reotypes, as scientific theories, but says that the last third of the course, in which Sarich talks about the primate fossil record and molecular evolution (Sarich's areas of expertise), "is a credit to the department."

Beyond the issue of fairness lurk deeper—and much more difficult—questions of how to handle the case of an eminent scientist who teaches material others object to. One of the few things most members of the faculty and administration agree on in this case is that the disruption of Sarich's course was wrong. "If you don't like what a person is saying or teaching, you cannot silence him by closing his class by violence," says vice-chancellor John Heilbron, who is in charge of academic issues at Berkeley. Indeed, the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Freedom condemned the disruption, and disciplinary action is proceeding against the protesters who have been identified.

But the issue of academic responsibility—of what should be taught in science courses and who should decide—is tougher to settle. Perhaps because it might have a chilling effect on academic freedom, there is no well-established procedure for monitoring the content of courses at Berkeley. The review established by the anthropology department was one such effort, but that ended after the Vice-chancellor "suggested" that the Academic Senate's Committee on Courses was the appropriate forum for a review.

Yet Fiona Doyle, chair of that committee, says that authority over curricula is delegated to the department, which has the expertise to judge course content. To make matters worse, the anthropology department at Berkeley—a hotbed of fractious debates and personal animosities—is so splintered that it has no chairperson. "Nobody is really in a position of authority," says Stanley Brandes, head of the department's executive committee.

Although no one on the faculty takes very seriously the protesters' demands that the tenured Sarich be fired, some have floated the idea that he not teach the introductory course, but only courses relevant to his specific expertise or electives. If the department does decide to take that step, Sarich could appeal to the university's Committee on Privilege or its Committee on Academic Freedom.

For the administration, the controversy has been unsettling. "We're in a land where we haven't many guideposts," laments vice-chancellor Heilbron. Sarich is going on sabbatical next semester, and is not scheduled to teach Anthropology 1 next year. "The span of attention at Berkeley may not last a year and a half," says Heilbron, "but the issues are perennial." ■ PAUL SELVIN

*Paul Selvin is a postdoctoral researcher in biophysics at UC Berkeley.*

# U.S. Backing for Fusion Project Seen

In the next few weeks, the Bush Administration is expected to announce that the United States will continue its participation in a major multinational effort to design a fusion energy test reactor. The first phase of the project, involving preliminary design work on the machine, the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER), was completed in December. The next stage—advanced design and R&D—is expected to cost $1 billion, and the Department of Energy has been keeping fusion researchers guessing about its willingness to ante up. There are now signs, however, that the Administration has decided to back the effort.

The strongest evidence of the Administration's intent is that some $40 million for the undertaking, sources say, is included in the fiscal year 1992 budget that President Bush will present to Congress in early February. In addition, although formal negotiations have not yet begun with the other partners in the venture—the European Community, Japan, and the Soviet Union—government and industry officials say most of the planning for the second phase has been worked out through unofficial discussions.

Another positive signal for ITER is an announcement by DOE last week that it has chosen San Diego, California, as the U.S. candidate for a site for the project. The European Community and Japan are expected to offer their own candidates next month, and a final selection would come later in the year.

"Right now things are looking pretty good for ITER," comments John Clarke, the former director of the Office of Fusion Energy and, until recently, chairman of the ITER Council, which has been overseeing phase one. A total of $200 million has been spent over the past 3 years to produce the conceptual design for the reactor. There is no commitment on the part of any country at this point, however, to actually build the $6-billion device. That decision will not come for 5 or 6 years, when the final design is completed and better cost estimates are in hand. ■ MARK CRAWFORD

*Mark Crawford is a reporter with* New Technology Week.

# High Noon in Utah

Utah officials seem to be running out of patience with Stanley Pons, the chemist who claimed to have discovered cold fusion nearly 2 years ago. The University of Utah, Pons' employer, has given him until 1 February to hand over the raw data from experiments that Pons claims prove the existence of cold fusion. And the Fusion Energy Advisory Council, which oversees the $5-million investment that the state legislature made in cold fusion research at the university, may withhold the rest of Pons' share of those funds if they are not satisfied with his data.

The state has already spent $4.1 million, says Randy Moon, Utah state science adviser and a member of the advisory council. The council is now deciding whether to release the rest to the university, which in turn would give about 20% of the money to Pons and the remainder to the National Cold Fusion Institute in Salt Lake City. The problem, Moon says, is that the university has not provided the council with complete information about results from cold fusion research conducted so far. The university, in turn, blames Pons. John Morris, associate vice president for academic affairs, says the work from the cold fusion institute is "fundamentally sound," but the university has not been able to evaluate Pons' work because it "didn't have the details."

To solve the problem, the university convinced Pons and his lawyer to agree to turn over Pons' raw data to Wilford Hansen, a physicist at Utah State University and a member of the advisory council. According to the written agreement, Pons promised to give Hansen part of the data by 14 January and the rest of it by 1 February. Hansen says that Pons met the first deadline.

But the advisory council is not waiting. It has given the university until 22 January to announce how it proposes to spend the rest of the funds. If Pons' data are unconvincing, the council may not approve any spending plan that includes support for Pons. And, Moon adds, unsatisfactory data from Pons could endanger the whole effort. "The thing that got everybody excited was the excess energy from Dr. Pons' experiments and, darn it, that's what we invested in."

Meanwhile, Pons has quit his tenured professor position at the university and accepted an 18-month contract as a research professor. Three months ago, Pons requested a sabbatical from the university, saying he wished to concentrate on research, but that fell through. Morris gave no details on the negotiations that led to Pons' new relation with the university, but did say that the university did not force him out. ■ ROBERT POOL