

training program which the Institute launched last year for the local and state officials in the Philadelphia metropolitan area. The latter group includes men and women from borough, township, city, county, and state governmental agencies in Chester, Dauphin, Delaware, Montgomery, Northampton, and Philadelphia counties. All have been awarded part-time scholarships by the Institute, which was established at the University in 1937 by the Samuel S. Fels Fund and has been maintained by the Fund since that time. The new thirty-week planning program consists of an introductory seminar on City and Regional Planning Objectives and a companion seminar on City and Regional Planning Practice. Robert B. Mitchell, executive director of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, is in charge of these weekly seminars and the dinner discussions that follow. The four other weekly seminars offered in the Institute's part-time scholarship training program are: (1) Administrative Objectives in Local and State Government; (2) Administrative Practice in Local and State Government; (3) Administrative Problems in Local and State Government; and (4) Public Administration Theory and Administrative Law.

Fortieth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. The fortieth annual meeting of the American Political Science Association was scheduled to be held in Washington, D. C., on February 1-4, 1945, with the Hotel Statler as headquarters. It was to have been a joint meeting with the American Economic Association and the American Society for Public Administration; and although scheduled in 1945, it was viewed as the 1944 annual meeting. In an attempt to comply loyally with the efforts of the Office of Defense Transportation to reduce travelling to a minimum, the meeting was planned for February instead of the Christmas recess, and the intended participants were largely limited to persons residing in the District of Columbia and others whose governmental duties would bring them to Washington at the time of the meeting. On January 5, 1945, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion requested the cancellation of all large conventions and group meetings; and after a careful canvass of the situation, it was decided to cancel the joint meeting. In view of the timeliness of the subjects selected for discussion, it is deemed appropriate to publish the outline in full, as follows:

Thursday, February 1

PUBLIC MEETING

8:00 P.M. SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND THE POSTWAR WORLD

Chairman: Joseph S. Davis, President, American Economic Association.
Charles E. Merriam, University of Chicago—"Unfinished Business."
Joseph H. Willits, Rockefeller Foundation—"New Business."

Friday, February 2

9:30 A.M. SOCIAL SCIENTISTS IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Chairman: Kenneth O. Warner, Foreign Economic Administration

Discussion: Morris A. Copeland, War Production Board; John J. Corson, Social Security Board; Lauchlin Currie, Foreign Economic Administration; Frederick M. Davenport, Council for Personnel Administration; Philip M. Hauser, Bureau of the Census; Lloyd M. Short, University of Minnesota.

9:30 A.M. LATIN AMERICA'S PLACE IN THE POSTWAR WORLD

Chairman: Russell H. Fitzgibbon, Office of the Coördinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania—"Latin America's Part and Problems in International Organization."

Henry Reining, Jr., National Institute of Public Affairs—"The Brazilian Program of Administrative Reform."

Frank A. Waring, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—"Why Should the United States Encourage Economic Development in the Other American Republics?"

Discussion: Louis Brownlow, Public Administration Clearing House; John M. Cabot, Department of State; Dana G. Munro, Princeton University; Sherman S. Sheppard, Bureau of the Budget; Frank Tannenbaum, Columbia University; George Wythe, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

9:30 A.M. JAPANESE GOVERNMENT IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD

Chairman: Harold M. Vinacke, Office of War Information.

Discussion: Kenneth Colegrove, Northwestern University; Eugene Dooman, Department of State; Charles Burton Fahs, Office of Strategic Services; William C. Johnstone, George Washington University; Lieutenant Commander W. B. McGovern, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Sir George Sansom, British Embassy; Lieutenant Charles N. Spinks, Navy Department.

9:30 A.M. CONSUMPTION ECONOMICS

Chairman: Edwin G. Nourse, Brookings Institution.

Kenneth E. Boulding, Iowa State College—"The Place of Consumption Concepts in Economic Theory."

James P. Cavin, Bureau of Agricultural Economics—"Some Aspects of Wartime Consumption Experience."

James J. O'Leary, Wesleyan University—"Consumption as a Factor in Postwar Employment."

