

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:

As a member of the APSA for many years, I should like to protest the action of the Program Committee in arranging a plenary session at the recent Washington meeting, which afforded a platform for a one-sided presentation by Clark Clifford of a highly controversial issue, i.e., SALT II.

To my knowledge, it has been the practice of the APS at plenary sessions to comply with the elementary requirements of fairness and balance in debating crucial issues of international policy, and to have speakers present opposing views. Thus, I recall a plenary session in which Professor Richard Falk of Princeton was opposed by Professor W. W. Rostow. I submit that to present a partisan speaker on the issue of SALT II violates the ethical responsibility of the APSA to refrain from making its facilities available for political propaganda and partisan advocacy. Mr. Clifford is a very able and clever advocate, but there can be no doubt that he took advantage of the opportunity to make a pitch for SALT II, on rather dubious grounds. But my opinion is beside the point; the fact is that Mr. Clifford is Co-Chairman of "Americans for SALT" and that must have been very obvious to the Committee who selected him, since those who attended the plenary session were solicited in the corridors of the hotel to attend a subsequent rally of "Americans for SALT" to be chaired by no other than Mr. Clifford himself. I have a copy of the pamphlet being handed out in the corridors of the hotel, captioned "Americans for SALT; a national citizens' campaign, etc." At the plenary session, during the question and answer period, I requested the opportunity to ask Mr. Clifford, if, indeed, he was Co-Chairman of Americans for SALT. Mr. Epstein and Mr. Sorauf, presiding, refused to let Mr. Clifford answer my question.

There is grave concern these days about the necessity for universities maintaining their autonomy and independence from public interference with their role in teaching and research. This plea for autonomy and freedom from government interference rests, and must continue to rest, on public confidence in the integrity and intellectual honesty of scholars whom the public perceives as engaged in the quest for truth. The moment the academic world shows signs of becoming politicized and an instrument of political factions, we lose all claim to the preservation of our immunity from governmental interference. Academia then be-

comes another partisan group engaged in ideological conflict.

I know that other members of the APSA share my concern about academic integrity and feel the same as I do about the plenary sessions. I trust that our position will be considered at meetings of the APSA in the future.

David S. Lichtenstein

To the Editor:

The letter from David Lichtenstein raises an important issue. Must the plenary sessions of a convention—indeed, must all its sessions—be cast in an adversary format or at least in some format that explicitly represents a number of points of view on a controversial question? Certainly those formats are useful and appropriate in many instances. But a program committee would not in all cases welcome either the delicate negotiations to determine points of view or the responsibility of stipulating the points of view to be represented. Furthermore, there are instances when undiluted advocacy may advance the scholarly dialogue most effectively. Certainly our members are not without the ability to put advocacy in perspective or to challenge it in question and discussion periods. In other words, I doubt that the marketplace of ideas at our conventions needs such extensive management.

In arranging plenary sessions one confronts an additional consideration. Many of our members would like the Association to invite prominent public figures to address our meetings. Many of those individuals are unaccustomed or unwilling to participate in a debate or panel discussion. I would hate to see us adopt a rule of format that would, for example, exclude a speech by a Cabinet member or a Supreme Court justice, no matter how much some of us might disagree with the position he or she took. I do think, however, that such speakers would be willing to respond to questions from the audience, as indeed Mr. Clifford did at some length.

As for the other points Mr. Lichtenstein raises, Permit me just a few words. I was not aware that Mr. Clifford was co-chairman of Americans for SALT when I invited him to speak at the convention. (I did no research into the organizational affiliations of any participant in the 1979 program.) I invited him primarily because I thought many political scientists would welcome the opportunity to see and hear one of the most enduring members of the Washington Establishment. Finally, I can assure the members of the Association that the Program Committee had nothing to do with the activity of Americans for SALT in the corridors outside

the plenary session. Given the traditions of the Association, however, I do not think we should have tried to prevent or stop it.

