vember 1994, p. 1178). Some universities have picked up on that cue. Last year, for example, the University of Tsukuba widely advertised for senior-level researchers for its new Tsukuba Advanced Research Alliance (TARA), an ambitious plan to promote interdisciplinary research in selected fields in cooperation with the private sector. A majority of the 200 applicants were from overseas, says Hiroshi Saito, a TARA administrative official, and the program ended up filling two of the seven vacancies for permanent positions with foreigners. (One is a Japanese scientist now working in Canada, however.)

Charles Rhodes, a professor of physics at the University of Illinois, Chicago, who will move to TARA next spring, says that so far his career move has been smooth. "The supportive role of Monbusho has been exceptionally positive and helpful," he says.

But Rhodes is still an exception in Japanese academia. Monbusho's Itabashi says that universities prefer to use the *kyoin* system rather than the *kyoshi* system when hiring foreigners for long-term or permanent positions. Indeed, the number of *kyoin* has risen from 201 to 389 in the past 2 years. And each university exercises considerable autonomy in deciding whether to offer foreigners a permanent position. For example, the prestigious University of Tokyo has the largest number of *gaijin kyoin*, 31, including 11 with permanent positions, the most in Japan. Tokyo's Shun-Ichi Kobayashi, professor of physics and former science dean, says appointments to permanent positions on the faculty of science are made regardless of nationality, and that the physics department, for one, advertises all openings in international journals. In contrast, the equally prominent Kyoto University has only eight *kyoin* on its faculty, and none hold permanent positions. A spokesperson for Kyoto says the absence of "permanent" foreigners reflects an internal regulation limiting *kyoin* to 3-year renewable appointments.

Indeed, foreigners who don't get permanent positions in Japan are increasingly facing explicit time limits on their stay there. Newly hired *kyoshi* must now deal with a new policy among universities which states that their 1-year contracts will be renewed a maximum of three or four times. Although Hall says universities are within their rights to adopt such a rule, he believes it will make foreigners even more of a token presence on most Japanese campuses. As for Freeman, he's scraping by on the income from several part-time teaching positions. "At age 58, I have found it impossible to find an alternative full-time position," he says.

–Dennis Normile

RUSSIA

Anthropology Institute Accused of Racism

At the first national congress of the Association of Russian Ethnologists and Anthropologists in Ryazan last month, delegates unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the growth of racial intolerance and xenophobia. The resolution called on their colleagues "resolutely to oppose in their daily academic, practical, and teaching work any attempt to sow ethnic and racial hatred."

You might take those words as a pro forma nod to one of the social problems of today's Russia, where extreme nationalists have gained considerable strength in parliament. In fact, the problem is much closer to home for Russia's anthropologists: The "extremists" the resolution condemns include members of their own discipline, and over the past year its premier establishment—the Russian Academy of Sciences' Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology in Moscow—has been accused of protecting them. A group of Russian anthropologists who first alerted colleagues in the West about the affair called it "the current disgrace and shame" of Russian anthropology. And the institute's clumsy response provides a window on Russian intellectuals' current disarray.

The academic at the center of the affair, Viktor Kozlov of the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, seems an unlikely apologist for neo-Nazis. A World War II veteran in his 70s, Kozlov was left with a permanent speech impediment from injuries sustained fighting Nazi Germany. He has been a leading figure in Russian ethnology, and last year he and a colleague were asked to give expert testimony in a trial of Viktor Bezverkhy, a former professor of Marxism-Leninism who has become notorious for his far-right and racist publications.

Bezverkhy was being tried for a second time under Russia's law against promotion of interethnic hatred. His recent writings argued, in a pseudoscientific style, the inferiority of Jews, gypsies, and people of mixed race who, he wrote, had no place in a "socially organized society." Kozlov and a colleague, Nadezhda Lebedeva, were asked to report on the writings. The report, which was mostly Kozlov's work and was submitted in the name of the institute, stated that there was nothing in Bezverkhy's writings that was contrary to the law and that they contained only a few passages that were "rude" or "baseless." Bezverkhy was duly acquitted.

Kozlov's role in Bezverkhy's acquittal sparked an outcry in the democratic press and drew a response from Valery Tishkov, director of the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology. "Such a report [as Kozlov's] should never have been forwarded in the name of the institute," he told *Science*. Tishkov says he wrote to the St. Petersburg court, where the case was still open on appeal, offering a "collective evaluation" of Bezverkhy's writings approved by the whole institute. But the offer was ignored. Tishkov did not, however, take any disciplinary action against Kozlov, and when the institute's academic council came up for re-election in January, Kozlov kept his seat.

This sparked fresh controversy in leading Russian newspapers, notably *Izvestiya* and *Moscow News*, which interpreted Kozlov's re-election as an endorsement of his support for Bezverkhy. Some academics see the re-election of Kozlov differently. "I think that in the postcommunist climate, the intellectual community is still trying to find its feet along the principle that personal or political views should not affect one's position at work, simply to break with the past," says British anthropologist Tamara Dragadze of London's Centre for Caucasian and Central Asian Studies, adding, "In Russian society there is still a certain amount of respect for the old."

The situation took a new turn in April when a group of Russian anthropologists circulated an "open letter" to colleagues in the West, condemning the institute's position and calling on westerners to "save the honor of Russian anthropology." Many recipients of the letter wrote to Tishkov voicing their concern. "Next time I am invited to [collaborate with the institute] I will think very carefully," one recipient, Sergey Kan of Dartmouth College, told *Science*, adding, "I don't think Tishkov has done enough." Jonathan Benthall of London's Royal Anthropological Institute agrees: "In a British or American department or institution, any anthropologist who made remarks like those attributed to Kozlov would be severely disciplined."

Kozlov stands by his statements. Meanwhile, Tishkov is trying hard to contain the damage to his institute. He has launched a program of "urgent studies" on the sources, nature, and implications of pro-fascist and anti-Semitic trends in Russia. He co-authored the anti-racist resolution at last month's congress and has issued another statement condemning Kozlov's "expert testimony." But many of the writers and supporters of the letter fear that the Kozlov affair is just the tip of the iceberg. "Support for Kozlov is not very great [among Russian anthropologists]," says Sergey Khazanov of the University of Wisconsin. "But readiness to confront his views is not very large either."

–Vera Rich

Vera Rich is a writer based in London.