Discussion: R. G. D. Allen, Combined Production and Resources Board; S. M. Livingston, Department of Commerce; J. J. Spengler, Duke University.

9:30 A.M. FUNCTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN POLICY FORMATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Chairman: Arthur W. Macmahon, Department of State.

Discussion: George W. Brooks, War Production Board; Samuel Jacobs, Office of Price Administration; V. O. Key, Jr., Bureau of the Budget; Avery Leiserson, Bureau of the Budget; Harvey C. Mansfield, Office of Price Administration; Carl Henry Monsees, War Production Board; William Newman, Petroleum Administration for War.

12:30 P.M. LUNCHEON MEETING

Chairman: Luther H. Gulick, President, American Society for Public Administration.

Donald M. Nelson, Personal Representative of the President—"The Stake of the United States in Foreign Industrial Development."

2:30 P.M. EXPANDING CIVILIAN PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT
AFTER THE WAR

Chairman: E. A. Goldenweiser, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

Arthur R. Uppgren, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis—"Objectives and Guides to Policy."

Paul Hoffman, Committee for Economic Development, and Studebaker Corporation—"Business Planning for Postwar Prosperity."

Lincoln Gordon, War Production Board—"Transitional Government Control for Industrial Reconversion and Expansion."

Discussion: Milton Gilbert, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; John H. G. Pierson, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Donald H. Wallace, Office of Price Administration.

2:30 P.M. NATURAL RESOURCES AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Chairman: Alexander Loveday, League of Nations.

Harold F. Williamson, Yale University—"Prophecies of Scarcity and Exhaustion."

E. I. Kotok, U. S. Forest Service—"International Policy on Renewable Natural Resources."

Egon Glesinger, Comité Internationale du Bois—"Forest Products in a World Economy."

Discussion: S. v. Ciriacy-Wantrup, University of California; John Ise, University of Kansas; Eugene Staley, Foreign Service Educational Foundation.

2:30 P.M. THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Chairman: Clarence A. Berdahl, University of Illinois.

Discussion: Phillips Bradley, Queens College; Everett M. Dirksen, Member, U. S. House of Representatives; George B. Galloway, Commission on the Organization of Congress; Ernest S. Griffith, Library of Congress; Robert K. Lamb, United Steel Workers of America; Francis Maloney, Member, U. S. Senate; A. S. Mike Monroney, Member, U. S. House of Representatives; Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

2:30 P.M. GERMAN GOVERNMENT IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD

Chairman: Rogers H. Wells, Bryn Mawr College.

Maxine Sweezy, American Association of University Women—"The Problem of the German Economy."

John Brown Mason, Foreign Economic Administration—"Religion After Hitler."

Fritz Morstein Marx, Bureau of the Budget—"Germany's Rôle as Part of the Soviet Order."

James K. Pollock, University of Michigan—"The Rôle of the Public in a New Germany."

2:30 P.M. INTERDEPARTMENTAL COURSES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Chairman: A. B. Wolfe, Ohio State University.

Edward A. Shils, University of Chicago—"The Chicago Sequence in Social Science."

Louis M. Hacker, Columbia University—"The Contemporary Civilization Course at Columbia."

Discussion: Morris A. Copeland, War Production Board; Benjamin F. Wright, Harvard University.

2:30 P.M. IMPENDING ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS IN CIVILIAN AGENCY
OPERATIONS

Chairman: Donald C. Stone, Bureau of the Budget.

Discussion: Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Board; Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion; W. A. Jump, Department of Agriculture; John Ross, Department of State.

5:00 P.M. BUSINESS MEETING, AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE
ASSOCIATION

8:00 P.M. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR THE MAINTENANCE
OF PEACE

Chairman: Grayson L. Kirk, Columbia University.

Frederick S. Dunn, Yale University—"Security Organization: The Political Problem."

Major George Fielding Eliot, *New York Herald-Tribune*—"Security Organization: The Military Problem."

Philip C. Jessup, Columbia University—"Security Organization: The Problem of American Participation."

