did in the *Cell* paper. Somewhere along the line that summer, Imanishi-Kari told Eisen that she knew Bet-1 did not work the way she claimed. At least, that is what Eisen thought he heard Imanishi-Kari tell him. Eisen told Baltimore.

On 9 September 1986, Baltimore wrote, "The evidence that the Bet-1 antibody doesn't do as described in the paper is clear. Thereza's statement to you that she knew it all the time is a remarkable admission of guilt." Adding that neither he nor principal author David Weaver knew anything about it, Baltimore wrote, "Why Thereza chose to use the data and to mislead both of us and those who read the paper is beyond me."

In the same letter Baltimore counsels against a public retraction for two reasons: (i) Bet-1, good or bad, is not central to the overall conclusions of the paper. (ii) "A retraction would be difficult because David Weaver would be identified as senior author and he really had nothing to do with those data."

There is, Eisen says, a perfectly good explanation. Imanishi-Kari, whose native tongue is Portuguese, is notoriously difficult to understand. When questioned about the astonishing admission about Bet-1, Eisen says, it became clear he had misunderstood her the first time around. The truth, says Eisen, is that Imanishi-Kari never said Bet-1 was no good. Rather, she said that she knew how difficult a reagent it is and that some preparations of the antibody assay were better than others. "Further discussion [in September 1986] with Imanishi-Kari made it clear that though she knew all along of Bet-1's difficulties there was no doubt that good preparations did, indeed, have the properties . . . [described in the paper]," Eisen wrote in a memorandum.

In a recent telephone conversation, Baltimore told *Science* that he regarded his letter to Eisen as "an extension of a conversation" the two had had the day before. "If it really had been true that Thereza said Bet-1 was not good, we would have had to write to *Cell*. I would have come to that opinion myself," Baltimore said, "even though it might have hurt David Weaver. But it didn't come to that." (Weaver did the molecular biology in the study; Imanishi-Kari was the expert for the serology.)

Anticipating a rough time for Baltimore *et al.*, one of his colleagues at MIT has launched a campaign to enlist the support of the scientific community nationwide—a preemptive strike aimed at getting Dingell to back down. In a "Dear colleague" letter, Phillip A. Sharp has asked scientists to help "in countering the continuing activities of Representative John Dingell's subcommittee in Congress." *Science* has a copy of that letter, in which Sharp says "It seems obvious that the congressional subcommittee has decided to continue to hassle David and the other authors and this has serious implications for all of us." Sharp is urging letters to every member of the Dingell committee, as well as newspaper editors around the country, and has offered a sample letter. "The most serious aspect of the subcommittee's actions is that they have repeatedly rejected the judgment of qualified scientists . . . " in this matter. If Dingell cannot be stopped by scientists maybe he can be brought around by congressional colleagues. A special effort is being made to contact the Republican minority on the subcommittee for support.

As *Science* goes to press, it is too early to gauge the response to Sharp's call for an outpouring of outraged support. But some are saying Dingell will become the Joe McCarthy of science, because the case is being exaggerated out of all proportion to its significance.

The subcommittee, however, views the notion of a preemptive strike with what might be called bemused scorn.

Furthermore, Dingell staffers vehemently reject the common perception that by pursuing the Baltimore case, Dingell is out to get science. "Hell, Dingell's father was involved in setting up NIH," one staffer told *Science*. "His brother works there. Dingell has always been a big supporter of NIH, but he sees a problem" and he wants to resolve it. "These hearings will be more than fair. You'll see." ■ **BARBARA J. CULLITON**

Previous Science *articles on this case include the following: "Baltimore cleared of all fraud charges," 10 February, p. 727; "A bitter battle over error," part I, 24 June 1988, p. 1720; part II, 1 July, p. 18.*

Wyngaarden to Leave NIH

James B. Wyngaarden, director of the National Institutes of Health since 1982, will leave NIH at the beginning of July. Wyngaarden announced his departure to NIH senior staff late on the afternoon of 20 April, just after Health and Human Services secretary Louis Sullivan called to say that President George Bush wants his own appointee in the job.

Wyngaarden has been saying privately for months that he was ready to yield the director's post. "The pressures are utterly relentless and wearing," he says, as is the frustration of not having nearly as much authority as the director is credited with having. At one point, he said in an interview with *Science*, he had mentally set November 1988, when his pension became vested, as a departure date. But several factors compelled him to stay on. "I wanted to see the human genome program get off the ground," he said. "The fraud in science issue was heating up last summer and I thought we had to reorganize NIH's offices on that. And Vince DeVita resigned as director of the cancer institute. I didn't want to leave NIH with two presidential-appointee slots vacant at the same time." So he put off leaving but, he says, "it became clear around the time of the inauguration that the President wanted turnover in this office."

Did abortion figure in Bush's decision? "It never came up," Wyngaarden says.

The President has agreed to conduct a traditional academic search for Wyngaarden's successor and a committee will be named to work under the assistant secretary for health. Presidential science adviser designate, D. Allan Bromley of Yale, is also expected to play a role in the decision and he has begun contacting people for names of candidates.

If a present NIHer gets the job, bets are that it will go to Anthony S. Fauci, AIDS scientist and director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. During a campaign debate, the President cited Fauci as one of his "heroes" and there have been rumors about Fauci moving up ever since.

What next for Wyngaarden? One possibility is that he will return to Duke, where he was professor of medicine for more than 20 years before coming to NIH. Another is a yet unidentified position in science policy. "I'm very concerned about what's happening to science," he says. "The anti-intellectualism, fraud issues, animals in research, fear of recombinant DNA—all of these need to be dealt with." For the moment, he's open. ■ **BARBARA J. CULLITON**