chain]. It's a matter of taste." Buseck can't recall anyone finding anything like these chains preserved for so long on Earth. Here they seem to fall apart on the death of the bacterium, not be preserved for billions of years as required for any martian examples.

Meteoriticist Ralph Harvey of Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland is less understanding. "We've seen this before" with ALH84001, he says. "Someone says, 'Let's take a novel technique and turn it on a very complex rock.' Who knows what the inorganic magnetite in rock may look like with this technique? They're just interpreting things in a narrow way." Some nonbiological process might just as well produce magnetite in such arrangements, he says, given that magnetite very much like Thomas-Keprta's has been made in the laboratory (*Science*, 31 March 2000, p. 2402). An equally intensive search of other rocks—both extraterrestrial and earthly—is in order, says Harvey. If these "chains" are going to change anyone's mind, adds Buseck, "we're going to need better chemistry and images [of the chains], perhaps better than is available now." **–RICHARD A. KERR**

GERMAN SCIENCE

New Money to Lure Talent From Abroad

BERN—When she visited Silicon Valley and Stanford University in January, Edelgard Bulmahn, Germany's research minister, quizzed German scientists about why they had left their homeland. She got an earful: Complaints ranged from a dearth of jobs to distaste for rigid university hierarchies. Bulmahn appears to have taken such complaints to heart. Last week, she announced that her ministry will channel $82 million into various initiatives aimed in part at winning back expatriate scientists and preventing talented young researchers from leaving. "We want to stop the brain drain," says Bulmahn, "and instead start up a brain gain."

Bulmahn and others in Germany's science establishment have plenty of reason for angst. Several German scientists have won Nobel Prizes for research done in U.S. labs, including physicist Horst Störmer in 1998 and cell biologist Günter Blobel in 1999. Compounding the problem, a recent study found that about 14% of German science students land graduate or postdoc positions in the United States, and up to a third of them don't return.

To try to begin countering this trend—as well as inject foreign blood into German universities—the research ministry has tapped government revenues raised last year from licensing use of communications frequencies to help launch new programs at the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and the Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). "We want to attract some of the world's best scientists to Germany," says Humboldt president Wolfgang Frühwald, who calls the new government funding "an important initiative."

Humboldt is using its share of the extra funding—$46 million over the next 3 years—to launch new programs such as the Wolfgang Paul awards. This program aims to attract between 15 and 20 top-notch scientists to Germany by offering grant support of as much as $2 million over 3 years. While the Paul awards are aimed mainly at non-German scientists, native Germans who have worked abroad for more than 5 years are eligible to apply. "We're interested in the high quality of the researchers, not the countries on their passports," says Humboldt's Thomas Hesse. In another program, Kosmos, Humboldt will give 3-year grants of up to $1.1 million to younger scientists.

Bullish on foreigners. Minister Bulmahn, here with a young U.S. researcher, wants to infuse fresh blood into German science.

The other beneficiary of the new funds, the DAAD, will get about $34 million over 3 years to jump-start three new programs. One, Innovatec, will sponsor about 50 guest scientists annually—open to any professors at all levels outside Germany—to work at German universities. Another program will help fund exchanges of between 500 and 1000 graduate students and advanced undergrads a year. The new programs will complement ongoing efforts to give young researchers more independence and to help transform German universities (*Science*, 5 January, p. 23, and 2 February, p. 821).

Bulmahn thinks these initiatives, along with a wave of retirements at universities expected over the next 5 years, will open up new opportunities for scientists. As she told the California expatriates, "it would be great to see you again in Germany."

–ROBERT KOENIG

SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT

Fallout From German Fraud Case Continues

BERN—An expert panel has criticized Roland Mertelsmann, one of Germany's best known cancer researchers, for failing to detect data falsification and manipulation that allegedly occurred in his department and in some papers on which he was listed as a co-author. Responding to the findings, the rector of the University of Freiburg last week asked the state government to launch disciplinary proceedings. Mertelsmann, chief of the university medical center's oncology and hematology department, immediately called the inquiry "unfair" and vowed to mount a vigorous defense.

Last June, a task force found that 94 papers co-authored by former cancer researcher Friedhelm Herrmann between 1988 and 1992 contained likely falsifications or instances of suspected data manipulation (*Science*, 23 June 2000, p. 2106). Herrmann, who quit his post at the University of Ulm in the wake of the allegations, had worked in Mertelsmann's department at Freiburg.

Investigating Mertelsmann's role in the questionable work, the Freiburg panel, headed by Albin Eser—director of the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg—found no evidence of falsifications by Mertelsmann, who was listed as a co-author on 58 of the Herrmann papers the task force called into question. But the panel faulted Mertelsmann for failing to monitor his department's research closely enough to detect the alleged misdeeds.

The Freiburg panel also cited "serious irregularities" related to two articles co-authored by Mertelsmann that did not involve Herrmann: a September 1994 paper in *Blood* and an August 1995 paper in *The New England Journal of Medicine*. The panel found that some data in these papers, describing clinical trials of cancer treatments, were presented in such a way that they gave the impression of being "more complete and consistent than was actually the case." The panel also found inadequate records of whether some patients had given written informed consent to participate in the trials.

According to the panel, these shortcomings—which also involved other researchers who have since left the university—showed "reckless violation of the rules of good scientific conduct." The panel's report credits Mertelsmann, however, for deleting nearly all the suspect papers from his publication list and taking an active role in correcting or retracting some papers.

In a statement last week, Mertelsmann complained that he had been denied ade-

CREDIT: MARTIN MEISSNER/AP