nothing to answer our specific allegations," one faculty member says.

Mosher argues that faculty members acted in their own best interests. "They're protecting their own," Mosher says. "It's either offending two faculty members or me. I'm nobody in comparison." But the professors counter that the university tried hard to minimize any conflict of interest. The three-member investigating committee was composed of two non-China specialists in the department and a professor from Stanford's law school. The China experts in the department, Skinner and Wolf, were not allowed to vote.

Mosher continues to maintain that the heart of the issue is academic freedom, even though Stanford insists evidence of serious professional misconduct justifies the decision to expel him. He is not the least bit contrite that his article ran with the photos or that it was published in Taiwan, whose government is a blood enemy to the Chinese. "I apologize to no one for having done so," he says. "It was a scholarly objective article and I'm proud of it. It is a measure of the success of my research that the Chinese Communists are so anxious to discredit it."

So, while Mosher portrays himself a maligned man, charging Stanford with following the Chinese in "falsely accusing me of 'grave misconduct,' " anthropology department members remain tight-lipped about the specific reasons they kicked him out. Several believe that disclosure of the report would particularly endanger Maggie So's relatives, who might suffer if Mosher's behavior was revealed. Although some members believe that the risk may be small, they say they are not willing to take the chance.

What seems to have been lost in the controversy over Mosher is the issue of late abortions. Mosher was not the first to report on abortions performed by the Chinese late in pregnancy. What is curious is that, in letters to Skinner and to the National Academy's China committee, Mosher did not express any moral outrage over the abortions until months after he left China and was back in Taiwan, sources say. So it is not apparent why Mosher raised the issue of abortion in China. He will pursue the subject of birth control in China in a chapter of a book to be published this summer.

Prewitt points out that it is uncertain whether forced late abortions is a government-wide policy or an isolated campaign by one overly zealous brigade in a country determined to stem its population growth. More study is needed, Prewitt says. Mosher may have intended to focus the world's eyes on China's abortion practices, but instead he has captured the limelight himself. Skinner wrote Mosher that "international observers will see your piece as designed to embarrass the [Chinese] government politically; it comes off as a political gambit not as a humanitarian protest. How could you be blind to this outcome?"

—MARJORIE SUN

U.S.–India Project: Bold Plans, Few Dollars

Both sides have chosen research topics and want results in 2 years; now the money must be found

Nine months ago President Reagan and India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi endorsed a plan conceived by the U.S. State Department for a high-level scientific exchange. It was meant to bring the two countries together in a problem-solving effort after a long period of estrangement. This spring the Indo-U.S. Science and Technology Initiative, as it is now called, is going through an early trial that will shape its future and establish the degree to which it will differ from older programs of this kind.

The officials and scientists who have volunteered to work on the exchange hope to meet in Washington this month to sketch out budgets and detailed study plans. It is already clear, however, that the high level of political commitment to this program will not be matched by a major commitment of funds, at least in the short term. The Administration's goal is to come up with tangible results which Reagan and Gandhi can boast about in another meeting to be held in 1984. However, one of the U.S. research directors says this will have to be accomplished this year on a shoestring budget. The 1985 appropriation will be crucial.

The beauty of science and technology agreements, as one White House aide said recently, is that they are seen as nonpolitical. Their work "cannot be attacked politically by anybody, and it can be used by everybody." Their weakness is that they tend to fade into obscurity once the first gesture is past. India's science attaché in Washington, R. D. Deshpande, says of the earlier exchange programs, "They tend to gather dust." In his opinion, the most important distinction of this program is that it has "a direct link with the White House through the Office of Science and Technology Policy." No previous exchange with India had this, which he describes as "a major policy gain."

On the U.S. side, the program comes under the direct jurisdiction of George Keyworth, the President's science adviser. In India, it reports to M. G. K. Menon, chairman of the science advisory committee to Gandhi's cabinet. Administration of the program has been passed to the National Science Foundation (NSF), which will coordinate research funded by the National Institutes of Health, the Agency for International Development, the Department of Agriculture, and others. The initiative will not lack overseers. There is an independent U.S. Senior Scientific Panel, chaired by D. Allan Bromley, the Yale physicist and president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The Indian committee is chaired by S. Varadarajan of the Department of Science and Technology. In addition, Frank Press, president of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, will appoint another group of outside experts to watch over the research. Its assignment is not clearly defined, but will include finding Americans interested in joining the program, reviewing projects, and suggesting follow-on studies.

