February, will be chaired by Brent Scowcroft, President Ford's national security adviser. It includes Harold Brown, Secretary of Defense in the Carter Administration, and Reagan's former Secretary of State Alexander Haig, Jr. Charles Townes, a physicist from the University of California who chaired two previous panels on the MX, has not been invited to serve on the new panel. He concluded about Dense Pack that "the Soviets may have appropriately modified their weapons—for an effective attack on it—almost as soon as it is fully deployed."

Once the experts have reported and the President has supplied Congress with additional details, Congress will have roughly 45 days to approve or disapprove a missile basing mode. If it approves, the Air Force will quickly begin test flights over the Pacific.

Some members of Congress anticipate that the MX will be strangled by the basing dilemma. They argue that any alternative to Dense Pack will require more money, and they note that even conservatives are beginning to be wary about spending billions and billions of dollars on a weapons system that contributes only marginally to the total number of U.S. warheads (the General Accounting Office recently said that by 1996 the MX would account for between 5 and 13 percent of U.S. strategic power). Representative Carroll Hubbard (D–Ky.), who is known as a defense hawk, told the House during the recent debate that "right or wrong, the words 'here come the Russians' nowadays do not scare Kentuckians half as much as 'here come the creditors.' "

Others in Congress predict that concern about the basing mode will greatly diminish if it appears that this issue could become an obstacle to building the MX at all. Overall, sentiment is in favor of the MX. Representative Joseph Addabbo (D–N.Y.) and Senator Ernest Hollings (D–S.C.) both campaigned against the MX last December. Yet they signed their names to the House-Senate conference report on the MX, which pledges "a firm commitment to modernization of our strategic forces." Three members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and several top White House advisers have indicated that they would be satisfied by deployment of the MX in existing, highly vulnerable Minuteman missile silos, arguing essentially that the missile's size and capability make it worth having at any cost. Selling this viewpoint on Capitol Hill may be essential to the survival of the MX in the next Pentagon budget.

—R. JEFFREY SMITH

A "Euro-Brookings" Enters the Lists

After an on-again-off-again start, a European version of an American-style think tank on economic and social policy has begun operations. The Belgium-based Center for European Policy Studies opened with an inaugural conference before Christmas.

The initiative for the center dates back to the mid-1970's when then Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy proselytized European officials on behalf of a think tank modeled on the Brookings Institution in Washington. The European Commission, the European Community (EC) executive, embraced the idea of a government-financed research institute (*Science*, 23 February 1979, p. 727), but intergovernmental negotiations dragged and the project foundered when the newly elected Thatcher government in Britain declined to participate after deciding that European cooperative activities were costing too much.

Proponents of a "Euro-Brookings" managed to revive the idea by proposing that startup funding come from nongovernmental sources. Some $500,000 was raised to establish the center, including a $225,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to be paid over 3 years, and grants from several European private foundations. The center will operate from offices in central Brussels and Louvain-la-Neuve—the site of the francophone segment of the bifurcated University of Louvain—outside the Belgian capital.

Originally conceived as comparable to Brookings in size, the center is expected to operate initially with a budget about a quarter that of Brookings' roughly $10-million-a-year funding. The center will have a small core staff and recruit researchers from European universities and research institutions to work on center projects.

Director of the center is Peter Ludlow, a University of London economic historian who also has been associated with the European University Institute, the EC-sponsored graduate school and research institute in Florence.

As in the original plan, the center will set its sights on problems common to all Western European countries with the idea of gaining the participation of other nations besides those in the EC and NATO. Although operating on a smaller scale than Brookings, the center proposes an agenda of studies on economic, social, environmental, and security problems similar in breadth to Brookings'. One center project is to be a periodic survey of European national budgets resembling the Brookings series on setting U.S. national priorities.

The center is committed to independence in choosing its own research topics and operating outside the structures and strictures of government. And it has taken the first successful steps toward becoming self-supporting. But European business and government are unaccustomed to such independence and the center will have to persuade potential clients of the value of supporting research projects they don't control.—JOHN WALSH

Princeton Physicists Meet Tokamak Deadline

It came down to a race with the calendar, a feverish attempt to beat the coming of the new year. And it worked. At 3:06 a.m. EST on Christmas Eve 1982, after 7 years of planning and construction and an expenditure of $314 million, researchers at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory successfully inserted a hydrogen plasma into the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR).

The event was immediately hailed as a milestone. TFTR is the first of a new generation of tokamak reactors. Along with its brethren now under construction in Europe, Japan, and the Soviet Union, it is expected to attain the long-sought goals of energy breakeven and plasma ignition by the end of the decade. In practical terms, however, the Christmas Eve event was largely symbolic. Princeton's contract with the Department of Energy specified first plasma in 1982, so 1982 it was. The real physics will come at a more measured pace. The first plasma was hardly heated at all, for example, and as expected, it lasted only 50 milliseconds. Experiments with ohmic heating, the simplest method, will not begin until March: researchers will induce electrical currents in the plasma and allow the plasma's resistivity to

dissipate the energy as heat. In late 1983 they will step up to the more powerful method of neutral beam injection, wherein the plasma is simultaneously heated and refueled by beams of high-energy atoms. Meanwhile, for simplicity's sake they plan to work with hydrogen or deuterium plasmas until the end of 1985, since these isotopes do not undergo the fusion reaction. Only in early 1986 will they attempt a plasma of deuterium and tritium, which do fuse. If all goes well, TFTR should achieve energy breakeven that year.

