To Rosen and others, the shortage comes at a particularly bad time. In May, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed a costly clampdown on arsenic levels, a natural contaminant, in drinking water. EPA is also funding a burst of research on how arsenic causes cancer, because pinning down this elusive mechanism could reveal whether the limit needs to be so stringent. To understand the mechanism, researchers are using arsenic-73 to find genes that metabolize arsenic and to explore how these metabolites enter cells and damage DNA.

But Los Alamos, which makes the isotope by smashing protons from an accelerator into a rubidium bromide target, hasn't produced any arsenic-73 since the source of these protons—a tritium production program—ended in early 1999. A new isotope production facility was slated to open early next year, but the massive fires that swept through the region in the spring have pushed back the scheduled completion date to mid-2002. Los Alamos ran out of arsenic-73 inventory around July. "None of us knew about it until it was too late" to make other plans, says Marc Mass, an EPA toxicologist. There are alternative tracers, he says, but they're costly and too insensitive for some experiments.

Los Alamos officials say they can make arsenic-73 at another accelerator, then purify it at Los Alamos. But it took a flood of phone calls and letters from scientists to convince DOE officials to make it a priority, and it may be another 6 months before there's any arsenic-73 available, says Gene Peterson, manager of the lab's Isotope Production Program. The lab has to finagle beamtime on an accelerator—most likely one in Canada—prepare the target, he says, then cut through the red tape for transporting radioactive materials. Peterson says it's often not easy to predict shortages of radioisotopes used by only a handful of researchers, but that the new facility should make it easier to catch up because it won't depend directly on other experiments for protons.

That's little comfort to arsenic researchers, who are at their wits' end. Toxicologist Vas Aposhian of the University of Arizona, Tucson, who bought up the last few millicuries of arsenic-73 this summer, says, "We're going to scream bloody murder and call our congressman and senator" when the lab's supply runs out in a few weeks. Miroslav Styblo, a biochemist at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, is trying to persuade colleagues at an accelerator in his native Prague to make a batch of arsenic-73. But "so far," he says, "we don't have realistic promises."

–JOCELYN KAISER

CREDITS: (TOP TO BOTTOM) WARREN WESTURA/AP; CHARLES TASNADI/AP

ELECTION 2000

Uncertainty Wins By a Landslide

Scientists seeking order from the chaos of the U.S. election results may have a long wait. With the closest presidential election in a generation still undecided as *Science* went to press and the winners in several closely watched Senate and House races also unknown, it may be months before researchers and science lobbyists know who will fill influential posts in Congress and the new Administration for shaping science policies and budgets.



In or out? Outcome of Holt's reelection bid is still unclear.

Amid the confusion, however, were a few results that election watchers could count on. They included the narrow defeat of Representative James Dickey (R–AR), a prominent opponent of government support for stem cell research, and the comfortable margin that returned Representative Vern Ehlers (R–MI), one of two physicists in the current Congress. Voters also approved several state ballot initiatives that will channel some funds from tobacco lawsuit settlements to research-related activities.

Those clear-cut decisions, however, were overshadowed by the chaos in the presidential race that has focused on Florida. That standoff was mirrored in New Jersey, where Democratic Representative Rush Holt—Congress's other physicist—was locked this week in legal wrangles with Republican Dick Zimmer over disputed ballots. On election night, Holt, a former official at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory in New Jersey, appeared to have won by 56 votes, but later tallies prompted both candidates to claim a lead. "Rush likes to say that, as a scientist, he likes to get the facts," campaign spokesperson Peter Yeager said as the controversy swirled this week. "So that's what we are doing, counting votes and trying to get the facts."

If Holt loses, he would join stem cell opponent Dickey as one of the few incumbent House members to be defeated. Each year since 1995, Dickey has successfully pushed a controversial spending provision that prohibits federal funding for research that creates, harms, or destroys a human embryo. When the National Institutes of Health (NIH) earlier this year announced guidelines for use of human embryonic stem cells, which are derived from human embryos, Dickey threatened to sue if NIH actually awarded any grants (*Science*, 1 September, p. 1442). Dickey's defeat won't end that threat, however, notes Richard Doerflinger of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in Washington, D.C. Returning lawmakers, including House majority whip Tom DeLay (R–TX), are likely to pick up where Dickey left off.

The election also heightened speculation about who will lead the committees involved in crafting science policy and budgets. In the House, James Sensenbrenner (R–WI) is attempting to jump from the chair of the Science Committee to the head of the higher profile Judiciary Committee. If Sensenbrenner is successful, Representative Sherwood Boehlert (R–NY), currently the science panel's second-ranking Republican, would likely inherit the top seat. Boehlert, an avid environmentalist whose district includes the U.S. Air Force's Research Laboratory in Rome, New York, has said he would bring "a lot of ideas" to the post, without offering specifics.

Another vacant seat is the chair of the House appropriations subcommittee that oversees NIH's spending. The post was held by retiring Representative John Porter (R–IL), a major backer of efforts to double NIH's budget. Observers say there is no clear replacement.

Heir apparent? Boehlert could lead the House Science Committee.

In the Senate, Porter's counterpart, Senator Arlen Specter (R–PA), hinted before the election that he may also abandon his spending panel post. If he does, his replacement is uncertain. A victory by Democrat Marcia Cantwell over two-term Republican Slade Gorton in Washington state—a race still too close to call as this issue went to press—

could leave each party with 50 seats. If that happens, Democrats may demand to fill a number of committee leadership slots, although such power-sharing is unprecedented. With the statewide race likely to remain unsettled until late November, "it's getting agonizing just trying to figure out all the possible scenarios," says one science lobbyist.

