

edited by RICHARD STONE



Driven underground? Mining industry claims health association suppressed scientist's testimony on sulfur dioxide fumes.

Canceled Testimony Sparks Debate

A dispute has erupted over the right of a journal editor to testify about changes in federal air standards if his views could influence selection of journal articles.

The issue involves University of Chicago pulmonary specialist David Leff, who was scheduled to testify last month at an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) hearing on a rule to reduce exposure to the pollutant sulfur dioxide. Leff, invited by the National Mining Association (NMA), was expected to cast doubt on EPA's justification for the new rule, namely, that short-term exposures to SO₂ pose a threat to people with asthma.

But Leff backed out at the last minute. A week before the hearing, Marilyn Hansen, executive director of the American Thoracic Society (ATS), told Leff his testimony would pose a con-

flict of interest because he edits one of ATS's journals. "We wanted to protect his ability to review manuscripts without the appearance of bias," says Hansen. Although ATS supports the SO₂ rule, "it didn't matter what side of the SO₂ issue he was on," she says.

Not surprisingly, NMA is furious: In a letter to EPA Administrator Carol Browner, NMA President Richard Lawson said ATS's action "threatens to deprive EPA of independent views."

DOD Recruiting Rule Extends Funding Ban

University officials are trying to persuade the Department of Defense (DOD) to modify a new rule that would end funding for researchers at universities that ban military recruiters. The interim rule, issued on 24 January to comply with a congressional directive, is a reaction to protests against the military's policy toward homosexuals.

According to DOD, some 100 universities restrict military recruiting. Last August, DOD threatened to withhold funds for breast-cancer researchers at the State University of New York because the school had barred DOD from using its recruiting facilities (*Science*, 2 September

1994, p. 1351). But DOD failed to act on its threat.

DOD's new rule demands that recruiters enjoy "entry to campuses" and "access to directory information pertaining to students" in order for researchers to be eligible for DOD funds. But it's vague on how DOD will enforce compliance, suggesting that any university with a law school could be barred from receiving DOD grants. The reason: The Association of American Law Schools (AALS) recently adopted a policy that directs members to oppose job discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

That prospect alarms universities. In a 15 March letter signed by the AALS, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and the American Council on Education, ACE Vice President Sheldon Steinbach proposes a way "to accommodate military recruiters without needlessly stifling academic freedom." ACE suggests altering the DOD rule such that a law school and, say, a chemistry department on the same campus would be considered separate institutions for purposes of awarding grant money.

DOD is expected to issue a final rule within the year. In the meantime, Representative Gerald Solomon (R-NY) plans to attach to upcoming reauthorizations of federal research agencies a clause that would require them to adopt the funding ban.

Mexico Forms Research Council

Mexico now has its own version of the U.S. National Research Council (NRC). Earlier this week, the Mexican Academy of Scientific Research announced the establishment of the Mexican National Research Foundation (MNRF). Like its U.S. counterpart, the MNRF, to be based in Mexico City, will organize scientific panels to prepare reports on policy topics.

The Mexican Academy of Scientific Research set up the foundation after a joint study with the NRC on threats to Mexico City's water supply. That study "made us realize how valuable an interdisciplinary organization ... could be to Mexico," says academy president Mauricio Fortes.

Disenchanted NASA-Goddard Chief Quits

Looming budget cuts and a notoriously demanding boss appear to have taken the fun out of being director of a National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) research center. Last week John Klineberg announced his resignation as director of Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland, shortly after his deputy bailed out too.

Klineberg told *Science* he is disappointed in the way the public, Congress, and the Administration view public service. Incentives for employees to leave, such as the buyout Klineberg is grabbing in his exit, "can hurt organizations like NASA" by chasing away qualified people, he says. Officials close to Klineberg said he was fed up with the planned cuts and disenchanted with the rule of NASA Administrator Daniel Goldin. Goldin has replaced almost every center director since he took over the agency in 1992, tightening his grip on the dozen centers that form NASA's core. As *Science* went to press, NASA had not identified obvious candidates to replace Klineberg.

Klineberg, age 56, says he has no idea what he'll do once he leaves NASA next month after almost a quarter century with the agency. He did not rule out a return. "Tell them I may be back. If Michael Jordan can do it, so can I."

Russian Parliament Approves Huge Science Budget Boost

Deputies in the Duma, the lower house of Russia's legislature, have done their U.S. Republican counterparts one better in support of science. Last week, not only did the Duma vote to shrink government spending by \$220 million, it agreed to apply the savings to the science budget. Deputies even won a promise that scientists would get first dibs on any year-end surplus. "It's a psychological turning point, because none of the items in the budget except science were increased," says science minister Boris Saltykov.

The budget figure comes after several months of wrangling in the Duma over the Yeltsin Administration's proposed \$1.36 billion (5.4 trillion ruble) science budget. Last month, science subcommittee chair Nikolai Vorontsov suggested raising that figure by 30% and

paying for it with cuts in governmentwide overhead. Vorontsov got help from an unlikely source: Vladimir Zhirinovskiy's Liberal Democrats sidetracked the debate into a 2-hour discussion on unrelated topics, during which time Vorontsov persuaded enough deputies to approve the increase in a subsequent vote.

However, government officials insisted that bureaucratic belt-tightening could generate no more than half that increase. As a compromise, the Duma science subcommittee suggested a formula whereby the government would commit to raising the science budget by \$220 million, and more if there is a year-end surplus.

Given the state of Russia's economy, a surplus would be surprising. Still, Vorontsov says the increase is a moral victory for Russia's ailing science base.