Discussion: Harold H. Sprout, Princeton University.

8:00 P.M. PRICE CONTROL AND RATIONING IN THE WAR-
PEACE TRANSITION

Chairman: Donald H. Wallace, Office of Price Administration.

J. M. Clark, Columbia University—"Problems, Objectives, and General Principles."

Merle Fainsod, Harvard University—"Policy Implications of Political and Administrative Aspects."

Clair Wilcox, Swarthmore College—"Economic Policy."

Discussion: Harvey Mansfield, Office of Price Administration; Elmer Staats, Bureau of the Budget.

8:00 P.M. ORGANIZED LABOR AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Chairman: Wayne L. Morse, Member, U. S. Senate.

Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard University—"The Responsibility of Organized Labor for Employment."

Robert M. C. Littler, San Francisco, California—"The Public Interest in the Terms of Collective Bargains."

Discussion: Fritz Machlup, Office of Alien Property Custodian; James J. Robbins, American University; George W. Taylor, National Labor Relations Board.

8:00 P.M. AVIATION IN THE POSTWAR WORLD

Chairman: Claude E. Puffer, University of Buffalo.

Lewis C. Sorrell, Air Transport Association of America—"The Economic Outlook for Air Transportation."

Kent T. Healy, Yale University—"The Elements of Workable Competition in Air Transportation."

Quincy Wright, University of Chicago—"Problems of International Organization of Aviation."

Discussion: Paul T. David, Bureau of the Budget; Escott Reid, Canadian Embassy.

8:00 P.M. THE 1944 ELECTION

Chairman: Harold D. Lasswell, Library of Congress.

Louis H. Bean, Bureau of the Budget—"The Votes."

Harold F. Gosnell, Bureau of the Budget—"The Polls."

Charles S. Hyneman, Federal Communications Commission—"The Southerners."

Ralph D. Casey, University of Minnesota—"The Campaign Tactics."

Discussion: J. William Fulbright, Member, U. S. Senate.

Saturday, February 3

9:30 A.M. THE HUMAN PROBLEM IN THE WAR-PEACE TRANSITION

Chairman: Geoffrey May, Bureau of the Budget.

Brigadier General Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans Affairs and of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration—"The Program for the Veteran."

William Haber, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion—"The Program for the Industrial Worker."

Arthur S. Flemming, United States Civil Service Commission—"The Program for the Government Employee."

Robert K. Lamb, United Steel Workers of America—"What Labor Needs."

Mrs. Eugene Meyer, *The Washington Post*—"What the Community Needs."

9:30 A.M. INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND CREDIT ARRANGEMENTS

Chairman: Robert B. Warren, Institute for Advanced Study.

Imrie de Vegh, New York City—"Capital Requirements and the Proposed International Financial Agencies."

William A. Fellner, University of California—"The Commercial Policy Implications of the Fund and Bank."

Walter Gardner, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System—"The Future International Position of the United States as Affected by the Fund and Bank."

Discussion: Alice Bourneuf, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Ragnar Nurkse, League of Nations.

9:30 A.M. AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

Chairman: Edward S. Mason, Office of Strategic Services.

E. J. Working, University of Illinois—"Highlights of the A. E. A. Committee Report."

Discussion: John D. Black, Harvard University; Karl Brandt, Food Research Institute; H. B. Arthur, Swift and Company; O. V. Wells, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

9:30 A.M. INSTITUTIONAL RECONSTRUCTION IN FRANCE

Chairman: Walter R. Sharp, United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture.

Discussion: Raoul Aglion, French Embassy; Shepard B. Clough, Social Science Research Council; Henry W. Ehrmann, Washington, D. C.; Leo Gershoy, Office of War Information; Robert K. Gooch, Department of State; Henry B. Hill, Office of Strategic Services; Louis Marlio, Brookings Institution; Louis Rosenstock-Franck, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; Christian Valensi, French Embassy.

9:30 A.M. POLITICAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD

Chairman: Arthur N. Holcombe, War Production Board.