With so much prestige at stake, Desphande says, it is not necessary to worry about money. It will come when it is needed. In the same vein, Bromley says, "It's amazing what a difference [Presidential involvement] makes in cutting through bureaucracy and red tape." In addition to its high visibility, the program will be distinguished, Bromley says, by the fact that it will be a true exchange, supporting only work of bene-

fit to both sides. It is not a technology transfer scheme. Bromley does not think it unrealistic to expect progress within 24 months, "not when you've got the two heads of state breathing down your neck."

Like others, Bromley mentions that the project is due to receive about $10 million in U.S. support and a similar amount from the Indians. This would make it quite significant, larger in budgetary terms than the exchange with China. However, officials at NSF mention a lower figure—$2 million—and say even that is tentative. The NSF budget has not cleared Congress, so at this point the agency does not want to specify just how much will be available or exactly where it will come from. But NSF Director Edward Knapp has pledged to find $2 million in the 1984 budget one way or another. This will be used to pay for travel, exchanges of data, and the support of Indian scientists in the United States. India will support Americans abroad. The research covered by the program is for the most part already under way. The new element, as an NSF staffer put it, is its "internationalization."

One of the more promising areas is the study of monsoon dynamics. The administrative pattern in this case seems typical of the whole. According to NSF, research on the monsoon has been going on since the mid-1970's when the agency learned, much to its surprise, that many American scientists are interested in the subject. The agency now spends about $2 to $2.5 million annually on monsoon work and has participated in two large experiments—one based in Kuala Lumpur and the other in Delhi. It also supports collaborations between U.S. and Chinese scientists.

Reagan and Gandhi discuss science agreement, July 1982

The short-term goal for the monsoon project will be to introduce Indian scientists to the latest U.S. weather modeling techniques and to help them transfer the computer tricks learned in the United States to Indian systems. The U.S. scientists hope to gain access to an enormous data base on monsoons collected by Indians, and they hope to share the data collected by an Indian satellite to be launched soon into geosynchronous orbit. The information will be valuable to those who live and voyage in the tropics, including the U.S. Navy.

In the area of public health, ongoing projects in leprosy and other problem diseases will be made a part of the program. Nutrition-related blindness and control of fertility will be given special attention. Bromley mentions that U.S. researchers would like to know much more about the epidemiology of slow virus diseases, and India could provide unique data on some of them. In agriculture, collaboration will focus on fuelwood research, nitrogen fixation, and the efficient use of fertilizer in irrigated lands, where large losses are common. The fourth area of concentration—materials research—is less clearly defined, but will involve the use of photovoltaic cells to provide power in remote villages under harsh climatic conditions.

In virtually all these areas, the U.S. agencies have already found volunteer collaborators and drawn up agendas. In some cases, the proposals have already been sent off to India; in others, the proposals are due to go out in a matter of days. The next phase will not begin until the Indians have given a formal response, which is not expected before June.—**ELIOT MARSHALL**

Scientists Fault Charges of Soviet Cheating

Experts say that the United States lacks good evidence of Soviet dishonesty on strategic arms treaties

Senator James McClure, a conservative Republican from Idaho, seems to be privy to a lot of sensational information about Soviet compliance with arms control treaties. Just the other day, he received a "comprehensive statistical study of Soviet weapons testing," which proves that the Soviets have repeatedly violated the Threshold Test Ban Treaty. He claims to have seen official documents that describe Soviet testing of two new intercontinental ballistic missiles in direct violation of the SALT II treaty. He also has government reports on the secret stockpiling of Soviet ICBM's and the deployment of banned Soviet missiles. It all adds up, he says, to "a consistent pattern of Soviet violations of the whole range of arms control treaties."

If true, the allegations would probably force the United States "to reassess its entire spectrum of negotiations and relations with the Soviet Union," as McClure says. There is only one problem. The issue is gray and not black and white. Interviews with scientists, government officials, and outside experts with access to classified information reveal that considerable doubt exists about all of his charges. They say that McClure has at best exaggerated and at worst flatly distorted the facts.

This obstacle notwithstanding, McClure and some conservative congressional colleagues are pressuring the Administration in a series of speeches and press conferences to charge the Soviets officially with treaty violations. They say that their aim is to acquaint the Ameri-