some good faculty members in recent years and is "in danger of losing its best junior and middle-level researchers in recombinant DNA and hybridoma-based investigation."

The center will have at its disposal $750,000 over the next 5 years from a special endowment. In addition, according to acting director Dale Oxender, up to $250,000 may be available from the university's general fund. Initially, the money will be used to supplement the stipends of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows and to hire two junior faculty members. Eventually, two senior investigators will also be hired.

Like the robotics center, the genetics unit has a state-funded counterpart, the Molecular Biology Institute. Established in Lansing, close to Michigan State University, it will perform contract research and, like the Industrial Technology Institute, it will work closely with the universities. The two institutes are part of Michigan's pitch to attract high-technology industry into the state.

So far, the university's financial woes do not seem to have seriously damaged its prestige. According to the recent ratings of graduate schools published by the National Academy of Sciences, Michigan ranks in the top five universities in social and behavioral sciences and in the top 20 in most other disciplines. The next year or two are likely to be critical, however.

One key element will be the success of the fund-raising campaign. About half the proceeds will be used for endowment to support faculty positions and student aid. The remainder will be used for some long-overdue construction projects such as a new chemistry building, a recital hall, and some health research facilities. (A $260-million university hospital is already under construction with state and private funds.)

Perhaps more critical is what happens at the state level. The newly elected governor, James Blanchard, has proposed yet another cut in appropriations for higher education. More important, however, he has also steered through the legislature a proposal to raise state income taxes in an attempt to bring the budget deficit under control. University officials are fully behind the proposal, and they regard its passage as essential to bring some stability to funding for higher education. Further erosion of support would pose severe problems, says vice president Kennedy. "I don't think we have damaged the core of the institution yet," he says, "but if we continue on this path we will not be the University of Michigan." —COLIN NORMAN

National Science Board Okays Theory Center

The National Science Board has approved continuation of the Institute for Theoretical Physics for a second 5 years of operation. The institute, which is located at the University of California's Santa Barbara campus, began as a 5-year experiment in the fall of 1979 (*Science*, 11 March, p. 1207). Science board approval of the renewal proposal means that the National Science Foundation can issue a new grant that is to commence in 1984. The institute's annual expenditures have been just over $1 million and are not expected to increase greatly.

Walter Kohn, the institute's director, says he is pleased with the decision, especially because the science board voted to continue the center a full year and a half before the first grant expires. Planning the institute's study programs begins 3 years in advance. The science board's decision now to stay the course means "we can maintain our momentum," says Kohn. There had been some concern that doubts within the physics community as to the effectiveness of a centralized theory center with a large proportion of short- to medium-term visitors, which were expressed at the time of the institute's establishment, might resurface and adversely influence the board.

With approval in hand, three other items of the institute's business can proceed. The first is the search for a new director to replace Kohn, who has said he will step down when the institute reaches its fifth birthday. One of the issues to be resolved is whether the next director should come from the Santa Barbara faculty or, as some institute staff prefer, from outside the campus. A prestigious theorist netted in a nationwide search would be a big asset but might also be difficult to lure to Santa Barbara for a long period without the promise of a tenured faculty position.

Access to computers has been a minor frustration for institute scientists. With its continuation assured, the institute can now firm up its previously tentative order for its own mid-sized computer. For tasks requiring number crunching, the institute has completed arrangements to use one of the Los Alamos National Laboratory supercomputers. And negotiations are beginning that may lead to a powerful scientific computer being installed at the institute by the end of this year.

Finally, one provision of the new grant will allow the institute to add a new permanent staff person to go with the three, in addition to Kohn, already hired. A search, probably for an elementary particle physics theorist, will begin promptly, says Kohn.

—ARTHUR L. ROBINSON

Soviets Reject Test Ban Changes

The Soviet Union has spurned an offer from the United States to discuss modifications to the Threshold Test Ban Treaty. The agreement, which was signed by Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev in 1974, is supposed to limit the yield of underground nuclear weapons explosions to 150 kilotons, thereby curbing the development of multimegaton bombs. The treaty has yet to be ratified by the Senate.

In February, the Reagan Administration said that the Soviets might be cheating and that new measures were needed to verify Soviet compliance (*Science*, 18 February, p. 819). Specifically, it proposed to dispatch a team of scientists to Soviet test sites for direct measurement of each blast above 75 kilotons. The Soviets could reciprocate and send their experts to Nevada.

After deliberating for a month, the Soviets said they were unwilling to discuss any changes. "We are very disappointed in the Soviet response," said Alan Romberg, a State Department spokesman. "If they continue to refuse to discuss our concerns, we would be forced to question how genuine their commitment is to effective limitations on nuclear testing."

A number of U.S. scientists have challenged the Administration's allegations of Soviet cheating, claiming instead that U.S. estimates of Soviet test yields are incorrect. Others have said that cheating—if it occurs—is minor and of little strategic significance. A growing number of congressmen