Frank J. Sorauf
Chairman, Program Committee for the
1979 Convention

To the Editor:

[The letter and comment below is printed at the suggestion of Christian Bay. It was printed originally in the *Moscow (USSR) News*, November 4, 1979. The *News* made the following editorial comment on the letter.

"The letter from Christian Bay appears in full just as he requested. Of course, we do not agree with many of his ideas, such as his contention that people are persecuted in the USSR because of their views. Impartial testimony shows that if "dissidents" happened to be punished, it is not because they think differently, but for actions which fall under the criminal code.

"Prof. Bay's own conclusion that there are definite achievements in the USSR in 'building and expanding human rights,' and the very possibility for him and his Western colleagues to freely discuss these topics, show that what we say above is fact. Finally, we appreciate his desire to affirm the right to peace, a right which is contained in the Constitution of the USSR."]

The editors of the *Moscow News* have invited comment on human rights issues from participants in the recent Moscow meetings of the International Political Science Association. I send the following reflections to the *Moscow News* as well as to the *New York Times*, requesting of both papers that my letter either be published in full or not at all.

One year ago I took part in defeating, at a business meeting of the American Political Science Association, a motion that would have the APSA withdraw from participating in the Moscow congress, on account of deficiencies in academic freedom and other human rights in the USSR.

I share the concern of many North Americans over Soviet violations of human rights: the lack of free access to books and to academic meetings, the lack of a wider freedom to emigrate, and, above all, the confinement to prison, or even to psychiatric hospitals, of many critics of the Soviet regime. Nevertheless, I feel strongly that in our time one human right must take precedence over all others: the right to peace. Indeed, I came to Moscow to speak on "The Right to Peace and the Right to Critical Political Knowledge."

Our meetings in Moscow proved eminently worthwhile. They contributed positively, I am convinced, to the world-wide struggle toward building an effective right to peace: a right to be protected against the extremes of violence caused by war, deprivation, and oppression. They also helped to advance our critical poli-

tical knowledge, on both sides of what many Americans once used to call the "Iron curtain." I take a wide access to critical political knowledge to be necessary for the long-term protection of the right to peace, and indeed of all essential human rights, in all countries.

Access to critical political knowledge is today everywhere limited. For example, most Americans appear programmed not to see that enormous violations of the most basic human needs, even of the need for life and health, especially in the Third World, are caused by the "free enterprise"—prerogatives enjoyed by their giant corporations; and many Americans who are eloquent about Soviet human rights violations appear to play down the deficiencies in their own country with respect to the right to health, to human dignity, and to access to critical political knowledge. Most North Americans seem predisposed to reject without critical reflection the idea that essential human rights should take precedence over corporate rights; and even the idea that there must above all else be a fundamental right to life and to access to good health services for all.

Most Russians, on the other hand, seem to reject out of hand the right of their own fellow citizens to disagree publicly with, or even to question, basic public policy priorities in the USSR, or fundamental tenets of Soviet Marxism/Leninism.

But the point of these remarks, and of my participation in the Moscow IPSA meetings, is not at all to argue for mutual recriminations, or for a sense of national superiority, anywhere, on account of human rights achievements til now. The point is that human rights achievements to date are inadequate everywhere; and to ask how all nations can find ways of moving forward in cooperation.

The nations will succeed in making the building of basic human rights our shared concern only, I believe, if we by strengthening the detente can secure, first of all, the right to peace. Toward this crucial objective I believe our IPSA meetings in Moscow made a small but significant contribution.

As a next step, I would like to see military experts of many countries meeting in Moscow, or in Washington, to seek ways of bending national defense efforts gradually toward international defense cooperation, against war itself and against shared environmental threats to our security, and for quick and massive relief to victims of epidemics, earthquakes, nuclear energy-caused accidents, and other probable catastrophes, both natural and man-made.

