

AAAS and the Social Science Research Council have joined the Academy in a consortium to work for continued support of the institute.

IIASA is still not well known despite the fact that it is now probably the only forum where Soviet and Western scientists are working cooperatively on long-term global problems. Under its new director, Thomas H. Lee from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Institute will be focussing in particular on global energy, environmental degradation, and industrial restructuring. Lee has cited acid rain as a problem that cuts across all three subjects. This will be addressed in a new project on sustainable development of the biosphere.


Administration officials have complained in the past that the Soviets were getting much more out of the IIASA arrangement than the Americans were. But Harvard economist Howard Raiffa, the Institute's first director, has said that this thinking discounts intangible benefits such as "when someone at the World Health Organization says he can always recognize a Soviet who has spent time at IIASA because he approaches problems so differently from other Soviet scientists."—CONSTANCE HOLDEN

Congress, NIH Dedicate Center to Mary Lasker

A beautiful old convent that belonged to the cloistered Catholic Order of the Visitation was officially dedicated the Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education at ceremonies on 19 September at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The center, which adjoins the NIH campus in Bethesda, will house medical students interested in spending a year at NIH in research training under a program jointly sponsored by the institutes and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

The dedication ceremonies were a vivid reminder of the role philanthropist and consummate lobbyist Lasker has played over the years in persuading Congress to increase funds for medical research in areas she particularly favored. It was Lasker, for instance, who was the prime mover behind the National War on Cancer

that gave the cancer institute special status and vast resources in the early 1970's. At the time, the majority of the academic research community deplored the fact that politics and Lasker's personal influence worked to give cancer research such prominence. Many would have preferred that NIH maintain its more equal distri-



The Mary Woodward Lasker Center on the NIH campus.

bution of funding based on the purer intellectual process of peer review. But Mary Lasker prevailed, just as she did a couple of years later when she convinced Congress to give special treatment to the National Heart Institute.

Thomas (Tip) O'Neill, Speaker of the House of Representatives, captured Lasker's influence on Congress when he recalled a day in the early 1970's when Mary Lasker and her select coterie of well-known research physicians came to lunch on Capitol Hill. "You were so upset about funding for cancer, Mary," recalled O'Neill who, for his part, brought appropriations committee members to the lunch to be lobbied. O'Neill captured the way the business of health politics was conducted when he noted that \$140 million was added to the cancer budget that day. The Lasker Center, said O'Neill, is "but a small token from a grateful nation."

Lasker, who is in her eighties, has been a powerhouse in NIH politics for decades. In brief remarks, she revealed that she had been sickly as a young girl and said, "I resolved to do something for medical research when I was 10 years old." She has.

—BARBARA J. CULLITON

Researcher's Suit Against NCI Wins Mixed Judgment

Pathologist Melvin D. Reuber who has sued his former employer, the National Cancer Institute (NCI), and several other parties for libel and damages has received a mixed judgment in his first round at court. A U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia has ordered that the defendants destroy all copies of a 1981 letter containing "false allegations" about Reuber. However, the court refused to award Reuber the monetary damages he sought.

Reuber's legal suit against NCI is one of three he has filed over the same issue (*Science*, 27 April, p. 367). In it, he claimed that he was harshly reprimanded and subsequently harassed out of his job at the Frederick Cancer Research Center in Frederick, Maryland. While working as a pathologist there in 1981, Reuber was reprimanded for mailing out his personal, unreviewed report calling the pesticide malathion carcinogenic. NCI official reports found malathion safe, including for use in aerial spraying to control fruit flies.

The Frederick lab is run by a private firm, Litton Bionetics, for the National Cancer Institute. Reuber's second suit is against Litton. A third suit, pending in Washington, D.C., charges lobbyists for Stauffer Chemical Company and the National Agricultural Chemicals Association with ruining Reuber's career.

The 26 March 1981 letter ordered destroyed by the court contained several false allegations, according to U.S. District Judge William B. Bryant. Those false assertions are that Reuber "knowingly and wrongfully" bypassed appropriate NCI and Frederick clearance procedures, and that he published manuscripts implying that the two agencies endorsed his views. However, the judge concluded that the evidence did not support the claim that NCI employee William (Vernon) Hartwell had leaked that letter of reprimand nor that there was a motive for him to injure Reuber personally.

The Judge's decision is viewed as a "symbolic victory" by Reuber's lawyer, Ray Battocchi. That victory faces them with a difficult decision over whether to appeal. —JEFFREY L. FOX