Ernest S. Griffith, Library of Congress—"The Program and Problems of the Research Committee of the American Political Science Association."

William Anderson, University of Minnesota—"The Research Programs of the Committees on Government and Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council."

John M. Gaus, University of Wisconsin—"Research in Public Administration since 1930."

Pendleton Herring, Harvard University—"Political Science in the Next Decade."

9:30 A.M. URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Herbert Emmerich, Public Administration Clearing House.

Discussion: Charles Ascher, National Housing Agency; Walter Blucher, American Society of Planning Officials; Harold Buttenheim, The American City; Miles L. Colean, Consultant in Residential Construction and Finance; Major General U. S. Grant III, National Capital Park and Planning Commission; Alvin H. Hansen, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Reginald R. Isaacs, National Housing Agency; Robert Mitchell, Philadelphia City Planning Commission; Paul Oppermann, Federal Housing Administration; Warren Jay Vinton, Federal Public Housing Authority; Kenneth Vinsel, Louisville Area Development Association; Coleman Woodbury, National Housing Agency.

12:30 P.M. LUNCHEON MEETING

Chairman: Leonard D. White, President, American Political Science Association.

2:30 P.M. THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF INTERNATIONAL CARTELS

Chairman: Myron W. Watkins, Twentieth Century Fund.

W. Y. Elliott, War Production Board—"Possibilities in the Organization of International Raw-Material Cartels"

Theodore J. Kreps, Department of Justice—"The Economics of International Commodity Haute Politique."

Robert A. Brady, University of California—"The Rôle of Cartels in the Present Cultural Crisis."

Discussion: Ervin Hexner, University of North Carolina; Edward S. Mason, Office of Strategic Services; Howard J. McMurray, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Walter S. Tower, American Iron and Steel Institute; Robert M. Weidenhammer, Department of Commerce.

2:30 P.M. CITIZEN ATTITUDES TOWARD POLITICIANS AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS

(Joint Session with National Council for the Social Studies)

Chairman: Wilbur F. Murra, Civic Education Service.

Discussion: Ethan P. Allen, Bureau of the Budget; Mrs. Mary L. Ambrosi, Powell Junior High School, Washington, D. C.; John B. Blandford, Jr., National Housing Agency; Henry H. Field, University of Denver; Walter H. C. Laves, Bureau of the Budget; James Mendenhall, Office of Price Administration; Jerry Voorhis, Member, U. S. House of Representatives.

2:30 P.M. FISCAL PROBLEMS OF TRANSITION AND PEACE

Chairman: Lawrence H. Seltzer, Wayne University.

W. L. Crum, Harvard University—"Postwar Federal Expenditures and Their Implications for Tax Policy."

Albert G. Hart, Committee for Economic Development—"Wartime Financial Accumulations in Postwar Policy."

Richard V. Gilbert, Office of Price Administration—"Outline of a Proper Postwar Fiscal Policy."

Discussion: Roy Blough, Treasury Department; Gerhard Colm, Bureau of the Budget; Julius Hirsch, New York City; Arthur R. Uppgren, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.

2:30 P.M. PROBLEMS OF REGIONALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Chairman: Robert D. Calkins, Columbia University.

John V. Van Sickle, Vanderbilt University—"Regionalism: A Tool for Economic Analysis."

Leon Wolcott, Foreign Economic Administration—"Regionalism—Political Implementation."

Walter M. Kollmorgen, Department of Agriculture—"Trends in Conflict with Regionalism."

Discussion: Miriam E. Oatman, Foreign Economic Administration; John F. Miller, National Planning Association; J. J. Spengler, Duke University.

2:30 P.M. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE: OUTLOOK AND POLICY

Chairman: John D. Black, Harvard University.

F. F. Elliott, Bureau of Agricultural Economics—"In the War-Peace Transition."

J. B. Canning, War Food Administration—"In the Longer Run."

Discussion: Frank Munk, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; Harold B. Rowe, Foreign Economic Administration; P. Lamartine Yates, British Embassy.

8:00 P.M. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

Chairman: Robert E. Cushman, Cornell University.