The various national defense establishments must learn to define their objectives more broadly than they do today, and must seek to build transnational trust by learning the art of practical cooperative efforts in the service of human security and well-being everywhere. First of all, of course, SALT II must be ratified; America already bears a heavy enough responsibility as the pace-setter over 30 years for our still escalating, costly and dangerous arms race.

In conclusion, may I thank our gracious Soviet hosts for their warm hospitality, which was extended without prejudice or discrimination to political scientists from all participating countries, including the several which are without diplomatic representation in Moscow. I have returned to Canada full of admiration for many Soviet achievements, also in the domain of building and expanding human rights; even if, as in every country, much more remains to be achieved.

Our free, frank, and friendly encounters in Moscow have made a real contribution, if I may state my view again, to the long struggle for a universal right to peace and to critical political knowledge, and to the remaining essential human rights that depend on the protection of these two.

Christian Bay
University of Toronto

To the Editor:

The Women's Caucus for Political Science wishes to offer its congratulations to each and every new APSA officer and council member and to reaffirm its support for the Association's good offices.

It is our intention to continue to work with and through the Association for the improvement of the status of women and for the best interests of our profession. The recent campaign surrounding the APSA election offered many opportunities for constructive dialogue; we look forward to the continuation of such opportunities.

Sarah Slavin Schramm
President
Women's Caucus for Political Science

To the Editor:

I found much with which to agree in Professor Ithiel de Sola Pool's critique of the proposed HEW regulations for the protection of human subjects. (*PS*, Fall 1979, pp. 452-55). Both Professor de Sola Pool and *PS* are to be applauded for their efforts to bring this highly important matter before members of the Association. But in our efforts to make ourselves heard and, perhaps as a consequence, to have some impact on the ultimate content of the regulations, we risk weakening our credibility if we permit our professional self-interests to obscure from view the very real ethical dilemmas associated with social science research.

I have no difficulty with Professor de Sola Pool's contention (p. 453) that the provision requiring the IRB to determine that "The research methods are appropriate to the objectives [of] the research and the field of study" represents a threat to academic freedom and scientific integrity because it allows the members of the IRB to "substitute their judgment as to what constitutes appropriate research meth-

ods" for that of the scientist proposing the study. Indeed, the potential chilling effect of such a provision should be of serious concern to all social scientists. But I cannot agree with the author's statement that the provision has "nothing to do with protection of human subjects" (p. 453). It has a great deal to do with protecting subjects from the pernicious effects of unwarranted deception, a technique traditionally associated with the discipline of psychology but one that is finding an increasingly receptive home in political science.

I do not wish to dwell on the "evils" of deception; the social science literature could be profitably consulted in that regard. I am prepared to argue, however, that deception does, in certain well-defined (scientifically) situations, have a place in social science research, but that it should only be used when the data being sought cannot be acquired through any other means and when debriefing is provided for in the original research protocol. (The HEW proposals provide for debriefing in section 46.112.) Viewed in this light, then, the provision does not appear so terribly onerous: research methods (deception) must be appropriate (justified scientifically) to the objectives of the research (acquisition and analysis of certain kinds of data).

My comments should not be interpreted as an argument in support of the provision as currently written. Rather, they should serve to remind us that in discussions among ourselves and with those outside the profession, we must not become so enthralled with our own well-intended aims and behavior that we risk becoming insensitive to alternative views or indifferent to opposing evidence. Ethical issues are not obstacles to good research, but an inevitable part of the research process. They can only be ignored at great peril—for both researchers and their subjects. They need to be subjected to informed and reasoned deliberation, not summarily dismissed as irrelevant.

Mark S. Frankel
Wayne State University*

To the Editor:

America continues to astonish her friends.

The November/December number of *Selected U.S. Government Publications* advertises a new booklet called "Galileo to Jupiter: Probing the Planet and Mapping its Moons." The official description begins:

NASA plans to launch project Galileo on its 1000-day journey to Jupiter in January 1982. It will be the first mission to use the space shuttle as an interplanetary lunch vehicle.

