

zation plan has some interesting implications for NIH. First, after six years of independence, NIMH is being returned to the NIH fold. As far as NIMH's biomedical research is concerned, the transfer will probably not make much difference because it never really left the NIH campus, and there has continued to be considerable integration of facilities and programmes. Dr John Eberhart, Assistant NIMH Director for Mental Health Research, has continued to attend meetings of NIH programme directors, for example, and the NIH Division of Research Grants has provided many of the same services for NIMH that it provides for other institutes of NIH.

But the transfer does bring into the NIH many service activities which have not previously been its concern (although the cancer bill has recently given NIH authority to run cancer control programmes). Many such health services are connected with NIMH's drug abuse activities, which are being kept in the institute more because of legal difficulties than anything else. The Administration has been toying with the idea of either splitting them off into a separate addiction agency or transferring them to the Center for Disease Control, but because they were originally consigned to NIMH by act of Congress, they could only be split off with Congressional approval.

As for NIH's Bureau of Health Manpower Education, the Administration's proposed budget cuts and the non-renewal of legislation dealing with manpower for health and allied professions have severely reduced its activities and effectively separated its programmes from other NIH activities. Although the events which have led to such a situation have been painfully felt and bitterly attacked in the medical schools, they have removed much of the original justification for placing the bureau under NIH control.

The transfer of NIMH back to NIH has been called a downgrading of the federal government's mental health programmes. That may be so, but for NIMH the writing was on the wall in January, when President Nixon's budget was unveiled. The budget proposed phasing out federal funding of community mental health centres (CMHCs), a programme launched by President Kennedy in 1963 as a bold new approach to caring for the mentally ill. The CMHC programme has resulted in the setting up of about 400 centres providing mental health care on a community basis, funded partly by NIMH and partly by state and local governments. Ironically, the Administration has proposed that federal support should be withdrawn because the centres are so successful—the argument is that the states will pick up funding with money from general revenue sharing.

Sakharov Honoured

THE National Academy of Sciences has elected Dr Andrei D. Sakharov, the dissident Soviet nuclear physicist, as a foreign associate. Sakharov, who played a leading role in development of the H-bomb in the Soviet Union and who has recently been in trouble with Soviet authorities for his championship of civil liberties, is one of only 12 scientists to be elected as foreign associates of the academy this year. Dr Philip Handler, NAS President, said last week that Sakharov's election was "by no means for political reasons"—his nomination came from the academy's physics section for original scientific research. He is, in fact, one of three Soviet scientists to be elected as foreign associates of the academy last week, the others being Vladimir Engelhardt, Institute of Molecular Biology, and I. S. Shlovsky, Institute of Space Research.

Other foreign associates elected were Sune Bergstrom, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm; Albert Eschenmoser, Technische Hochschule, Zurich; Dennis Gabor, Imperial College, London; David Glass, London School of Economics; Jean Goguel, Ecole des Mines, Paris; Motoo Kimura, National Institute of Genetics, Japan; George Klein, Karolinska Institutet; Ben Roy Mottelson, Institute for Theoretical Physics, Copenhagen; and V. Ramalingaswami, All-India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi.

NAS/NAE

Options Kept Open

by our Washington Correspondent

THE annual meeting of the National Academy of Engineering last week passed a resolution requesting the NAE's governing council to prepare a plan for incorporating the academy as a non-profit corporation separate from the National Academy of Sciences. But several amendments to the resolution, proposed from the floor, have kept options open for the NAE and they should help to ensure that the two academies will be able to live in harmony whether or not their planned divorce is made final.

In short, the resolution authorizes (but does not direct) the council to seek approval at its annual meeting in October of its plan to establish the NAE as a corporation, but it also suggests that

negotiations should be continued with the National Academy of Sciences, that a Congressional Charter should be prepared and that the members should be given at least two options for action before the next annual meeting. The chances are that the NAE will set up shop independently of the NAS, but NAE officials emphasized after the meeting that whatever the final outcome of the breakaway movement, they hope that the two academies will continue to work together on problems and studies of mutual interest.

The basis of the long-standing disagreement between the two academies is the management of the National Research Council, their joint operating arm. Governance of the NRC is vested solely in the hands of the Council of the NAS, and NAE officials want it to have a tighter management structure (see *Nature*, 243, 5; 1973). The NAE, which was set up in 1964 and has since been operating under the charter of the NAS, also wants to be more visible in the engineering community.

Shockley Again

FOR the past seven years, Dr William Shockley, co-inventor of the transistor, has been trying to persuade the National Academy of Sciences to examine the evidence for his belief that genetic factors make blacks less intelligent than whites. He failed again last week when the annual meeting turned down his familiar resolution calling for a committee to study the matter, but this year the meeting passed a substitute resolution which may help to blunt criticism from Shockley's supporters that the academy is treating him like a latter-day Galileo.

Offered by the academy's governing council, the substitute resolution acknowledged Shockley's efforts to bring his studies to the academy's attention, and encouraged "him and others engaged in such efforts to follow the normal scientific procedures of publication so that their results may be subjected to the usual peer review and accorded the scientific impact afforded by such publication". A preamble to the resolution said that Shockley's previous attempts had been voted down without debate because "only a small minority of the membership has any expertise in the field and . . . many of those with expertise doubt that the field has progressed to the point at which a definitive conclusion is warranted".