

Political Scientists: More Concern about Political Involvement, Ethics

Many academic professional organizations are troubled about whether they should become more politically involved and also about the formulation of their own profession's code of ethics, especially in regard to government-sponsored research. Such issues were vigorously argued at last year's annual meeting of the American Political Science Association (APSA) and received more conclusive action at the annual meeting held last week in Washington.

At the 1967 meeting, some of the less conservative members were disturbed by the constitutional inability of the society to act on several policy resolutions, including one which condemned the subpoenaing of the membership lists of student organizations by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Distressed by this deficiency and by the APSA's failure to criticize two of its officials who ran another organization which accepted research money from foundations partly supported by the CIA, a group gathered to form a "Caucus for a New Political Science."

One of the complaints of these more radical members is that the leadership of APSA is interested in supporting the policies of the existing political "system" rather than in providing alternatives. One of the "new voices," Christian Bay of the University of Alberta, has argued that many political scientists stay away from APSA meetings because they view APSA as "an outfit controlled by an Ivy League establishment politically or apolitically wedded to the status quo." Bay said that, whatever the views of the older membership, he doubted that the younger members were satisfied with their "prestigious political impotence."

Those favoring a more potent APSA sponsored an amendment to the organization's constitution. In the past, the relevant paragraph has read: "The Association as such is non-partisan. It will not support political parties or candidates. It will not commit its members on questions of public policy nor

take positions not immediately concerned with its direct purpose as stated above." The amenders added the words, "But the Association nonetheless actively encourages in its membership and its journals, research in and concern for significant contemporary political and social problems and policies, however controversial and subject to partisan discourse in the community at large these may be."

By a large majority, the business meeting of the association adopted this amendment, as well as another more broadly supported amendment to the same paragraph, to the effect that "the Association shall not be debarred, however, from adopting resolutions or taking such other action as it deems appropriate in support of academic freedom and of freedom of expression by and within the Association, the political science profession, and the university, when in its judgment such freedom has been clearly and seriously violated or is clearly and seriously threatened."

When the meeting actually got down to political questions, the situation among the political scientists became more confused. The greatest passion at the business meeting, for which an unusually large contingent of more than 500 showed up, was engendered by resolutions to move the 1970 APSA annual meeting from Chicago. After a complex procedural battle, the association refused to adopt more militant denunciations of Mayor Daley and Chicago "police brutality." The association then voted, by more than 3 to 1, to seek a city other than Chicago for a meeting site because it is essential to the political scientists that discussions take place "in an atmosphere conducive to free discussion, debate and dissent without fear of private or official intimidation or fear for the physical security of its members."

At times the spirit of August events in Chicago threatened to disrupt the APSA meeting. Members of the audience yelled out "Mr. Albert" at the mild-mannered APSA President Merle Fainsod of Harvard who was conducting

the meeting, and one shouted "Are you going to do here what they did in Chicago?" An intense young white man from Princeton, wearing steel-rimmed glasses, kept calling out, "May I quote a relevant passage from the Autobiography of Malcolm X?"

Generally, the members followed the recommendations of their governing Council, but they did pass a resolution which the Council had wanted referred to the Standing Committee on Professional Ethics. This resolution prohibited officers and employees from "engaging in intelligence and other covert activities and from using their positions to advance any partisan political interests"—obviously a direct slap at APSA Executive Director Evron M. Kirkpatrick and at Treasurer Max M. Kampelman, a friend and adviser to Vice President Hubert Humphrey. Kampelman retires this year after serving as APSA treasurer for the past 12 years, although he will continue to act as the APSA legal counsel.

In the winter of 1967, some members of APSA had been upset by the revelation that an organization (Operations and Policy Research, Inc.) in which Kirkpatrick and Kampelman served as major officers had received funds from CIA-supported foundations. Although Kirkpatrick and Kampelman were defended by an APSA special committee appointed to investigate the matter, mention of their names did elicit a few boos and hisses at one point during last week's business meeting. After the audience was cautioned against "demonstrations" by President Fainsod, there were no further incidents of this kind.

Partly in response to the commotion over CIA funding of an organization which APSA officers directed, the APSA set up a committee to explore the ethical problems of political scientists. The committee, which was headed by Marver H. Bernstein of Princeton University, delivered its final report this summer; it was discussed at last week's meeting. The Bernstein committee proposed two rules to govern "two potentially troublesome aspects of the teacher student relationship": (i) a faculty member must not expropriate the academic work of his students, and (ii) the academic political scientist must be very careful not to impose his partisan views upon his students or colleagues.

