

materials science community when the proposal was developed. DOE has now set up a panel to review the proposal, and the committee said it will entertain a request for funds next year, after DOE's study is completed.

The Catholic and Columbia university facilities have been reviewed neither by DOE nor by the House Committee on Science and Technology. They were first proposed in amendments to a DOE authorization bill on the House floor, after some slick lobbying orchestrated by a Washington public relations firm.

The glaring inconsistency in the committee's actions is sure to be pointed out as the bill wends its way through the rest of the legislative process. But the committee can at least take some comfort from Emerson, who noted that "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines."—**COLIN NORMAN**

Argonne Puts in a Bid For Virginia's Accelerator

Plagiarism usually occurs in private, but there was Senator Charles Percy (R-Ill.) telling the press on 25 May that he thought it would be a great idea for the Argonne National Laboratory to "adopt" an accelerator design proposed by a competitor in Virginia and build the machine in Illinois. Percy made the suggestion as he and Secretary of Energy Donald Hodel emerged from a committee room in the Capitol after an hour-long meeting on this subject. The question they discussed is: whom will the government choose to build a new \$150-million electron accelerator for nuclear physics research, Argonne or the Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA) based in Newport News, Virginia?

Both competitors submitted designs to a group of experts earlier this year. The panel, the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee (NSAC), judged SURA's design the best and Argonne's second best of five offered (*Science*, 27 May, p. 929). But NSAC blurred its findings by noting that either of the top two contenders could build an excellent machine, and by urging SURA to look for a better loca-

tion than Newport News. (It seemed remote from big airports and universities.)

Argonne seized on this as an excuse for trying to override NSAC's decision. Thus Percy arranged the meeting with Hodel to tell him about the economic and political advantages of building the project near Chicago. These are so compelling, Percy argued, that no matter which design is the best, Argonne should build it. Percy claimed that Argonne could shave at least \$42 million off the lifetime cost of the accelerator because it already has a technical infrastructure in place.

The project will be funded jointly by the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Science Foundation, with DOE providing the larger share. Funds are not expected to appear in the budget before 1985, but the inter-regional rivalry is strong because both Illinois and Virginia are trying to build up their image as high-technology centers.

Hodel, as expected, was thoroughly noncommittal as he left the committee room, saying he had received technical advice from NSAC and now is pleased to hear other kinds of advice, such as Senator Percy's. Hodel left this meeting to visit another key player in the drama, Senator John Warner (R-Va.), the most prominent backer of SURA. An aide said the two met on other matters, but that the senator did "reaffirm his strong support of the SURA proposal" during the meeting. Hodel doubtless is pleased to consider this advice too, for Warner sits on the subcommittee that will write DOE's research budget.

In the gathering outside Percy's committee room, Argonne officials gave out a 52-page impartial report showing why Argonne should get the project and not SURA. It is entitled "Comparative Economic Analysis of Alternative Sites for an Electron Accelerator Facility." An Illinois official also released that day a long letter beginning, "We, the Great Lakes Governors . . ." and concluding (what else?) that the Midwest deserves to get the accelerator.

While this lobbying has its amusing moments, its intensity is beginning to worry the accelerator's first sponsors, the nuclear physicists. It could create a backlash, they fear, which could injure the entire field.

—**ELIOT MARSHALL**

Clark of NSF to Be V.P. of Bowling Green

Eloise E. Clark, an assistant director of the National Science Foundation, has been named vice president for academic affairs at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. Clark, who has been with the science foundation since 1969, was asked to resign last fall when Edward Knapp came in as head of NSF and made a clean sweep of staff at the top echelons (*Science*, 24 December, p. 1286).

Clark, who holds a Ph.D. in developmental biology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, has been head of the NSF directorate for biological, behavioral, and social sciences since 1976. At Bowling Green she will be working with Paul Olscamp, its new president, to further develop the university's graduate programs.—**BARBARA J. CULLITON**

Stanford Appoints Panel to Review Mosher Case

Stanford University has appointed a three-member committee to review the expulsion of Steven Westley Mosher, a graduate student in the department of anthropology. Faculty members in the department voted 11-0 last February to expel Mosher for "illegal and seriously unethical conduct" while he was in China on a research visit (*Science*, 13 May, p. 692). Mosher appealed his dismissal to Norman K. Wessells, dean of the school of humanities and sciences, who decided to appoint the review panel.

The panel consists of Stanford emeritus professors Gordon Wright, a historian, and Ernest Hilgard, a psychologist, and University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Ward Hunt Goodenough. It has been asked to submit its report by 30 June.

Stanford has so far declined to make public the full charges against Mosher because it claims that to do so could endanger innocent people. The panel has been asked to write its report in such a way that the report itself or a summary document can be published, however.—**COLIN NORMAN**