tion is found in a report issued in April by Britain's Royal Society. The report said that Russia already has decided to establish a Russian Fund for Basic Research on the model of the US National Science Foundation. It "will begin life under ministry auspices with a capitalization of 300–400 million rubles. Later, as it grows, it may become independent," the report said. Some 10 000–15 000 scientists with solid international reputations are expected to serve on expert councils assessing grant proposals.

But even apart from the difficult questions of whether or not Russia will be able to raise the money it has promised for the foundation and what the money will be worth when it appears, there are other serious objections to the notion that a Russian foundation would render an international foundation superfluous. In a meeting of FSU scientists held under the auspices of The American Physical Society at its April meeting in Washington, and at a meeting of individuals concerned about FSU science that was held at the National Academies of Science and Engineering in March, many individuals expressed this major concern: The science institutions and institutes of Russia and the other FSU states remain to a disturbing extent under the influence of the "old guard" that opposed *glasnost* and *perestroika* and failed to oppose the attempted putsch last year with sufficient vigor (see box, page 69); this old guard may not channel monies to the right individuals and, in any event, is not trusted by many FSU scientists to make funding decisions fairly. But fairness and a perception of fairness—as NSF's William Blanpied pointed out to PHYSICS TODAY—are the essential preconditions for establishment of a successful science foundation. (Blanpied heads an APS task force on FSU physics, but he is not involved in the evaluation of APS grant proposals to NSF.)

National Academy meeting

At the meeting at the National Academy in March, the participants formulated several proposals for Bromley that implicitly represent an alternative or a supplement to the Okun–Rubbia approach. They suggested first of all that the US establish a $25 million fund specially for non-weapons scientists, matching the Baker–Genscher fund for weapons scientists. Second, they urged the White House to establish a fund of $50–100 million to help large FSU institutes with infrastructural costs.

Because of rampant inflation in the FSU states, energy costs at a typical institute often exceed combined salaries of scientific personnel, as Sagdeev pointed out at the APS meeting of FSU scientists in April. Several participants in the APS meeting proposed partnerships between US or European institutions and FSU institutions as a means of addressing infrastructure costs.

But there also are those who rather strongly oppose infrastructural support in all forms. Joseph Birman of the City College of New York, who has been active for many years in human rights causes and who has been to the USSR many times, is one such person. "I don't support our giving money to large units," Birman told PHYSICS TODAY. "I believe *we* cannot keep the lights or heat on in the winter. If the Russian, Ukrainian or Kazakh governments cannot provide that very

Reformers Frustrated by New Academy, Moscow University Leadership

The Soviet Academy of Sciences, easily the largest science organization in the world throughout the postwar period, ceased to exist on 9 December last year. A presidential decree of 21 November had put all academy institutions on Russian soil under the control of the new Russian Academy of Sciences. In elections to the newly fused academy that were held 17–20 December, Yuri S. Osipov defeated Evgeny Velikhov for president—an upset. Aleksander F. Andreev, deputy director of the Institute for Physical Problems in Moscow, replaced Yuri A. Ossipyan as the vice president in charge of physics.

There had been some thought that the Soviet academy might survive as a central institution serving the whole Commonwealth of Independent States, but apparently its dubious behavior during the coup attempt last August sealed its fate. According to a report just released by Britain's Royal Society, "the USSR Academy and the Union of Writers were the sole learned societies which did not condemn the attempted coup as unconstitutional." In elections two years before to the newly formed Congress of People's Deputies, the academy's leadership had discredited itself by attempting to control the results, which provoked a grassroots rebellion among members (PHYSICS TODAY, May 1989, page 65).

On 10–12 December, a conference of scientists from academic institutions was held and a new statute for the Russian Academy was adopted. The results "fell short of the original objectives of the younger scientists," the Royal Society reported, particularly a decision that "representation from research institutions at the General Assembly should be elected not by full staff but by the more conservative scientific council of each institute."

Though the statute insists on its independence, the Russian Academy, like its Soviet predecessor, is in fact entirely dependent on the state for funding. For the foreseeable future its budget will come from the Russian Ministry of Science, Higher Education and Technology Policy, which is headed by B. S. Saltykov.

Both Saltykov and Osipov are applied mathematicians: Saltykov worked for the Central Economics–Mathematics Institute of the Academy of Sciences, and Osipov was director of the Institute of Mathematics and Mechanics at Ekaterinburg (formerly Sverdlovsk). Osipov was associated with the USSR's military–industrial complex for many years, and according to the Royal Society, he owed his victory over Velikhov to his reputation as an effective administrator, his success in combining the Russian and Soviet academies and an assumption that "he was likely to be fully acceptable to the Russian political leadership." No doubt Osipov's origins in Ekaterinenburg, Russian President Boris Yeltsin's home and original base, and his association with Yeltsin, were decisive factors in his election.

Evidently the election of Osipov represents a compromise between eager young reformers and the old guard, which remains a force to be reckoned with. The persistence of the old guard is evident also in the succession at Moscow State University, probably the most important institution of higher learning in Russia. The former rector, Anatoly Logunov, was notorious for many years because of his anti-Semitism, his opposition to relativity theory and his hostility to political reform. An emigré scientist at an APS meeting in April said Logunov had been conducting a war with equal vigor against both Einstein and Yeltsin. But the emigré indicated that Logunov's successor, Victor Sadovnichiy, was little or no improvement and maybe worse. Sadovnichiy was selected by a committee Logunov hand-picked. —ws