Leonard D. White, President, American Political Science Association—"Can Congress Control the Public Service?"

Luther H. Gulick, President, American Society for Public Administration—"Domestic Administration and World Affairs."

Joseph S. Davis, President, American Economic Association—"Standards and Content of Living."

Sunday, February 4

10:00 A.M. THE SOVIET UNION IN THE POSTWAR WORLD

Chairman: Mortimer Graves, American Council of Learned Societies.

Ernest C. Ropes, Department of Commerce—"Soviet Commercial Policy."

Oscar Lange, University of Chicago—"Soviet Foreign Policy in Europe."

John N. Hazard, Foreign Economic Administration—"Soviet Internal Policy."

Discussion: W. Chapin Huntington, American Council of Learned Societies; Lieutenant Colonel William McChesney Martin, President's Soviet Protocol Committee; Brownson Price, Office of War Information; Charles Prince, Federal Communications Commission.

10:00 A.M. THE USE OF SAMPLING SURVEYS IN DEVELOPING AND
ADMINISTERING GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Chairman: A. C. C. Hill, Jr., War Production Board.

Discussion: Lieutenant Colonel Charles Dolard, Army Service Forces; Theodore R. Gamble, Treasury Department; Philip Hauser, Bureau of the Census; John B. Hutson, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion; Charles E. Noyes, War Production Board; Saul B. Sells, Office of Price Administration.

10:00 A.M. THE SUPREME COURT DURING AND AFTER THE WAR

Chairman: Robert K. Carr, Dartmouth College.

C. Herman Pritchett, University of Chicago—"Judicial Attitudes Toward Administrative Regulation in the Present Supreme Court.

Arthur A. Ballantine, New York—"The Supreme Court—Principles and Personalities."

Carl B. Swisher, Johns Hopkins University—"Conceptions of Welfare in Current Supreme Court Opinions"

2:00 P.M. THE FUNCTION OF GOVERNMENT IN THE POSTWAR
AMERICAN ECONOMY

Chairman: James Washington Bell, Northwestern University.

"Highlights of the A. E. A. Committee Report."

Discussion: Corwin D. Edwards, Northwestern University; Simeon D. Leland, University of Chicago; and others.

2:00 P.M. THE RÔLE OF THE STATES IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD

Chairman: Patterson H. French, Office of Price Administration.

Discussion: Frank Bane, Council of State Governments; Lieutenant Commander Frank W. Herring, Navy Department; George A. Shipman, Bureau of the Budget; Major John O. Walker, Council on Intergovernmental Relations.

2:00 P.M. POSTWAR CONTROL OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION
OF INFORMATION AND IDEAS

Chairman: Robert D. Leigh, Commission on the Freedom of the Press.

Francis C. de Wolf, Department of State—"The Post-War Structure and Control of Point to Point Telecommunications."

Llewellyn White, Commission on the Freedom of the Press—"The Post-War Short Wave Radio."

Nelson Poynter, St. Petersburg, Florida, *Times*.—"Post-War Structure and Control of Foreign Correspondents and Press Associations."

Haldore Hanson, Department of State—"Post-War Export and Import of Books, Magazines, and Motion Pictures."

2:00 P.M. ORGANIZATION AND COÖRDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL
AND ECONOMIC AGENCIES

Chairman: Benjamin Gerig, Department of State.

Discussion: J. William Fulbright, Member, U. S. Senate; Leland Goodrich, Brown University; Alexander Loveday, League of Nations; Leroy Stinebower, Department of State.

The Executive Council of the American Political Science Association met in morning and afternoon sessions on Thursday, February 1, in the Hotel Statler in Washington, D. C. At the luncheon interlude, Waldo G.

Leland, director of the American Council of Learned Societies, gave a brief survey of the participation of the Association in the ACLS, and Charles G. Fenwick, chairman of the Inter-American Juridical Committee, recently returned from Rio de Janeiro, presented comments upon Latin American attitude toward the Dumbarton Oaks Charter.

