

levels in Japan. The cabinet, on 19 May, called for modification of the procedure of handling U.S. Army research grants, and Premier Eisaku Sato commented the following week that his government would have to intervene in dealings between Japanese scientists and the U.S. Army.

Perhaps the most significant result of the controversy so far has been a stringent new set of regulations issued by the Japanese Ministry of Education governing the acceptance of grants from outside sources by scientists at the 74 national universities and colleges and 24 national junior colleges. If applied literally as now written, the regulations would force an end to virtually all U.S. grant programs in the national schools. Ironically, the U.S. agency chiefly affected would be NIH, not the Army.

Diplomats and agency representatives from both countries are currently working to find a way around the new rules. But whatever the outcome, the episode has raised questions about the wisdom of allowing the U.S. military to support scientific research outside the United States.

In a speech last July, Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, commented on the controversy in Japan and on the fact that the Defense Department was then spending some \$15.8 million sponsoring research in foreign countries. "I am not saying that the research as such is not beneficial," Fulbright said. "What I do not understand is the reason behind the military sponsorship of such projects . . . I cannot understand why our government takes the risk of bruising our relations with other countries by having the Department of Defense undertake such research."

In some ways it seems unfair that the Army's program in Japan should provoke such criticism, for it's hard to imagine how the Army could have been more circumspect in its dealings with Japanese scientists.

A special Defense Department report prepared for Fulbright states that the Army supports research "by outstanding Japanese scientists" who have "unique capabilities in ideas, facilities or access to materials." Such research is "confined almost entirely to basic medical research," ranging from fundamental studies of sensory neurophysiology to studies of diseases endemic to Japan, such as Japanese B encephalitis.

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **CLASSIFIED RESEARCH:** The Department of Defense is planning to discontinue the practice of conducting classified basic research projects at universities. The effect of this impending move remains unclear, however, since the Department acknowledges that some classified university research that is now categorized as basic could continue under other labels. The Department's decision is contained in a statement by John S. Foster, Jr., director of Defense Research and Engineering. It states, in part, "I am taking steps to assure that in the future all basic research supported by DOD [Department of Defense] at universities will be unclassified. However, because universities possess special skills unique for necessary national security activities, we will continue to support a very small number of exploratory development and study efforts at universities as well as occasional consulting arrangements." The Department reports that in fiscal 1966, it had 4152 contracts at universities, and that of these, 138 were classified. A statement spelling out details of the new policy is expected to be issued before the end of the year.

● **NSF BILL:** A measure that would amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) In April the House passed a similar bill, sponsored by Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.). Kennedy told the Senate his bill would "strengthen the National Science Board" and "modify and modernize the structure" of NSF. No date has been set for hearings on the measure which will be conducted by a subcommittee of the Labor and Public Works Committee.

● **HEALTH ECONOMICS INSTITUTE:** The Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics, a multidisciplinary institute that will include both academic and research programs, has been established at the University of Pennsylvania. Davis supported the institute's establishment through gifts to the university. He is a certified public accountant and chairman of the Colonial Penn Group, a Philadelphia-based organization that was instrumental in establishing the first national health

insurance plan for retired persons. Executive director of the institute is Robert D. Eilers who previously was executive director of the S. S. Huebner Foundation for Insurance Education in the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce.

● **MILLION DOLLAR CHAIR:** An anonymous donor has given Columbia University \$1 million for the creation of an endowed chair in neurosurgery in memory of the late Byron Stookey. Stookey was a pioneering neurosurgeon and professor emeritus of neurological surgery at Columbia. The new chair is one of 100 which the university is attempting to establish as a part of a 3-year \$200-million fund drive.

● **BUCKLEY RUNS AGAIN:** William F. Buckley, Jr., Conservative Party politician and editor of the *National Review*, has announced he will run as an insurgent candidate for the 19-man Yale Corporation to protest the university's "liberal bias." Buckley, a 1950 Yale graduate, said his candidacy is based on objections to the "almost total absence of conservatives on the faculty." He will oppose a slate of candidates selected by a corporation-appointed committee. The Yale Corporation is comprised of ten permanent trustees, Connecticut's governor and lieutenant governor, six alumni who serve for 3-year terms, and the university president. Buckley is the author of several books including *God and Man at Yale*.

● **BRITISH ABORTION REFORM:** Britain's House of Commons has approved a controversial bill that will make abortions available without cost for a wide range of social and medical reasons. Under the bill, an abortion may be permitted if any two physicians agree that one of the four following conditions might result if the pregnancy were not terminated: the life of the mother might be threatened; the mother's physical or mental health might be injured; any of the mother's existing children might be injured, mentally or physically; or that a child born from the pregnancy might "suffer from such physical or mental abnormalities as to be seriously handicapped." The new law will become effective 25 March.