

gotten about \$200,000 to go out and look for these hypothetical Edisons. "The idea is to award modest grants to about 16 people," says Holt. "We want a three-page proposal on an idea appropriate to the scientific or technical utilization of a space station, a curriculum vitae—we're looking for people with technical capability, so that will exclude high school students—and a plan to develop the idea within 6 months."

"It's not clear yet what we're after," he adds, "except perhaps fresh people who don't know yet what can't be done."—**M. MITCHELL WALDROP**

Chinese Decry Dishonesty in Scientific Research

If misery loves company, then American scientists may find some comfort in the fact that researchers in China are trying to grapple with the problem of scientific misconduct.

According to several publications from China, scientists there are wrestling with cases of misbehavior that are similar to ones that reddened the face of the American scientific community during the past few years. The Chinese journals cite troubles, for example, with fabrication of data and unfair claims to authorship. Some China watchers speculate that the government's unrelenting drive to upgrade science and technology, which is one of the goals of the "Four Modernizations," might have led to the problems.

An article in the *Journal of Dialectics of Nature* reveals that some Chinese scientists also suffer from the "publication-by-the-pound" syndrome. The article said that "many people think only of getting hold of a small topic in pursuit of 'keeping the news pouring out,' and still others intentionally break up an article into smaller pieces." It said that some scientists "even do not hesitate to resort to falsification or giving false information about achievements. . . . These petit bourgeois workstyles which are reappearing in scientific labor are diametrically opposed to the demands of scientific and academic modernizations."

The official Chinese news agency *Xinhua* reported last March that the

National Defense Scientific and Technological Commission party committee has set down standards for scientists working in defense research. The committee, for example, said, "Never permit fabricated experiments, records, rigged experiment data and false reports on research achievements; welcome others to surpass oneself instead of being jealous of their abilities, . . . and strive to do more with less money in scientific research." White House science adviser George Keyworth might be inclined to echo the commission's admonition when scientists apparently complain of lack of funds. Hardworking scientists "used their heads . . . and solved difficulties."

According to a recent issue of *Beijing Review*, a Chinese political magazine, "Some people stoop to deception by doctoring data and research results in their pursuit of personal fame and gain. . . . Some even resort to plagiarism." It reported that a Chinese scientific journal last year began running a regular column on ethics in science at the request of four members of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. These researchers also prompted more than 100 researchers and technicians to draft a code of ethics for the Peking scientific community.

The *Beijing Review* article detailed one example of misconduct in which a Hunan University professor demanded that a junior faculty member share the authorship of a book, although he had only suggested some revisions of the manuscript and proofread the galleys. The junior colleague "gave in to this unreasonable demand." After an investigation, the professor was "criticized in the university and helped to put his misbehavior in the right perspective."

The article went on to laud the conduct of another scientist whose actions contrast with usual practice among Western researchers. The scientist was a candidate this year for a major Chinese mathematics award, but told authorities that a second scientist had achieved the same results 3 months earlier. The results of the first scientist, however, were published before those of the other man. The first scientist said that the other man deserved the recognition because he had completed the work first. Authorities awarded the honor

accordingly. The article said that the scientist's honesty "became the talk of the Chinese mathematics circles."—**MARJORIE SUN**

Acid Rain Map Stirs Controversy

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recently received some unwanted assistance from the Izaak Walton League, an environmental organization headquartered in Arlington, Virginia. At a well-publicized press conference, the League distributed copies of an EPA map showing areas of the United States that are highly vulnerable to the adverse effects of acid rain. EPA subsequently sought to downplay its importance.

According to the League, the map shows that "significantly larger portions of the United States are vulnerable to acid rain damage than previously believed." It shows, for example, that the alkalinity of lakes in many portions of the South and the Southeast is fairly low, which means that they may be incapable of neutralizing some highly acid rain.

The location and severity of the pollutant's effects are contentious issues right now, with environmentalists and citizens in the Northeast pressing for tighter controls on emissions of its precursors, sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides (*Science*, 17 September, p. 1118). "These findings change the nature of the politics of the acid rain debate," said League official Paul Hansen because they suggest acid rain can potentially wreak havoc in regions outside the Northeast.

Needless to say, this was not a popular interpretation at EPA headquarters. A spokesman, Byron Nelson, accused the League of perpetrating a "major disservice" through "the most blatant misrepresentation to date of environmental research reports." He pointed out that the data were hardly new, having been drawn from alkalinity surveys over the last 10 years. And he said that it was simply untrue that low alkaline areas are threatened with serious harm. Finally, Nelson said, it was unnecessary for the League to distribute the report. It was available, he said, to anyone who requested it.—**R. JEFFREY SMITH**