Schloss Laxenburg. *IIASA's converted 18th-century hunting lodge.*

"IIASA has been a very important organization in advancing both the science of modeling and the science of systems analysis," says Simon. "Equally important, it has been a place where scientists from many countries, both East and West, can come together and work on their common interests."

Some of the research projects, however, have been widely seen as producing little of either intellectual or practical value. In some cases, this is said to have been the result of giving free rein to strong-minded individuals with an excessively zealous commitment to the claims of systems analysis. There has also been some concern that Eastern European states in particular, including the Soviet Union, have occasionally appeared to offer IIASA research fellowships to their scientists as little more than rewards for good behavior at home.

Recent attempts to solve the first of these problems range from the increasing use of outside peer review for research proposals, to the insistence that all research results should be published in refereed and internationally available journals.

As for the second, nobody appears keener to raise the intellectual level of Soviet and Eastern European participants than the newly elected chairman of the IIASA council, Vladimir S. Mikhalevich, director of the V. M. Glushkov Institute of Cybernetics in Kiev and a member of the Supreme Soviet.

Mikhalevich has long been associated with one of IIASA's more highly regarded programs, that on system and decision sciences, which has been responsible for important work in fields such as optimization and decision theory. In particular, he is said, as head of the Glushkov Institute, to have been influential in ensuring that research positions on this program were allocated, where appropriate, to some of the brightest young Soviet mathematicians.

"IIASA is a very small institution. Its resources are limited, and they will never amount to very much," said Mikhalevich in an interview with *Science*. "This is one reason that we must take care to ensure the good quality of our work, particularly if we wish to broaden our attraction to young scientists."

The record of IIASA research in the past has, he says, been "variable," with some projects, such as those on basic methodology, having received "very strong" support from top scientists in both the East and the West, while others have suffered from inadequate critical assessment. "The issues in IIASA must be more realistic, and we must, for example, establish closer ties with other international organizations," he says.

Mikhalevich admits that this new sense of scientific realism on the part of the Soviet Union is a reflection of the new spirit of "economic realism" in Moscow. He points out, for example, that one of the chief architects of Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms, his economic adviser Abel G. Aganbegyan, was one of the original IIASA fellows, and returned recently to deliver a lecture on perestroika.

Much of the public discourse about IIASA continues to reflect its early ambitions. A press release issued at the end of the anniversary meeting described how discussions had focused on "the application of scientific research to such world issues as nuclear disarmament, changes in the global climate and development in the Third World."

Within IIASA's research programs, however, there has been a shift away from global problem-solving toward a more pragmatic interest in topics of specific interest to its member organizations and their governments, such as the reasons for the successes and failures of joint East-West commercial ventures, or of environmental problems—like acid rain—which affect countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain. This trend, although criticized by some as turning IIASA into a "service agency" and away from its goal as a research institution, has been reinforced by recent moves to seek outside finance through consultancy contracts in order to make up for the budget shortfall caused by the withdrawal of U.S. funding.

It may also be bringing a new sense of reality to research goals. Jermen M. Gvishiani, chairman of the IIASA council for the first 15 years and director of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Research Institute for Systems Studies, admits that IIASA has sometimes been too ambitious in the past. Although the institution has been successful at finding "creative problem statements," he told last month's meeting in Laxenburg, it may have been wrong "to try to achieve both the development of viable problem statements and strategies for their solution."

But Gvishiani expressed optimism about the future. "At present, we see a rapid change in the general international situation to a certain extent akin to what was happening at the time when the Institute was created," he said. "Let us hope that the new thinking and the new international reality will give [IIASA] new energy and new impetus." ■ DAVID DICKSON

Panel Completes Interviews in "Baltimore Case"

The National Institutes of Health's official panel of three immunologists who were called in to investigate a paper coauthored by David Baltimore, director of the Whitehead Institute at MIT, is said to have found no evidence of fraudulent research.

The committee met in Boston for 3 days last month and interviewed the principals in a dispute about the validity of data in a paper published in *Cell* in 1986 (*Science*, 1 July, p. 18). Joseph M. Davie of Searle, Hugh McDevitt of Stanford, and Ursula Storb of the University of Chicago have begun writing their report, which will be sent to the coauthors for review before it is released.

According to sources close to the NIH investigation, the committee will report weaknesses in the controversial paper but will not accuse anyone of misconduct.

The *Cell* paper, which presented new data about the production of immune cells in transgenic mice, has been reviewed by researchers at MIT and at Tufts, where one of the principal authors is now. Each review allowed that the disputed data could be subject to more than one interpretation, but found the paper to be within scientific norms. However, two self-appointed fraud busters at NIH have raised enough questions to require a third analysis. NIH expects its report to be completed within a few weeks. ■ B.J.C.