

Even the Security Ministry began to waver. On 5 May, it dropped the charge against Mirzayanov, declaring that "the expertise on the reliability and the degree of secrecy of the information disclosed by Mirzayanov established that the information...is not secret and does not constitute a state secret." But the victory proved to be fleeting. New charges were filed on 13 May, with virtually no explanation for the about-face. The ministry said only that "sufficient evidence has been gathered to elaborate and complement the previous charge." The final step came in December, when the ministry announced it would hold a trial of Mirzayanov closed to outside observers.

The start of the trial on 24 January sparked a new round of protests from organizations in the West, including the American

Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). AAAS, which publishes *Science*, argued in a legal brief submitted to the Moscow court that what Mirzayanov described, if true, violated at least two treaties, and that Mirzayanov's right to talk about it is protected under international law. Similar sentiments were expressed last month in a press conference by the U.S. ambassador to Russia, Thomas Pickering, who defended Mirzayanov "for telling the truth about an activity which is contrary to a treaty obligation."

The three-judge panel has apparently found a face-saving solution to the problem by turning the case over to Kazannik for further investigation. U.S. officials note that Yeltsin appointed Kazannik and has more control over him than over the Security Ministry, and they hope he will privately

persuade Kazannik to drop the charges. "I'm pretty sure Kazannik will close the case," says astrophysicist Roald Sagdeev, a former director of Russia's Institute of Space Research. Sagdeev, now at the University of Maryland, also speculates that ethnic prejudice—Mirzayanov is Tartar—may have prolonged the campaign against him.

Mirzayanov's supporters have learned not to get their hopes up too high, however. Although Mirzayanov was expected to be freed for the duration of his trial, he was instead incarcerated for almost a month and only this week released from the "Sailors Silence" jail. Still, his friends say the recent captivity hasn't dimmed his spirits. Says Lev Federov, "Vil is ready to fight to the very end."

—Richard Stone

AAAS MEETING

Losing Friends and Influencing Policy

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA—John Gibbons, President Clinton's science adviser, opened the 160th annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)* with a story about a talking frog. A man walking down the road comes upon a frog, who says, "Sir, I may look like a frog, but I'm a fairy princess" and implores the man to kiss her. The man puts the frog in his pocket and walks on. The frog, dismayed, says, "Sir, perhaps you didn't understand me" and again asks for a kiss. "Well, frankly," the man finally replies, "at this point in my life, I think I'd rather have a talking frog."

Like all parables, this one is subject to many interpretations, but some listeners concluded that Gibbons meant his job has won him few friends, and he's wary of its glitter. In fact, Gibbons said more explicitly later in his speech that he only enjoys his job "from time to time," apparently because of its bruising, political nature.

As Gibbons explained in his 45-minute, Friday evening keynote talk, since taking over the helm at the Office of Science and Technology Policy last year, he has found himself thrust into "the rough and tumble world of White House political decisions"—a far cry from his old job as head of the Office of Technology Assessment. "In that job, I provided lots of options for political decision making, but I never made recommendations or decisions—that's how you keep your friends," reminisced Gibbons. "Now that seems like a long time ago."

Among those whose friendship Gibbons would like to keep are basic researchers, many of whom fear that the Administration's zeal

for strategic or applied science is threatening support for academic science. Scientists, he said, must respond not with fear but by regrouping and providing a better explanation to society at large of just how their work benefits the greater good. "We cannot forget that the reasons scientists do science are seldom the reasons the general public funds science," he advised.

In this unsettled climate, Gibbons argued, one of the key issues for the scientific community will be the funding of scientific megaprojects, and much of Gibbons' talk focused on how the Administration intends to manage such enterprises. The Administration, he said, had drawn two lessons from the scuttling of the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC). One is that big ticket re-

search today forces the United States to make longer commitments to research projects—up to a decade at a time. The second is the need to "internationalize big science as much as possible."

Gibbons said it will fall to the president's newly formed—and as yet rather vaguely defined—National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) to direct U.S. participation in international megaprojects. The NSTC, which Clinton heads and Gibbons sits on, will work with Congress to find a way to ensure multiyear support for the most important science projects and avoid the annual budget agonies suffered by the SSC. Among the projects Gibbons thinks could require such treatment: the International Thermonuclear Energy Reactor, which is being pursued by a consortium involving the United States, Europe, Russia, and Japan; the Human Genome Project; the space shuttle and the Russian space station, Mir. And the list could soon include U.S. participation in Europe's Large Hadron Collider.

Given all the headaches involved in budgeting U.S. cooperation in those projects, by the time of the AAAS meeting next year, in Atlanta, Gibbons may well be wishing even more devoutly for the company of friendly frogs rather than tantalizing princesses.

—Jon Cohen

Science Editor to Resign

Daniel E. Koshland Jr., editor-in-chief of *Science*, announced at the AAAS annual meeting that he intends to resign to pursue his research as soon as a successor is named to guide the magazine. A biochemist at the University of California (UC), Berkeley, Koshland has been editor of *Science* since 1985 and has increased the international scope of the journal, its readership, and its advertising base. Richard Nicholson, chief executive officer of the AAAS, announced that a nine-person search committee was being formed to find Koshland's replacement. F. Sherwood Rowland of the University of California, Irvine, will head the committee, which will include Florence Haseltine of the National Institutes of Health, and Chang-Lin Tien, chancellor of UC Berkeley. Six other members will be named in "about 3 weeks," Nicholson said. The search committee will be charged with providing the names of three respected scientists as candidates "by the end of 1994," Nicholson said. In addition to scientific credentials, candidates will be judged on their "capacity to make difficult editorial choices and stand up to pressure" and their "openness to innovations in editorial content and presentation," AAAS said in a statement distributed at the press conference where Koshland's retirement was announced.

* "Science and a Changing World," 18-23 February. More coverage will appear next week.