

ing military grants. The list includes Hokkaido University, Kunamoto University, Kyoto University, Osaka University, Osaka Municipal University, Tokyo University, and Yokohama Municipal University, among others.

► Some individual researchers have announced that they are terminating their Army grants, or at least don't plan to renew them. The U.S. Army, however, says no Japanese scientists have yet dropped their grants.

► The Physical Society of Japan, at an emergency general meeting on 9 September, resolved that it will henceforth have "no relationship of cooperation, including aid, with all of the armed forces here and abroad," according to a U.S. State Department memorandum. The vote was 1,927 for, 777 against, with 639 abstentions and 38 votes invalid.

Afterward, Hidetoshi Takahashi, chairman of the society, told Japanese newsmen that the young members who forced the issue were "a political group." He lamented that the resolution will put a major restraint on the society and perhaps prove detrimental to the development of physics.

► Perhaps most significant of all, the Ministry of Education on 8 September announced changes, effective 1 October, in its regulations governing the acceptance of money by national universities from all outside sources—civilian as well as military, domestic as well as foreign. The regulations surprised U.S. officials (and many Japanese officials as well) by their stringency and broad impact.

State Department officials say it is "impossible" for U.S. granting agencies to "live with" a new Japanese regulation governing allocation of patent rights, primarily because the regulation conflicts with a presidential order. Conflicts have also arisen over auditing procedures, title to equipment purchased under the grant, authority of a granting agency to cancel its grant, and the return of funds that have not been expended.

If the regulations are literally enforced, officials say, all U.S. agencies will have to curtail their grant programs in the Japanese national universities. The largest such program, involving grants of \$863,769 for medical and biological research in fiscal year 1967, is conducted by NIH. Next in size is the Army program, which is believed to total about \$100,000 at the national institutions, while the Air Force con-

tributes approximately \$40,000 more.

The civilian programs were apparently ensnared by accident. A high official of the Japanese Ministry of Education told NIH the new regulations were aimed at the Army and at private firms that invest in research. He said the ministry hadn't realized NIH would be hit so hard.

The prospect of losing U.S. civilian grants has caused considerable consternation in some circles. The *Mainichi Shinbun*, Japan's second largest paper, warned that a "brain drain may occur" if eminent scientists lose their NIH support and feel forced to emigrate to greener pastures. At least one scientist has already threatened to leave. U.S. State Department analysts report that many Japanese scientists and national universities and the Japanese Foreign

Ministry are pressing for relaxation of the rules.

Though the U.S. civilian and military grant programs are all relatively small, they are regarded as politically important symbols of cooperation. And from a scientific standpoint, agency officials say, most of the projects would be hard to duplicate elsewhere.

About the only silver lining in this cloud is a pledge by various Japanese ministries to increase their financial support of science, largely because of charges that government stinginess contributed to the "moral crumbling" of Japanese scientists when confronted with U.S. Army money.

Though the uproar in Japan is regarded by U.S. State Department officials as "an isolated phenomenon" with "no global implications," it seems

U.S.-Soviet Exchanges: Agreement Nears Expiration

Time is rapidly running out for the exchange agreement under which the United States and the Soviet Union conduct their scientific and cultural exchange programs. The agreement expires 1 January 1968 and, at this writing, no date has been set for negotiations on a new agreement. Although State Department officials stress the importance of continuing the exchanges, they are proceeding cautiously because of Soviet sensitivity about the war in Vietnam.

There is no doubt that the war is causing some foot-dragging on the part of the Soviets—but the extent of the slowdown is not clear. For one thing, the Soviets have never been in any particular haste to complete exchange agreements. The current agreement, which covers the 1966–1967 period, was not concluded until 19 March 1966, even though the agreement that preceded it lapsed at the end of 1965. Perhaps as a gesture of protest by the Soviets over U.S. foreign policy, the belated 1966 agreement cut the number of scientists who could participate in the program conducted by the National Academy of Sciences and the Soviet Academy of Sciences from the 55 previously permitted to 45 and reduced the total months of exchanges from 180 to 170.

In March of this year, a five-member delegation from the National Academy met in Moscow with representatives of the Soviet Academy. Nothing concrete was expected to come out of the meeting, and to date nothing has. Lawrence Mitchell, staff director of the National Academy's Section on the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, said one of the projects that was discussed at length during the March meeting was a much-delayed symposium on the electron theory of metals. At one time the symposium was slated to take place in the United States during 1965. In March, the Soviets suggested holding the symposium in the U.S.S.R. in October 1967. After returning to the United States, the Americans countered with a suggestion that the symposium take place in the U.S.S.R. early in 1968. The proposal was made 8 months ago, but a reply has not yet been received.

Although the lack of correspondence between the national academies of both countries is not without implications, one official said the Soviets have never been noted for prompt replies. Whatever the reasons for the communication lapse, there is little optimism here that a new exchange agreement will be negotiated in the near future.—K.S.