CARNEGIE INSTITUTION
OF WASHINGTON

Extending the Frontiers of Science

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

July 12, 1991

Editor
Editorial Page Letters
Washington Post
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071

Dear Editor:

There are a number of problematic assumptions and statements in the editorial "The Science Cops" (June 29, 1991). Among the worst is the implication that the NIH Office of Scientific Integrity represents the views of working scientists. It doesn't. The dissatisfactions within the scientific community concerning the procedures and activities of the Office of Scientific Integrity are widespread and some have become public in recent weeks. Examples include the procedural objections raised by the expert Richards Panel, which was established to assure a fair and thorough investigation by the Office of Robert Gallo's research (see Science magazine, June 21, 1991) and by more than 100 distinguished immunologists in a published letter (Nature magazine, June 27, 1991) about the investigation of Thereza Imanishi-Kari's work. Contrary to your statement, most scientists do not prefer an investigatory model based on scientific procedures over one based on sound legal principles. They fully understand the necessity to protect the accused as well as the whistle-blower. And they too call on the Office of Scientific Integrity to clean-up its act so that the rights of scientists as citizens and the integrity of science can be properly protected.

Sincerely,

Maxine F. Singer

MFS/sb

1530 P STREET, NORTHWEST • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-1910 • 202 387-6400 • FAX 202 387-8092

Department of Plant Biology
Stanford, California

Department of Embryology
Baltimore, Maryland

Department of Terrestrial Magnetism
Washington, D.C.

Geophysical Laboratory
Washington, D.C.

The Observatories
Pasadena, California, and Las Campanas, Chile