

Communications

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:

I am writing to request that you publish in *PS* the SOS—Sakharov, Orlov, Shcharansky—Scientists and Engineers Pledge Moratorium on Behalf of Colleagues as a follow-up to the original letter on SOS which appeared in the Spring 1979 issue of *PS*. I am most hopeful that members of the Association will support the pledge. The pledge moratorium is as follows:

Scientists and Engineers Pledge Moratorium on Behalf of Colleagues

On 22 January 1980, our colleague Andrei Sakharov, an outstanding scientist and world-renowned leader of human rights, was arrested and exiled to Gorki by the Soviet authorities, for the "crime" of expressing his personal opinions. Since then he has been repeatedly harassed and even physically assaulted by the police. His wife reports he is in poor health. We must help!

To protest the Soviet government's savage treatment of their colleagues Orlov and Shcharansky, more than 2,400 American scientists pledged last year to restrict their scientific cooperation with the Soviet Union. This action was strongly applauded by Sakharov and other Soviet dissidents (and was widely denounced in the Soviet media). Nearly 1,000 French and Australian scientists have also adopted similar pledges. Because of Sakharov's exile and the deteriorating plight of other dissident scientists, we must act now and in much greater numbers than ever before.

We appeal to you, our fellow scientists and engineers the world over, to join together in a strong and significant protest of the Soviet Union's blatant violation of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accords to which it is a signatory. We propose a moratorium on scientific cooperation with the Soviet Union for a limited duration linked to Helsinki Accords actions.

To commemorate the founding of the Moscow Helsinki Watch Group by Orlov, Shcharansky and others, the Moratorium shall begin on the fourth anniversary of that date, 12 May 1980. Six months later, on 11 November 1980, there will commence a major conference in Madrid to monitor compliance with the Helsinki Accords, with representation from all 35 countries which signed the treaty. We propose to maintain the Moratorium until the end of the Madrid conference. Evidence from that meeting can then help determine the need for, and the course of, future action.

Scientists everywhere, acting independently of their governments, must express their deep concern now! We urge you to sign the pledge coupon below and to solicit additional signatures from your professional colleagues. The pledge does not preclude personal communication with Soviet scientists in the interests of promoting human rights and world peace.

We will publicize the pledge, along with the names of signers, and send the list to Soviet President and Secretary Leonid Brezhnev and to the President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, A. P. Aleksandrov.

Moratorium Pledge

To protest the human rights violations by the Soviet Union in the cases of Sakharov, Orlov and Shcharansky, we, the undersigned scientists and engineers, pledge a moratorium on professional cooperation with the Soviet scientific community for a period beginning 12 May 1980, the anniversary of the founding of the Moscow Helsinki Watch Group, and ending at the completion of the November 1980 Madrid Conference to monitor the Helsinki Accords. During this period we will not visit the Soviet Union or welcome Soviet scientists and engineers to our laboratories.

NAME (Please Print)

SIGNATURE

AFFILIATION (Department, Institution, Country)

ADDRESS (Zip)

Please mail pledge coupon to: Scientists for Orlov and Shcharansky, P.O. Box 6123, Berkeley, California 94706, U.S.A.; telephone (415) 486-4403. To help defray expenses, we would greatly appreciate a contribution. Checks may be made out to SOS or Scientists for Orlov and Shcharansky. Thank you.

Philip Siegelman
San Francisco State University

To the Editor:

In his letter in the Spring 1980 issue of *PS*, Michael E. Urban pointed out some of the political implications of the World Congress held in August 1979 in Moscow by the International Political Science Association. I should like to take the occasion provided by his letter

to expand a bit on some aspects of that Congress, for his comments raise some key points of perception that bothered many of us in Moscow and which are extremely important for me in my professional capacity as a student of international communications.

Many Americans went to Moscow expecting that the Moscow IPSA Congress would be like others which we attend in our professional careers. The APSA annual meetings, for instance, are fairly free-floating conferences: Attendance at panels at any given timeslot is doubtless no more than a third of all those registered for the annual meeting at that particular time; people wander from panel to panel to catch snippets from this or that; they arrive seldom on time in the quite-correct assumption that no panel ever begins on time; they spend a lot of time chatting over coffee or in the book exhibit; and so forth. In the United States we recognize—or at least I believe we do—that a scientific conference serves many purposes, one of which is the exchange of scientific views and data.

My experience at overseas conferences, especially but not exclusively in socialist countries, is rather different. The person attending the conference is frequently a delegate of his/her institute, who not only has the responsibility of reporting back in detail about the meeting but may have the responsibility of officially recording the institute's views on a particular topic. A consequence is that there is a more intense tone: At any given time most registrants are in fact participating in a session; they get there early to ensure that they have good seats (and, in our case, translating equipment); they take notes during the discussions; and they are keen to make known during the discussion period their own views or those of their institutes.

