

**Dear colleagues,**

It feels like only yesterday we were in a rush to complete the fourth volume of INEOS OPEN by May and were hoping to hit a good rhythm by the end of the year and release the fifth volume, but here we are now, it's May 2023, and we're only announcing the third issue. Was it a mistake of planning? Overly relaxed attitude post-Covid? International tensions? The reasons are many, yet there's only one conclusion we can make: we need to work better.

The current content leaves somewhat to be desired, but we decided not to engage in mass mailing of invitations to contributing to our Journal. The quality of content is a priority and it's inseparable from the overall activity of the Journal's audience. We hope that this year will see the interest toward INEOS OPEN growing exponentially. It is, after all, an indicator of the Institute's activity, the level of our articles, the quality of peer review, and the attention of the administration. All this creates the basis for the ongoing increase in quality, and with it—in popularity of our Journal among the specialists in the field.

Are there any reasons to be optimistic? Certainly. This year is special for us. The Nesmeyanov Academic Seminar has begun its work, having the study of our first director, A. N. Nesmeyanov's methods of scientific administration as its goal. For myself, I tend to call it "The School for Young Academicians". The continuing pressure exerted on the Academy stimulates us to analyze the recent changes deeply and to unexpectedly discover, one after another, the proof of the Academy being a unique institution. With deeper understanding, comes admiration with the genius of A. N. Nesmeyanov, who managed to turn the post-war "boxes" and "shady organizations" into a unique instrument of gaining knowledge—systematic, balanced, determining the scientific platform not only for the country, but for the entire community of socialist countries.

Even the first meetings of the Seminar have shown that the potential of Nesmeyanov's model is far from exhausted and is in fact extremely relevant. The young academicians are to study this model within the Seminar, and then implement and further it in their professional areas. We don't have to wait for more "enlightened ideas" from "genius" reformers. We need to return to the unique algorithms of work of the Academy institutes and to develop them further.

Within the Institute, we need to continue to study the depth of vision of our great director. We are to supplement the 19-volume creation of our Teacher with at least a one- or two-volume updated edition of the "The Methods of Organoelement Chemistry", his fundamental work in the field of organoelement chemistry. This work can no longer be postponed, and our Journal, with its format of highlighting reviews, is a very convenient and effective tool for this purpose.

We also have a duty to summarize our Teacher's brilliant insights in yet another area—synthetic food. Just one little booklet on the subject, the product of his report for

the Mendeleev Congress, in its importance, scientific basis, and cross-discipline reach, is light years ahead of subjective pretensions of western trends, such as the carbon footprint, anthropogenic impact on climate, and other business–science hybrids.

Comparing the global projects/programs is very revealing in terms of differences between the western and Russian scientific schools. In the West, they usually choose directions with clear prospects of scientific marketing, supported by waves of populist information boosts. The achievement of the proclaimed end goal isn't necessary; big movement within the scientific masses is more important. Most scientific discoveries are made along the way and, as a rule, aren't related to the declared goal.

For the Soviet–Russian school, the achievement of the selected goal is important, while everything collected along the way is secondary. For that reason, the goal selection was taken very seriously, with due consideration to the prospects of achieving them. The goal was never abstract.

If we look carefully at these differences in approaches, we can see how difficult it is to conflate them. Nesmeyanov's method of scientific projection was unique and managed to fully account for the advantages and disadvantages of both. Now, thanks to the concerted efforts of reformers, we've been veered off from the Nesmeyanov highway to the backyard of the western system, with its grants, h-indices, citation indices, *etc.* This is why it's vitally important to evaluate and consolidate Nesmeyanov's heritage, so that we could go back to the highway leading to the future.

Sincerely yours,

**Editor-in-Chief**

**Prof., Full Member of RAS**

*Aziz M. Muzafarov*