Legislators planned to return to Washington this week to try to finish off several spending bills for the current fiscal year—including funding for NIH—that were left hanging after protracted negotiations with the White House broke down a few weeks before the election. But the budget talks have now been pushed back until early December, and the uncertainty over the presidential results makes it impossible to predict how those negotiations will turn out and when Congress will adjourn.

Meanwhile, voters in five states—Arizona, Arkansas, Montana, Oklahoma, and Utah—approved ballot items that will allow officials to begin spending billions of dollars won in state lawsuits against tobacco companies. Although all call for spending some of the money on health care and antismoking efforts, only Arkansas's specifically mentions research, with about $60 million slated for several state-funded universities.

–DAVID MALAKOFF

With reporting by Gretchen Vogel.

ASTROPHYSICS

Astronomers Spot Their First Carbon Bomb

HONOLULU—Astronomers love watching things blow up, but they've never seen a blast quite like the one described here last week. Carbon on the surface of an ultradense star detonated in a 3-hour thermonuclear explosion, according to a report at a meeting of the American Astronomical Society's High Energy Astrophysics Division. If confirmed, the burst would be the first known cosmic explosion fueled solely by carbon rather than hydrogen or helium. That prospect, says theorist Lars Bildsten of the University of California, Santa Barbara, is "very exciting from a nuclear physics standpoint" for its potential to verify or revise models of carbon combustion.

The blast came from a waltzing pair of stars called a "low-mass x-ray binary." In such a system, a dwarf star orbits closely around a neutron star, a stellar corpse that packs the mass of one or two suns into a dense ball just 20 kilometers wide. Gas from the dwarf flows into a hot spiraling disk around the neutron star. Some gas hits the star's surface, forming a compressed slurry of hydrogen, helium, and a few heavier elements. When pressures and temperatures get high enough within the thickening layer, the elements can flash-fuse in a thermonuclear explosion. Then, the layer rebuilds and the flash repeats after some interval, usually hours or days. This process continues indefinitely, although the timing changes drastically depending on the orbital dynamics of the two stars.

Satellites see most explosions from such systems as mild x-ray flares that last 10 or 20 seconds. Last year, however, astronomers detected four flares that broke the mold. First, researchers at the Space Research Organization Netherlands (SRON) in Utrecht used the Dutch-Italian BeppoSAX satellite to find evidence for a long burst from each of three known low-mass x-ray binaries. The events lasted 500 times longer and unleashed 500 to 1000 times more energy than the generic short pops. "It's a new class of events that will challenge the theorists," says SRON astronomer John Heise. Heise's colleague Erik Kuulkers, however, stops short of claiming that the explosions are carbon-based. The hydrogen-rich dwarf stars in those binary systems don't dump the necessary raw ingredients onto their neutron star companions, Kuulkers believes.



Carbon ka-boom! A layer of carbon may have ignited a thermonuclear blast on the surface of this neutron star (center of blue disk). The dwarf companion is a few times larger than Earth, while the entire binary would fit within our sun (bottom of illustration).

CREDIT: NASA GSFC/DANY PAGE, NATIONAL AUTONOMOUS UNIVERSITY OF MEXICO

That's not the case with a fourth long burst, found by Tod Strohmayer of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland. On 9 September 1999, NASA's Rossi X-ray Timing Explorer (RXTE) satellite picked up a powerful flare from 4U 1820-30, the tightest known low-mass x-ray binary. The two stars whirl around each other once every 11 minutes within a volume of space just slightly larger than the planet Jupiter. The white dwarf feeds nearly pure helium to the neutron star, as its hydrogen gas was stripped long ago.

That helium slowly builds the bomb, Strohmayer says. The helium layer grows 20 or 30 meters thick before it explodes, a process that can happen a few times a day at 4U 1820-30. Each blast leaves some carbon, one of the main ashes of helium fusion. Those ashes, in turn, mantle the neutron star with several hundred meters of carbon after about a year, according to Strohmayer's scenario. When the base of the layer reaches some critical temperature threshold, it ignites a carbon bomb that rages for hours.

"This thing is 1000 times more powerful than the helium bursts," Strohmayer says. "It may blow apart the entire accretion disk." If that's the case, astronomers might gain their best insight yet into how disks of hot gas behave when they spiral into compact stellar remnants. New material from the frantically orbiting white dwarf would quickly replenish the blown-apart disk, Strohmayer says. RXTE's data may contain x-rays flowing from the disk during that reassembly, exposing the physics of the process as never before.

Even more tantalizing to theorists is their first close look at the details of a real carbon detonation, rather than one based on computer codes. Already, there are hints that prior theoretical calculations don't quite align with the stars. Recent work by Bildsten and former student Edward Brown, now a Fermi Fellow at the University of Chicago, suggests that temperatures within the rind of a neutron star should fall well short of the billion degrees or so needed to ignite a relatively thin layer of carbon. A much thicker layer—and the resulting higher pressures at its base—might suffice to trigger the bomb. However, Brown notes, the rates of matter transfer in 4U 1820-30 imply that such a layer would require a century to accumulate. That would make Strohmayer's observation lucky indeed.

Even so, Bildsten and Brown concur that the likeliest explanation is a carbon blast. As for reconciling the theoretical and observational differences, Bildsten says, "it's a fun problem for us to ponder." –ROBERT IRION