This pattern played itself out in Moscow. Although Eastern Europeans were outnumbered as registrants by approximately three to two, they were the groups most in evidence in any given session. They did get there early and got the best seats. They did take notes—perhaps doodles in some cases, but certainly full-fledged notes in the cases of the people sitting around me in the three sessions I attended. And they did make an early appeal to be put on the speakers' list for the discussion period. (So, too, did other Europeans, such as West Germans, by the way.)

Time and again my American colleagues arrived just as the meetings were beginning or shortly afterwards, only to find the room crowded and the translating devices no longer available. Time and again, during the discussion periods, when the spirit moved them to speak, they found that they were rather low on a long list of applicants. Time and again they came to me or someone else in an "official" capacity to complain about "packing" or domination of the discussion periods.

On each occasion I expressed my sympathy and encouraged them to get to the sessions earlier next time. But I cannot accept the proposition that somehow the Eastern Europeans played

dirty. They simply played by their rules. Since their rules are perfectly fair in the regards discussed above, it behooved others interested in attending sessions to play in the same way. As one can easily guess, it was not possible in Moscow and it is not possible in Washington or some other site of the APSA annual meetings to restrict access to early-comers, or set some sort of quota (e.g., no more than five audience members from Michigan in a session on voting behavior), or devise elaborate rules on the list of speakers in the discussion period (e.g., no two audience members from Michigan may speak back-to-back). I would like to believe, therefore, that the Moscow Congress of IPSA provided a learning experience for colleagues not overly familiar with the realities of cultural pluralism.

A second point raised by Professor Urban deserves some attention for, as I have said elsewhere, it concerns a problem that was of our own making. At one point in our planning we decided to ask each papergiver to bring to Moscow 50 copies of his/her paper. At another point in our planning we decided to raise the registration fee slightly but, to encourage people to pay it, give each registrant a coupon good for ten free conference papers. It did not occur to me that this was a bonehead error until we saw what actually happened.

A simple calculation should have told us that 400 papergivers might yield 20,000 papers and that 1500 registrants had a legitimate claim to three-quarters of the papers which would be available in the best case. This calculation alone should have told us that we were courting disaster. But, quite frankly, my thinking was fixed on the experience of APSA and the International Studies Association when, it seems, there are always ample copies of all but a few papers.

There were, of course, further complications. For one thing, not every papergiver actually appeared; and some who did appear failed to bring papers for distribution. For another, Eastern European scholars were very keen to acquire papers—papers on *any* topic by any Westerner. In many cases, I discovered, part of their responsibilities as delegates from their institutes was to secure as many papers as possible for the institute as a whole. And, given the funny monetary situation in that part of the world, the price of these papers was ridiculously low.

The result was predictable. Participants, especially Eastern Europeans, descended on the paper distribution center like desert travelers on a waterhole. Some groups evidently kept someone posted at the center to ensure that they got any new papers that might emerge. I saw stacks of new papers disappear in a matter of minutes. And, in the end, Westerners or others who waited not only found few papers they wanted but frequently saw none of their own. More than one younger scholar complained, without seeing the humor of the situation, "But who would want my paper? I'm unknown, and the

topic is not one of the most important ones in the world!"

This led to some charges that our Soviet hosts censored the paper distribution center. My impression, gained from my own observation as well as conversations with many other people, is that this was not the case. To be sure, our hosts did skim approximately five copies off the top of any new pile—for their own libraries, we were told, and to ensure that there would be master copies for subsequent reproduction. Moreover, they tried to respond as quickly as they could when a participant reported to me that his/her paper was no longer available, by reproducing another 50 copies. But, and this is more to the heart of the charge, I saw at one time or another papers at the center which I considered at least in some cases to be virulently anti-Soviet. They disappeared, too, one by one, in a great hurry.

I regret that our Soviet hosts did not have available the reproduction facilities which they had anticipated earlier would be there in case of need. But I saw no evidence of censorship.

Third, Professor Urban points out that Congress participants received preferential treatment. This is certainly true. I have noted that, when I was an Intourist visitor in other parts of the Soviet Union, our groups usually received preferential treatment. And, when something special seems to be going on, crowds gather. That there is a "class society" in the Soviet Union today is something I would not deny, nor would most objective observers.

In one respect, however, I should like to correct an impression given in Professor Urban's letter. The Congress met at a time when the University was not in session. And, as seems to be fairly traditional in many parts of Europe, when a university is not in session the buildings are locked and access is restricted even to students. That the University cafeteria operated at all was the result of some of IPSA's negotiations; and, I would guess, those operating the cafeteria geared themselves to the expected needs of Congress participants.

