## Martin Cline Loses Appeal on NIH Grant

A Department of Health and Human Services board recently upheld a decision by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to withhold funding from UCLA researcher Martin J. Cline, who in July 1980 violated rules governing recombinant DNA research and experimentation on humans.

In May 1981, NIH terminated a 3-year grant to Cline from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. The money withheld amounted to $162,283. Cline appealed (*Science*, 11 December 1981, p. 1220).

The department appeals board found that the punishment was "clearly reasonable in relation to appropriate institutional concern about activities in an awesome and potentially dangerous area of science."

Cline may continue to apply for grants involving recombinant DNA research and human experimentation but must pass several more levels of approval than before. He must also provide written assurance that he is complying with federal regulations. These sanctions are in effect until May 1984.—***Marjorie Sun***

## Yale Announces Plan to Handle Charges of Fraud

In the first such move for a university or college, the president and Fellows of Yale University have announced a formal plan for dealing with fraudulent research, especially deceit committed as part of team research. The full text of the policy on cheating appeared in a September issue of the Yale *Bulletin*.

The Yale Medical School in 1980 was shaken by an administrative imbroglio in which allegations against Professor Philip Felig and a data-fabricating colleague were basically ignored for 1 year, due in part to Felig's continuing assurances that his associate's work was credible (*Science*, 3 October 1980, p. 38). As Felig later told a congressional inquiry, "Recent events indicate that trust may be misplaced. Mechanisms should exist for a review process that takes the matter out of the hands of involved investigators."

The Yale fraud policy attempts to do just that. It centers on administrative mechanisms whereby deans, the president, or a university tribunal might investigate charges of misconduct. It goes on to spell out in some detail the responsibilities of various investigators involved in team research. "When research is published under multiple authorship . . . it must be self-evident that any fraud or inauthenticity in the work will taint all the authors. By claiming authorship of a scholarly publication, each collaborator must accept the discredit, as well as the credit, for the collaborative effort."

—***William J. Broad***

## Science Council Previews Report on Federal Labs

A White House Science Council panel studying the Department of Energy (DOE) multiprogram laboratories has concluded that the laboratories are an important national resource but are not being effectively utilized. Panel chairman David Packard passed along this assessment in a progress report to the council at its 17 September meeting.

Packard indicated that the panel will make recommendations for major changes in several areas where it perceives shortcomings. Severely critical of DOE management of the labs, the panel is expected to urge a curbing of "micromanagement" of lab projects by DOE officials and an increase in lab directors' authority over R & D decisions. A need is seen for better cooperation between the laboratories and industry, particularly more effective transfer of technology from the labs to industry. Packard said that the panel feels that current projects should be subjected to "market evaluation" and that certain work, particularly in alternative energy sources, should be done only with industry cooperation through joint funding.

Packard says that the panel's findings are generally in line with those of the Energy Research Advisory Board's panel on the DOE labs (*Science*, 10 September, p. 1015), but that his panel's recommendations could be tougher.—***John Walsh***

## Centaur Wars (Continued)

On 15 September the House of Representatives cleared the way for NASA to adopt the Centaur as an upper stage for the space shuttle. Starting in the mid-1980's, Centaurs will be carried aloft in the shuttle's payload bay and used to launch probes into interplanetary space, and to lift massive communications satellites into geosynchronous orbit.

Or maybe not. The recent House vote was only the latest episode in a long-running controversy (*Science*, 10 September, p. 1012). Scientists, communications experts, and NASA officials have always liked the liquid hydrogen/liquid oxygen–fueled Centaur because of its power and the fact that it could be ready for use by mid-decade. However, a number of congressmen, most notably Rep. Ronnie G. Flippo (D–Ala.), chairman of the House subcommittee on space science and applications, have opposed the Centaur on the grounds that adapting it for use on the shuttle would cost too much. They favor interim use of a less powerful, solid-fueled upper stage already developed by the Air Force, and the development later of a new liquid-fueled upper stage. They have had support from the Air Force and aerospace lobbyists.

On 15 September Flippo introduced an amendment to the 1983 NASA appropriations bill that would have forbidden the agency to do any further work on the Centaur. But he was undercut by an abrupt about face by the Air Force. In a 15 September letter to Rep. Edward P. Boland (D–Mass.), whose HUD-independent agencies subcommittee oversees NASA appropriations, Air Force Under Secretary Edward Aldridge and NASA Administrator James M. Beggs cited mysterious "new information" and announced that their respective agencies would soon conclude an agreement for joint development of the Centaur.

Boland explains that contamination detected in the shuttle's payload bay during the test flights means that shielding will be required for certain classified payloads, which in turn means that the Air Force will require the greater lifting power of the Centaur. Flippo's amendment was defeated, 316 to 77.—***M. Mitchell Waldrop***


0036-8075/82/1001-0037$01.00/0 