It may not be the first, however. JET, a similar device in the United Kingdom, is scheduled for completion this summer. The Soviet Union's T-15 is only somewhat further off, and Japan has already begun assembly of its JT-60. Japan's effort is particularly impressive, says Steven O. Dean, head of Fusion Power Associates and a recent visitor to that country. The Japanese are already spending twice what we do on fusion research, he points out, and their program seems to have considerably more momentum and direction. Next door to the JT-60 site, he notes, is a big vacant lot labeled "future power reactor."

—M. MITCHELL WALDROP

School Says Researcher Synthesized Results

Officials of Mount Sinai medical school in New York are seeking to set things straight after an investigation in which they say a researcher admitted he misrepresented work he did while at the school.

The research in question was done by Joseph H. Cort, who was at Mount Sinai as an adjunct professor between 1976 and 1980. Cort's work was funded primarily by the Vega Biotechnologies Company of Tucson, which had exclusive rights to drugs developed as a result of his research.

Dr. Cort told *Science* that the version of the Mount Sinai report he had seen contained "many mistakes" and on the advice of his attorney would not comment on the matter "until a later date."

Mount Sinai made public details of its own investigation of the matter in an official statement released in late December. Included was the finding that "Dr. Cort reported certain data and conclusions not supported by adequate scientific research. It is important to note that none of Dr. Cort's research at Mount Sinai was performed on humans."

Mount Sinai launched a 10-month investigation last February when Vega informed school officials that Cort, who was then working for the company in Tucson, admitted that he had fabricated research data while at Mount Sinai. The medical school, which is affiliated with Mount Sinai Hospital and City University of New York, immediately established an internal fact-finding group. In May the group reported its preliminary findings to a review committee which included members from the Harvard and University of North Carolina medical schools. The fact-finding panel completed its work in early December. Mount Sinai president and dean Thomas C. Chalmers said that the results of the investigation were communicated to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and that the school also is notifying the U.S. Patent Office and scientific journals with which Cort had dealings. A spokesman for the school says that NIH was informed immediately after formation of the fact-finding group that an investigation was in progress and the reasons for it. Cort had applied unsuccessfully for an NIH grant, but had received minor support from a general NIH grant to the department of physiology and biophysics to which he was attached.

Cort's career as a researcher took an unusual tangent after he became the center of a political controversy at the height of the Cold War. An American citizen with degrees from Harvard and Yale medical schools, he was on a fellowship in England in 1951 when he was ordered by the U.S. Embassy in London to return to the United States. According to a *New York Times* story, Cort, who had been a member of the Communist Party as a student, refused to return on grounds that the intention here was to prosecute him as a subversive. He was later indicted on charges of draft evasion and, when he was refused permission to stay in England, he took up residence in Czechoslovakia. In Czechoslovakia he became associated with a group of organic chemists working to alter the molecular structure of synthetic hormones to increase their effectiveness as drugs.

Despite a ruling favorable to him by the Supreme Court in the 1960's, the indictment against Cort was not dismissed until 1975. The next year he returned to the United States and took up the research post at Mount Sinai, which he obtained as a result of contacts made earlier at international scientific meetings. Cort's agreement with Vega dated from 1979.

At Mount Sinai he continued the line of research in which he had been engaged in Czechoslovakia. A focus of the medical school investigation was Cort's claim that he had synthesized five analogs of vasopressin, a substance which increases the level of a clotting factor which is missing or reduced in the blood of hemophiliacs. Cort had reported that he had developed five vasopressin analogs which did not cause the side effects that have prevented vasopressin's use in the treatment of hemophiliacs. The analogs had figured in an issued patent, several published and unpublished articles, and the NIH grant application. The Mount Sinai statement said that Cort had admitted to the panel reporting results on an analog that had not been synthesized and the panel found no evidence that another of the analogs had been synthesized. The panel also discovered inadequacies in documentation for biological testing in animals and discrepancies in the records on the synthesis of two hormone antagonists with a potential for use as a means of birth control.

Vega terminated Cort's contract when he admitted the falsification of data. The *Times* story quoted Cort as attributing his actions to pressures not to be beaten filing for patents and saying his main motive was to save the company and gain further support for his research.

Chalmers says that he is proposing new policies and procedures to "assure the integrity of scientific research at Mount Sinai." These include more regular review by faculty of their colleagues' work, increased responsibility of department chairman and division chiefs to assure that work meets the highest scientific standards, and a new permanent committee of trustees, administrators, and senior faculty to recommend new policies and generally oversee research practices.

—JOHN WALSH