conclude whether or not there may have been additional instances of plagiarism," Tosteson said.

Tosteson told *Science* that it apparently was Frazier's custom to quote extensively from others' publications when he gave speeches. Adequate attribution, Harvard found, did not make its way into print when Frazier then adapted the speeches for review articles or book chapters.

Frazier was unavailable for comment on the conduct committee's findings. Likewise, members of the conduct committee were unavailable. According to Tosteson, it is Harvard's policy not to reveal the names of members of its standing committee or of individuals who are called upon to bring special expertise on a case-by-case basis.

Frazier's failings as an author were first brought to Tosteson's attention in August by Paul Scatena of the University of Rochester. A philosophy student turned neuroscientist, Scatena was reading extensively about "phantom pain" in persons who have had an arm or leg amputated when he came across a gripping statement in one of Frazier's review articles. It said that in higher species, the amount of pain perceived is not directly related to the amount of painful stimulus. "It was one of the ideas that inspired me to go into neuroscience," says Scatena who told *Science* that he has carefully followed the adjuration of one of his professors to "always go to the primary source; don't rely on second-rate secondary sources." It was on reading the primary sources that Scatena noticed that substantial passages in Frazier were taken from other authors. He also noticed instances in which references varied from one Frazier paper to another, and in which data from a primary source were not summarized as accurately as he thinks they might have been. Harvard has notified journals and appropriate institutions of its findings.

As associate dean James Adelstein said in an interview with *Science*, "Intellectual property is extremely important in academic circles. It is part of our cultural norm and has to be taken seriously."

"What this says is that people who do science are people. Like everybody else, some have their pathologies," one Harvard professor says. Others are frankly outraged by Frazier's behavior. "This unfairly gives all of us a bad name and people here are furious," says another.

■ BARBARA J. CULLITON

Errors in *Cell* Paper Acknowledged

In a letter to the editor of *Cell*, Thereza Imanishi-Kari, David Baltimore, and their coauthors of a 1986 article have cited "three instances of misstatement" in the paper, which has been the subject of congressional hearings (*Science*, 24 June, p. 1720). Writing in the 18 November issue of *Cell*, the authors state that a reagent which the original article described as being highly specific in its reactivity cross-reacts, in fact, with more than one molecule. They have admitted as much ever since the statement was first challenged more than a year and a half ago by NIH workers Ned Feder and Walter Stewart.

Imanishi-Kari and the others also acknowledge in the letter to *Cell* that there are errors in the paper's second table. However, they reaffirm what they have been saying all along, that these are not material alterations and do not affect the conclusions of the paper, which is a discussion of gene expression in transgenic mice.

Representative John Dingell (D–MI), who has held hearings on what is widely known as the "Baltimore paper" because of Nobel laureate Baltimore's prominence as director of the Whitehead Institute at MIT, is not at all happy about the letter of correction. In a letter of his own to Health and Human Services Secretary Otis R. Bowen, Dingell alleges that the correction was written in an effort to preempt the findings of an NIH panel that has investigated the circumstances surrounding the original publication. Dingell also charges that NIH colluded with Baltimore by suggesting that he and his coauthors write the letter to *Cell*.

Dingell also asked for an investigation of an alleged leak to *Science* which reported in its 15 July issue that the review panel "is said to have found no evidence of fraudulent research." And Dingell called on Bowen to find out why the NIH review panel's report is still not complete and says that an NIH lawyer told his House subcommittee that a draft report does not even exist.

In truth, the NIH review panel of three scientists has been slower to produce its report than anyone anticipated. However, according to NIH director James B. Wyngaarden, NIH received the draft the day after receiving a copy of Dingell's 10 November letter to the secretary. That draft has now been sent to each of the coauthors of the *Cell* paper who have been asked to comment by the end of next week. "I certainly hope we'll be able to get the final report out this year," Wyngaarden says.

■ BARBARA J. CULLITON

Chimps Endangered, Research Reprieved

A wrangle between biomedical researchers and conservationists ended in a split decision last week when the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service decided to reclassify wild chimpanzees as "endangered," while leaving chimps living in research facilities under the less dire heading of "threatened."

The compromise will allow experimentation on man's closest relative to continue, while bringing into play more stringent restrictions on the importation of chimpanzees from Africa, where the species is under severe pressure due to massive habitat destruction, hunting, and capture.

"I think that this tells government officials and park officials in Africa that somebody out there in the big, wide world cares about what happens to chimpanzees," says Jane Goodall, who along with the World Wildlife Fund and the Humane Society of the United States petitioned the wildlife service to place the chimpanzee in the endangered category (*Science*, 12 August, p. 777).

The move was vigorously opposed by officials at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), who were concerned that captive populations in the United States might be lumped together with wild chimps under an endangered listing, thereby making biomedical research on the animals extremely difficult, if not impossible.

NIH officials, too, seem to harbor lingering suspicions about the motives of some of the conservationists, whom they believe are out to stop medical research on animals. Asked what effect the chimp ruling will have on research, George Galasso of NIH's Office of Extramural Research replied: "It will be business as usual until the other shoe drops." Galasso anticipates future attempts to restrict research on chimpanzees, now that the species is considered endangered.

The conservationists, in turn, harbor their own suspicions. They will look very carefully, they say, at the language that accompanies the formal proposal to change the chimp's status. The problem, as the conservationists see it, is how to distinguish between "captive" and "wild" chimpanzees in Africa.

"In Africa a chimp can be wild one day and captive the next. You just go out and shoot his mother and grab him," says Goodall, who envisions chimps being plucked from the wild, kept for a time in pens, "recycled," and then sold to traders. The wildlife service says it will have its proposal ready in about a month.

■ WILLIAM BOOTH