

SLAC staff members expressing opposition to the proposal. James says she wanted Panofsky to go to the meeting with a sense of the staff's feelings, and managed to collect 280 signatures in just 4 days. The committee essentially left the final decision up to Bienenstock.

Gregory Loew, deputy director of the technical division at SLAC and one of the signatories of the faculty letter, says that the disquiet at SLAC stemmed from the feeling that the proposal represents a departure from SLAC's basic mission of research in high energy physics. He also noted that it would hurt SLAC's outside image. "We have a tremendous number of visitors, and people invariably ask whether we are building bombs. In the past, we have always been in a position to say absolutely not, but if this work were to be done here, we couldn't answer in a straightforward way." James says she is concerned because her work in maintaining the electron beam at SLAC makes her in a sense a participant in all the SSRL experiments. She says she would feel very uncomfortable participating in weapons-related work.

This dispute puts Bienenstock in a difficult position. Like many who signed the letters and petitions, he says "I myself do not want to do weapons research unless there is a national emergency. But I don't want to use my position as director of a national lab to force my political views on anybody else."

Bienenstock notes that, apart from the opposition at SLAC to the weapons-related work, the proposal does present one major problem. In the past when outside groups have financed beam lines at SSRL, the university has insisted that one-third of the experimental time on the line be allocated to SSRL researchers. This proposal would allocate 100 percent of the time to the outside researchers, however.

Asked whether the proposal could be submitted elsewhere if SSRL turns it down, Lloyd Multhaupt says that the only alternative is the National Synchrotron Light Source under construction at Brookhaven. A shift to an East Coast facility would, however, present obvious logistical problems and probably preclude participation from the University of California. "We could not afford the travel costs. It would obviously not be feasible," says George Gruner, a physicist at the University of California at Los Angeles who helped prepare the proposal.

Gruner says that if the proposal falls through, the university's part of it—which does not involve any weapons-related work—would be dropped. "It is

obvious that we are not going to get support for \$6 million from the University of California system," to build a beam line, he noted. Asked whether the university scientists were trying to tap into the military's expanding budget to support their work, he said, "I can't see any

other combination of different institutions which could collaborate in getting a beam line." Gruner added, however, that "I can very much appreciate Stanford's position, and I don't think we should try to influence people in this controversy."—COLIN NORMAN

Fraud Inquiry Spreads Blame

In December 1981, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) appointed a panel of outside scientists to investigate allegations of data falsification in the cardiac research laboratory of the Harvard Medical School. The panel was asked to determine the extent of data falsification by a young researcher named John R. Darsee in an NIH-supported study on dogs (*Science*, 29 January 1982, p. 478). It was also asked to look into the supervisory procedures in the laboratory, which is run by Eugene Braunwald, one of the nation's most productive cardiologists.

The panel's report and subsequent NIH staff recommendations in the case were released as this issue of *Science* went to press. Among the recommendations are that Darsee, who is now working in upstate New York, be debarred from NIH funding for 10 years and that he be excluded from service on NIH peer review and advisory committees as well. And, because the panel found deficiencies in the way research was supervised in Braunwald's laboratory at the time of the fraud, the NIH has taken the extraordinary step of calling for an on-site review of supervisory practices and research procedures in approximately 1 year's time "to confirm the panel's impression that current laboratory procedures and supervision are adequate."

Harvard is not pleased. Braunwald's laboratory is located at the Brigham and Women's Hospital—a Harvard affiliate. In documents submitted to the NIH and released under provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, Braunwald took strong exception to the panel's view that his own numerous responsibilities kept him from maintaining sufficiently tight supervision of his laboratory. To support his contention that Darsee (and not the pressures of a high-powered lab) is solely responsible for the fabrication, Braunwald reported evidence of fraud in Darsee's previous research during training at Emory University. Although the NIH panel refused Braunwald's request that it investigate Darsee's Emory record, NIH now agrees that such an investigation is warranted in the near future.

With respect to procedures for reporting serious allegations of data falsification, the NIH panel, headed by Howard E. Morgan of the Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine at Hershey, has called for a policy of informing collaborators in ongoing research projects, coauthors of all papers—published or in press—and funding agencies. Acting on the belief that Darsee had committed but a single foolish act, Braunwald and other Harvard officials elected not to notify others when Darsee was first caught in the spring of 1981. NIH senior staff who reviewed the panel's report wrote that the "desire to be fair to Dr. Darsee and to ensure due process is commendable, but the fact remains that a large and costly study of great importance for a major public health problem was irrevocably compromised because of the failure to inform [NIH and the coinvestigators]."

NIH is now negotiating with the Brigham and Women's Hospital for return of the \$122,371 spent on the now useless study. Harvard's request that it be permitted to do the study over has been denied.

A policy encompassing strict procedures for responding to allegations of fraud is expected to be put in place at Harvard shortly. In June, the Association of American Medical Colleges called for such a policy for all research institutions (*Science*, 16 July, p. 226). The NIH review of the Darsee case and related issues will be discussed in detail in a subsequent article.—BARBARA J. CULLITON