As a member of the organizing committee, however, I had been at the University when classes were in session. At that time I went through the cafeteria, filled with students and presumably staff. The menu was approximately the same as IPSA Congress participants received—even down the Czech pilsner available for purchase.

Finally, I would say little about the initial point raised in Professor Urban's letter: the use by the Soviet Union of the IPSA World Congress for its own purposes. It did do so. This is certainly expectable, whether we like it or not. It is expectable in the same way that it was when IPSA met in Montreal and Edinburgh; and I fully anticipate that the Brazilian government will be able to find some good in the fact that IPSA will meet next in Rio de Janeiro. Already, for instance, the new IPSA President, Candido Mendes, has interpreted his election and the selection of Rio as the site for the 1982

meeting as evidence that political science in the Third World has come of age.

I would comment, however, that we would be foolish if we thought that there is no research and thinking going on in the Soviet Union or other Eastern European countries that corresponds to what we in the United States call political science. I think that this was one of the most remarkable things about the Moscow World Congress. Those interested in talking with Soviet colleagues, for instance, found that they, too, have problems with federal-state relations, environmental pollution, and municipal governance, and that some of what these colleagues have to say about circumstances in their countries could inform us in the United States about ours.

My experience in talking with many Western political scientists about their visit to the IPSA World Congress in Moscow is that their views are intense and, for those not familiar with conferences in Eastern and Western Europe, tinged with a bit of culture shock. That there were political implications to this Congress is an accurate assessment. The fun, however, at least for me, is to try to ascertain the roots and dimensions of these political implications, and especially why Western and Third World visitors had the reactions they did to their experience in the Soviet Union.

Richard L. Merritt
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

To the Editor:

Reading the notice of Charles R. Foster and Jutta Helm on the 1979 German Political Science Association Meeting (*PS*, Winter 1980, p. 92), the political scientist must be bewildered by the state of the German discipline: "German political science, once ideological and overly descriptive, has now moved into the isolation and arrogance of over-specialization," the authors sum up.

Here we are. Either trapped in an ideology and/or poorly copying reality if it happens that we are old, or if we are young we are moving into the isolation and arrogance of overspecialization. So, don't trust any political scientist over there. Poor guys or eventually dangerous, that is the question.

I am not prepared to take up all the points I disagree with. Let me pick up only two. The attendance of the membership is criticized. Actually, about 25 percent of the individual association members attended the meeting. This is less than the turnout at the last meeting, but no dramatic figure compared to the some 15 percent of the individual APSA members attending the 1979 meeting in Washington. The authors are disturbed by "the personal hostilities and ideological issues that surfaced in frequent exchanges." In any scientific community, some like each other and some don't. The style of discussing conflicts, open or covered, differs. In contradiction to the authors, I have registered a remarkable less "frontier" or "Lager" communication pattern in German social

science recently. By the way, I hope strongly the APSA still is not spelled "Angels' Political Science Association." In the long run it may become boring. Fortunately, at least, the conflict between APSA and CNPS leaves some excitement.

No question the authors are obviously right to criticize a number of boring questions in German political science today. However, my first point of criticism is they did not always pick up the real problems in the right way. Second, their summing up ignores similar problems in most social science communities. Their generalizations and justifications "lacked any empirical data or approaches," to put it in their own words. What is wrong with specialization in numerous specialist working groups at the meeting? Any difference to the APSA? No professionalization without specialization. Only without communication is there the danger of mutual isolation. But a look at the numerous permanent working groups of the German association or at the broad publishing in books and competing professional journals shows an active communication network clustering around some broader paradigms.

My own comment on the last meeting after some hectic conferences in the roaring seventies: back to work. However, this does not mean any more "business as usual," thanks to

some irritative but fruitful controversies of the past.

Ulrich von Alemann
University of Duisburg
Managing Editor
Politische Vierteljahresschrift

To the Editor:

It is my intention to visit the U.S. between September 1980 and January 1981 during my sabbatical leave, and I would like to solicit assistance in obtaining an academic base and/or lecturing opportunities during my stay. The purpose of my visit is to study U.S. foreign policy towards Africa.

I hold degrees from the universities of Fribourg (Switzerland), Stellenbosch (South Africa), and Kent (U.K.). I am responsible for the Southern African political studies program at this university, and am collaborating with Professor Leonard Thompson of Yale in the production of a work on South African politics.

I can offer courses on Southern African regional politics and U.S. foreign policy towards Africa.

B. J. Andrew Prior
Department of Political Science
University of Cape Town
Private Bag, Rondebosch 7700
Republic of South Africa