Space Telescope, to be launched in the mid-1980's. (Two other Greenstein proposals, however, the orbiting Gamma Ray Observatory and the 25-meter, millimeter-wave radio telescope, have been deferred by President Reagan.)

With memory of the Greenstein report still strong, the members of the Field committee have spent many long hours in arguments and negotiations over their own recommendations. The report will not be just a shopping list, says Field. The committee members were acutely aware that with money as tight as it is, listing an expensive project third instead of second might delay it for years, even kill it.

Field is reluctant to talk about specific projects and their rankings before the academy has approved and released the report. But it is no secret that advances in technology have placed astronomy on the verge of a new generation of instrumentation. Proposals having broad support within the community include an advanced x-ray orbital observatory for studying very high energy events; a ground-based telescope some 15 meters across for analyzing the spectra of very dim and distant objects; and a continent-spanning interferometer array, a system of radio telescopes that may be able to resolve structure in the interior of quasars.

Of course, no one report, however well-written, is going to have much of an impact by itself; Washington is full of reports. But astronomers have some other things going for them. One is the inherent appeal of their subject; people are turned on by black holes, quasars, and the Big Bang. Another is that astronomers and astrophysicists as a group have been notably articulate and energetic in making their needs known. Finally, as pointed out by Herbert Friedman, chairman of the academy's Assembly of Mathematical Research and Physical Sciences, the style of astronomical research is significant: "Optical, infrared, radio, xray—we need the full spectrum and all the methods of observing to figure out what is going on with a given object." Astronomers, he says, are used to working together.—M. MITCHELL WALDROP