*Effective January 1980, Professor Frankel can be contacted at the Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois 60616.

I trust that political scientists in the United States are fully alert to the research possibilities inherent in this development—and that our Association has already made a group reservation.

Anthony King
University of Essex, England

To the Editor:

I continue to receive a number of inquiries from colleagues concerning the events that occurred during my tenure review by the Department of Political Science at Yale University last spring. It seems to me that the least provocative way for me to discharge my duty to inform the profession is to ask you to reprint the following "Press Release" issued by the administration of Yale University concerning my case:

Last June 1st Associate Professor Thomas L. Pangle requested a review of the decision by the Department of Political Science not to recommend him for promotion to a tenure position in the Department. Under the grievance procedure set forth in the Faculty Handbook the Acting Provost appointed a Review Committee. This Committee, composed of Professors Robert M. Cover (Law), Edmund S. Morgan (History), Chairman, and G. Daniel Mostow (Mathematics), handed in its Report to the Provost on October 9th. This Report concludes with the following set of recommendations:

We recommend that the decision of the Political Science Department adverse to Professor Pangle be set aside. We recommend that an ad hoc committee be set up to nominate a candidate for a senior appointment in political philosophy. We recommend that the committee be composed of scholars outside the Yale Department of Political Science but with some degree of expertise in the field of political philosophy broadly construed. If necessary, some members might be drawn from political science departments in other universities. We recommend that the ad hoc committee be charged as the political science department's committee was charged, both to review Pangle's candidacy and to search actively and broadly for the best possible appointment in political philosophy/theory, broadly defined. We further recommend that the ad hoc committee be permitted to use the outside letters solicited in the prior Pangle review insofar as it believes them adequate to its purposes, and that it be permitted to seek further letters, from the same or other referees, insofar as it seems desirable. Finally, we recommend that the ad hoc committee be instructed to proceed by drawing up a short list of no more than five (5) names of the best candidates for the position ranked in order of preference. Should Professor Pangle's name be on that short list, we recommend that the ad hoc committee continue its deliberations and select a candidate for

the position. If the candidate selected is Thomas Pangle, the ad hoc committee should present the case directly to the Senior Appointments Committee, and if approved there, to the Board of Permanent Officers. If the candidate selected is someone other than Professor Pangle, the ad hoc committee should present the list to the senior faculty of the Department of Political Science. The department may choose to move the appointment of any candidate whose names precedes that of Thomas Pangle on the list and the appointment would then proceed through regular channels to the Senior Appointments Committee and the Board of Permanent Officers. If the department rejects the names of those nominees who are listed ahead of Thomas Pangle or if those nominees decline the appointment, the ad hoc committee should present the case for the appointment of Professor Pangle directly to the Senior Appointments Committee and, if approved there, to the Board of Permanent Officers.

Should Thomas Pangle's name *not* appear on the short list of candidates prepared by the ad hoc committee, we recommend returning the decision to the Political Science Department with complete freedom to make a recommendation to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senior Appointments Committee.

The Provost has accepted these recommendations and has appointed an Ad Hoc Committee composed of: Samuel H. Beer, Department of Government, Harvard University; Peter Demetz, Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures and of Comparative Literature, Yale University, Chairman; Peter Gay, Department of History, Yale University; Herbert E. Scarf, Department of Economics, Yale University; and Dennis F. Thompson, Department of Politics, Princeton University.

In view of both the specific recommendation of the Review Committee to this effect, and of the amount of public attention and discussion generated by this chain of events, in this case a summary of the Report of the Review Committee has been released. Copies may be obtained at the Office of Public Information, 149 York Street.

I should add that upon reflection I have decided to decline the administration's offer of a new tenure review, and have decided to accept the tenured position offered me by the Department of Political Economy of the University of Toronto.

Thomas L. Pangle
Associate Professor
University of Toronto