

Academician V.V.Ivanter,
Director,
RAS Institute of Economic Forecasting

Letter to the Editorial Board of Expert Journal

I was not particularly eager to join into the debate on the content of the article entitled 'Six Myths of the Academy of Sciences,'¹ signed by S.Guriev, D.Livanov and K.Severinov (Expert no. 48, December 14, 2009). Certainly, development problems of the Russian Academy of Sciences need a serious discussion. And the authors have had good reasons for expressing their thoughts about the subject. But in this case, there is nothing to polemize about. One cannot, in fact, hold the question of who has been the genuine RAS founder – Stalin or Peter the Great - for substantial. To discuss the topic seriously means to resemble the notorious innovative historian, Mr Yushchenko. I also find it humiliating to argue on the incest problem (may it be even scientific) touched on by the authors.

I am compelled, however, to write this text because one of the authors of the article, Mr Guriev, Head of the New Economic School, proved to be privy also to other forms of debate on academic matters. Quite recently, one of NES employees, Mr Sonin took active part in a low-cultured campaign aimed at discrediting RAS Vice-President, Academician Nekipelov. Sonin, Candidate in Physics and Mathematical Sciences, suddenly took an interest in the monograph by Nekipelov, Academician of the RAS Economic Branch, which was published more than three years ago, and immediately started, through several media, to spread his extremely negative reviews. There were statements in these reviews about the monograph lacking any academic value, about numerous cases of plagiarism and other bad features of the RAS Vice-President. By an odd coincidence, of the Vice-President who, in the name of RAS, has been rather efficient in negotiating on financial and property issues. I wish to note in particular that Mr Guriev has not held it for

«
»
?

possible to dissociate himself from his subordinate's exercises.

Honestly speaking, I came to know about Mr Sonin's existence only after the described story. All this makes me assume the topic of plagiarism is somewhat close and well-known to Mr Sonin. How else can one explain the fact that he diligently reproduces self-advertising technologies used by the Pug-Dog from the well-known fable by I.A.Krylov who, in his turn, is known for 'plagiarism' of La Fontaine's, his French colleague's, texts?

As to Mr Guriev, I wish to say discussion technologies about the efficiency of science applied by him, or with his participation, are not original. For example, Academician N.I.Vavilov, at his time, was also successfully defamed as low-efficient retrograde without any solid outcomes. Of course, this victory ensured access to academic titles and budgetary flows to Vavilov's detractors. But they forever lost reputation and respect.

¹ http://www.expert.ru/printissues/expert/2009/48/6mifov_akademii_nauk/

¹ http://www.expert.ru/printissues/expert/2009/48/6mifov_akademii_nauk/