The committee found that one of the ethical questions that political scientists were most concerned about was the

propriety of political involvement. The committee concluded that, like other citizens, the university teacher "should be free to engage in political activities insofar as he can do so consistently with his obligations as a teacher and scholar."

The committee also dealt with the sponsorship of research, in which, it argued, "the more conspicuous dangers have tended to arise from federal funding." In its rules, the committee concluded that financial sponsors of research should avoid actions which would call into question the integrity of American academic institutions and should not sponsor research as a cover for intelligence activities.

The committee's recommendations on research were made somewhat stronger by the inclusion of a section, prepared by the political science department of the University of Oregon, which stated that all social science research done in universities "shall be free of any restrictions on its content, its procedures, or on the form or place of its publication," and that "social scientists shall be recognized as having

the same rights of free inquiry under government grants as do natural scientists." (The Oregon group said that, "while the natural sciences have been gaining from government more funds and more freedom in their research, the social sciences have gained more funds and less freedom.")

The APSA business meeting voted approval of the committee and its work and established a Standing Committee on Professional Ethics. Austin Ranney of the University of Wisconsin said that the actions taken, while not binding on the membership, at least moved the association out of the ethical area "where we are now, where we have nothing," to a point where more progress in the formulation of professional ethics was possible in the future.

In the establishment of a committee on professional ethics, in the amending of the constitution to permit more political involvement, and in some of the other actions taken by APSA, the more militant members achieved part of what they wanted. The Caucus for a New Political Science also sponsored separate scholarly meetings on the kinds

of subjects they thought should be discussed at the APSA meetings. The leaders of APSA were helpful in accommodating and publicizing the meetings of the Caucus for a New Political Science and, in so doing, may have defused any potential for revolt.

Three of the more militant APSA members put out a statement which said: "Even the Caucus for a New Political Science shows severe strains of conservatism." The three argued that, in the separate business meeting held by the Caucus for a New Political Science, "there were few people under 30, no women and no blacks, the tendency being to vote for people with academic reputations, those well-known in the Association." The executive committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science recommended that the topic for panel discussions at next year's APSA meeting be "Prospects for Revolution in America." At this point it looks as though any "revolution" in the sedate American Political Science Association is in the process of being contained and assimilated.

—BRYCE NELSON

IHD: International Symbol or "National Embarrassment"?

Of all the federal science programs whose budgets have been cut by Congress, perhaps the hardest hit have been the international programs. And of all the international programs, the U.S. arm of the International Hydrological Decade (IHD), which has had financial troubles since its inception, has had perhaps the thinnest time.

Conceived in the image of the highly successful International Geophysical Year (IGY), IHD began in January 1965 and is to run until 1974. On a worldwide basis it is directed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). It was set up to spur work in hydrology throughout the world and to try to get comprehensive water resource data for all participating countries. For countries already doing extensive work in hydrology—such as the United States—IHD

was to help make that work known throughout the world and to try to develop programs of a cooperative nature to complement the research being done.

U.S. State Department officials played a major role in initiating the program, and President Johnson gave IHD his verbal seal of approval in August 1964. But, since then, Congress has shown itself unwilling to make United States participation anything more than token.

"It's worse than a disappointment, it's a national embarrassment," says one member of the U.S. IHD National Committee. "We started this thing in the first place," he told *Science*, "and now other countries are taking it up. But our participation has been very small and we have always been late in providing our share of the hydrological information asked of us."

The U.S. National Committee, which

is under the supervision of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, was set up too late to request funds for fiscal year 1966. So some money within the U.S. Geological Survey was reshuffled to get the committee going. For fiscal 1967 and 1968, the committee requested \$2.5 million and \$2 million, respectively, within the budget of the Geological Survey, which acted as a representative of all the government agencies involved. Neither request was approved. Congress did appropriate \$168,000 to the Survey and \$90,000 to the Corps of Engineers for new projects conducted for IHD for fiscal year 1968, but approved no money directly to the National Committee. The National Science Foundation (NSF) has provided some funds, as has the Department of State, to support the committee's secretariat for administration, planning, and coordination. But the State Department has had trouble getting money for its own Water for Peace program, and its participation and interest in IHD have correspondingly waned.

For the current fiscal year (1969) the National Committee, on the advice of the Federal Council on Science and Technology, made its budget requests