When in Moscow

Although in most fields the International Geophysical Year is producing a remarkable record of data exchange, in the rocket and satellite field the Soviets have not been as free with their data as we should like, nor as we have been with ours. The IGY program is coming to an end at the close of this year, but other exchange programs are in the offing, including a follow-up of some uncompleted IGY activities under the title of International Geophysical Cooperation—1959. It is time, therefore, to consider how best to promote exchange in those areas in which it is not yet fully satisfactory.

In rocket and satellite research the principal stumbling block in dealing with the Soviets has been their refusal to agree to the same kind of automatic exchange of basic data that has been instituted in other research fields. To the best of this country’s knowledge, the Soviets have kept the formal agreements that they have made concerning the exchange of results in rocket and satellite research. But although these agreements provide for the release of such items as news of the successful launching of satellites, they make it necessary for persons seeking information in other matters to negotiate each request separately. Coupled with this mechanism, or lack of one, for handling exchange is the unfortunate way the Soviets tend to deal with those requests that they do not wish to honor. Their pattern is to ignore the request or to talk about something else.

An example of answer by evasive tactics occurred when American scientists tried to visit the Soviet orbit computing center during the IGY conference in Moscow last summer. The center had been mentioned in a Pravda article announcing the launching of Sputnik III. The American scientists felt justified in seeking to make this visit since in September 1957 Soviet scientists had visited the Vanguard computing center. After some jockeying, arrangements for the visit were concluded. But when the appointed day arrived, the Americans found themselves inspecting not the orbit computing center but instead an institute for computer development.

When we are faced with shortcomings in the exchange of scientific information, our problem is how to respond in a way that will serve science and at the same time help science serve international good will. There are good reasons for us to be patient in our approach. For one thing, the feeling among American scientists is that by and large the Soviet scientists are as anxious as we are to participate in the exchange of data. For another, if in all areas the Soviets do not fully meet the conditions of exchange that we seek, still such conditions are now better than they have been in the past. A third reason is that it is possible that the evasive replies of the Soviets to some of our requests for information may be the result of a security system that in certain areas does not permit them to admit even the existence of a given piece of research.

But if patience is required in developing data exchange, then something more than a passing measure of toughness is also called for. The record of East-West relations does not suggest that an attitude of unalloyed politeness is the best way to do business with the Soviet Union. To the extent that the exchange of scientific results may have a bearing on nonscientific matters, it is difficult to see why, without considerable prodding, the Soviets will forego any arrangement that allows them to keep their cake and eat ours too.—J.T.
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