What has made these faculty members change from their anti-Administration stance of 2 years ago? After all, some admit that they welcomed Dingell's investigators when they first arrived on campus in 1990. "A lot of faculty felt that finally the university would have to listen" and curb the climbing rates, Shah recalls. But that welcome quickly cooled. "As time went on," says Shah, "the [government] people became zealots, rather than really trying to solve the problem."

Shah maintains that some of the flashiest disclosures—revelations of money spent on fruitwood commodes, $2,000 floral arrangements, and cedar closets for the president's house—dealt with an insignificant percentage of the indirect costs, but nonetheless created an image of widespread fraud that would later serve as an excuse to hack away at overhead rates. "We are delighted they caught those dumb things," says Shah. "But to [then] say that everything we do is wrong is crazy."

Moreover, Stanford faculty who were part of the original revolt say they saw no signs of corruption and were reacting only to overambitious spending. "The university should have been more frugal in what it spent," says electrical engineer Anthony Siegman, "but what it spent was honestly spent."

They also take strong issue with the reason given by the DCAA for cancelling the agreements—that Stanford's cost-studies don't support them. Stanford completed the studies in good faith, says Bienenstock, and if the government questioned them, it didn't have to sign the agreements. But government representatives did sign, and "a contract is a contract," he insists. Further, Stanford shouldn't be punished, its faculty say, just because DCAA didn't audit Stanford for a decade. Revoking 10 years of contracts retroactively with no room for renegotiation is not only "punitive," says Bienenstock, but will devastate research at Stanford. More disturbing yet, he says, it suggests a government trend away from providing adequate support for university research.

DCAA declined to comment on the rationale for the Stanford cuts, but it is apparent that Stanford's faculty aren't the only ones who think things have gone too far. "Mr. Dingell...has unleashed forces that threaten to do unspeakable damage to the nation's leading universities," warned an editorial in the 9 February *New York Times*. Bienenstock, for one, is heartened by such defenses, hoping they will help turn the tide of public opinion. "This country has a way of turning around. It goes through these periods, and then it realizes its fundamental values and needs," he says. "Research universities are an important national resource." ■ MARCIA BARINAGA

Berlin Academicians Refuse to Go

Berlin—Since it was founded in 1700 by mathematician-philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, inventor of differential and integral calculus, the Academy of Sciences in Berlin has survived two centuries of the Prussian kings, 12 years of Hitler, and 40 years of communism. But it's not entirely clear that it will survive the unification of East and West Germany.

By the time the two Germanys signed the reunification treaty in 1990, they had already agreed on how to tackle the reorganization of East Germany's network of 60-odd scientific research institutes. But they left unresolved precisely what to do with the academy itself. Located in what was East Berlin, it has served as a distinguished honor society for more than 250 years, and currently has about 200 members, most from the former East Germany. It also boasts some priceless nonhuman assets: an enormous turn-of-the-century building right at the center of old Berlin, a superb library of 350,000 volumes, a magnificent archive of the work of Leibniz, von Humboldt, and other famous German scientists, and the historical legacy of a 292-year descent from Leibniz.

ULLSTEIN-MANFRED KLÖCKNER

Leibniz' legacy. *The Academy of Sciences building.*

The new Berlin senator for science and research, lawyer Manfred Erhardt, has essentially proposed taking over the academy's assets but not its members. He wants it to be the home of a new academy set up in collaboration with the surrounding state of Brandenburg. "I want a new beginning. I do not want to get anybody foisted on me," Erhardt told *Science*, explaining his unwillingness to inherit scientists from the communist era.

So far, his plan seems to be to ignore the academicians in the hope they will go away and form their own private society. Erhardt's office sends back letters from the academy unopened. Pay for the five academy administrative staff has been terminated without notice. And in public, Erhardt refers to Horst Klinkmann, the academy's president and a medical professor from the University of Rostock in Mecklenberg, as the "ex-president." But Erhardt has not actually dismissed the 200 academicians. On that issue he passes the buck back to Klinkmann—it's his job to get rid of them, he says.

Klinkmann is having nothing to do with it. "The idea that a Mecklenburg country doctor shall disband the academy, which a universal genius, Leibniz, founded—that's just ridiculous," he says. He points out that the learned society includes several Nobel laureates and distinguished foreign members (among them Manfred Eigen, Ilya Prigogine, Victor Weisskopf, and Julius Axelrod), that steps have already been taken to get rid of communist appointees, and that more than 30 of the academy's own long-term research projects have won approval from the German Science Council—helping persuade the academy that it is far from dead. Indeed, such is the faith in the academy that most of its administrative staff are continuing to work without pay while Klinkmann gets ready to fight in court.

The law is on Klinkmann's side according to Hans-Peter Schneider, a law professor at the University of Hannover and one of the leading experts on constitutional law in Germany. He points out that the reunification treaty states: "How the learned society of the Academy of Sciences of the German Democratic Republic is to be continued, shall be ruled by state legislation." Schneider contends the wording does not allow for the "abolish-and-rebuild" approach that Erhardt supports.

Barring a political solution—which looks improbable even though the Berlin parliament plans hearings on the problem next month—Schneider's views are likely to be tested in court. That should ensure that the stalemate lasts at least another couple of years. ■ RICHARD SIETMANN

Richard Sietmann is a free-lance science writer based in Berlin.