

thing going that we did it on their terms," says Flory. The result was a "lopsided exchange."

Any new program should operate with clear ground rules that would include firm guarantees that Soviets named to meetings and other exchanges would be permitted to attend and also "freedom of communication by letter and telephone," says Flory. In addition, he advocates agreement on a "code of performance" which would commit the Soviets to conduct on human rights and scientific freedom issues regarded as "essential for true scientific cooperation and the advance of science."

Press indicated his own views on terms that should be included in a possible broadening of scientific contacts with the Soviets in a meeting this spring with representatives of another human rights organization. The group was the Committee of Concerned Scientists which has adhered to a policy of urging scientists to continue contacts with the Soviets while at the same time seeking to intercede in behalf of individual Soviet scientists in trouble with the Soviet government. Press told the group that he favored stiffer quid-pro-quo arrangements for exchanges, including the rule that only those invited would attend meetings. He also would seek an understanding that U.S. scientists visiting the Soviet Union could make contact with dissident and refusenik scientists.

It is generally agreed that a real revival of scientific cooperation depends first on an improvement in general political relations between the two countries. An expanded program of exchanges would have to fit in with the Reagan Administration's determination to restrict the flow of strategic technology to the Soviet Union. And it is unclear to what extent the Soviets' expressed desire for wider scientific contacts will overcome their increasingly strong objections to U.S. scientists' demands on human rights matters which they condemn as an effort to impose "bourgeois democracy" on them.

Meanwhile, a long-wave pattern in Soviet-U.S. relations seems to prevail. As Jeremy Stone, director of the federation of American Scientists and a seasoned observer of superpower science relations put it, when state-to-state relations are warm, U.S. scientists feel free to complain about human rights and other issues. When relations chill, concern about peace becomes paramount. It is doubtless a sign of the times that American scientists in greater numbers than for years are turning their attention to arms control and disarmament issues.

—JOHN WALSH

Panel Upholds Dismissal of Mosher

A decision by the Stanford University anthropology department to dismiss graduate student Steven Mosher was "justified," according to a three-member grievance committee which has reviewed the case. The committee report, however, does not reveal anything new about Mosher's alleged misconduct while conducting field research in China.

The anthropology department in February ousted Mosher from the program, charging that he was engaged in "illegal and seriously unethical conduct" in China without specifying his exact misdeeds. But Mosher has argued that he was terminated for political reasons because he published an article about Chinese birth control practices in a popular Taiwan magazine (*Science*, 13 May, p. 692).

Mosher's accusation is without merit, according to a report by the committee, which was comprised of two Stanford professors, Gordon Wright, past president of the American Historical Association, and Ernest Hilgard, past president of the American Psychological Association, and University of Pennsylvania professor Ward Goodenough, former president of the Society of Applied Anthropology. "We find nothing in the record . . . to support Mr. Mosher's contention that the department's findings were politically motivated," the report said. The committee was formed at the request of Norman Wessells, dean of Stanford's School of Humanities and Science, to review the grievance filed by Mosher.

The committee concluded that Mosher displayed a pattern of behavior that "involved deliberate disregard for the law of the host country, . . . a manipulative approach toward the people with whom he was living and working," and a "serious lack of candor" in his dealings with his academic advisers, the National Academy of Sciences' China committee, the Stanford investigating committee, and his funding agency. The committee stressed repeatedly that Mosher's conduct destroyed a relationship of trust between professor and student. The report, which has been released in full, said that Mosher's pattern of behavior, "as it unfolded through the course of the investigation, progressively eroded any possibility for a relation of trust" between Mosher and the faculty. "Violation of law by a student need not in itself be regarded as grounds for termination . . . what matters is the extent to which the actions and the circumstances in which they occurred represent a violation of the trust accorded the student by his faculty supervisors and by his institutional sponsors," the report states. Goodenough said in an interview with *Science*, "His subsequent dealings with the investigating committee did nothing to restore that trust."

The committee found that the department had been "fair and thorough" in investigating allegations against Mosher. Goodenough said that there was no evidence that the department based its decision on allegations made by Chinese officials. Mosher has said that his former wife has falsely charged him with wrongdoing. The committee concluded, however, that certain allegations against Mr. Mosher "were supported by sufficient evidence to make a case against him—allegations that Mr. Mosher could have easily refuted. . . ."

The committee concurred with the department's earlier decision not to disclose the specific details of Mosher's alleged misconduct in order to protect the welfare of other parties. Goodenough said, as Stanford has, that release of the report might endanger people in China.

Mosher, who is currently living in Taiwan, may appeal his case to two more levels at Stanford: the office of vice provost and the president.

Some observers have criticized Wessells for failing to appoint at least two members of the grievance committee from outside the university. Mosher, however, rebuked Wessells for forming the committee in the first place and also for including a non-Stanford member. Mosher said in a letter to Wessells that he wanted a single investigator from within the Stanford administration to prevent "further dissemination of the libelous confidential report compiled by the anthropology department." The formation of the three-member committee "is totally regrettable."—MARJORIE SUN