The Secretary-Treasurer reported that the membership and subscriptions of the Association for 1944 totaled 3216 as compared with 3025 in 1943. The new members of the Association were 553 as compared with 436 in 1943, while the cancellations were 362 as compared with 514 in the previous year. The net gain in membership was 191 as compared with a net loss of 78 in 1943, and a loss of 206 in 1942. Of the total membership, 3216, there were 2990 regular and associate memberships, 51 sustaining memberships (paying ten dollars per year), 7 contributing memberships (paying twenty-five dollars per year), and 41 life memberships. The increase of membership was due partly to increased interest in the study of government and international relations, partly to the extensive membership campaign conducted by the officers and members of the Association, and partly to professional appreciation of the *Directory of the American Political Science Association* now in press.

In the first year of World War II, the Association recognized that the impact of the war and the ensuing postwar problems raised an increasing need for the study and discussion of domestic and international governmental problems. If the Association were to continue its activities in teaching and training young men and women for government service and in promoting the public discussion of government and politics, it must maintain at least its level of membership. Almost the entire revenue of the Association is received from membership dues and subscriptions to the REVIEW. Barely two hundred twenty-five dollars are received each year as interest from the Trust Fund. Consequently, the Association resolved to continue its campaign for new members.

The financial report of the Secretary-Treasurer showed that the expenditures for 1944 were \$17,998.45 as compared with \$16,710.83 in 1943, while the income was \$22,658.26 as compared with \$16,520.92 in 1943. The income included \$4,743.77 in prepaid membership dues. The bank balance on December 15, 1944, was \$7,974.74 and cash in petty cash account was \$3.00, while there were no accounts payable. The total cost of the publication of the REVIEW was \$8,937.99 as compared with \$9,243.05 in 1943. This decrease did not reflect a decrease in the number of pages published in the volume for 1944, but rather the higher expenditure for 1943 included the cost of paper stock purchased in that year. The expenditure of \$9,060.46 in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer included \$2,200.00 received on behalf of the Committee on Congress from Dr. Benjamin B. Wallace and expended by this Committee.

The budget of the Association for 1945, as approved by the Executive Council, calls for an expenditure of \$17,925.00 and an estimated income of \$18,100.00. The proposed expenditures include \$9,300.000 for editing and publishing the REVIEW and \$8,800.00 for the expenses of the office of Secretary-Treasurer. The estimates of revenue include \$15,400.00 to be received from membership dues; \$1,175.00 from sale of publications; and \$1,525.00 from other sources.

The assets of the Association show a bank balance of \$7,794.74 and \$3.00 in petty cash. The Trust Funds include \$8,100.00 invested in U. S. Treasury Bonds and \$987.12 in the Trust Fund Account, making a total of \$9,087.12. The paper stock of the Association has been exhausted; the requirements for the REVIEW are purchased from issue to issue from the George Banta Publishing Company, of Menasha, Wisconsin. Office equipment is valued at \$191.95, and the estimated capitalization of the REVIEW is \$8,000.00, making a total of \$8,191.95. Accounts receivable are \$15.24 and there are no accounts payable. The securities held in the First National Bank of Evanston, Illinois, and comprising the Trust Fund of the Association include: 3% U. S. Treasury Bonds of 1951-1955 with par value of \$1,500; 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ % Treasury Bonds of 1955-1960 with par value of \$800; 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ % U. S. Treasury Bonds of 1958-1963 with par value of \$4,800; 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ % U. S. Treasury Bonds of 1937-1972 with par value of \$500; and 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ % U. S. Treasury Bonds of 1964-1969 with par value of \$500, making a total of \$8,100.

The audit of the Association's books was made on January 4, 1945, by Alexander Grant & Company (1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Illinois), certified public accountants. The committee on Audit, composed of John D. Larkin and Jerome G. Kerwin reported as follows: "We have examined the accounts of the Secretary-Treasurer of the American Political Science Association and have verified the audit report prepared by Alexander Grant and Company, which is attached. We have also found the statement of the Secretary-Treasurer to be correct. The financial conditions of the Association during the past year, ending December 15th, 1944, have improved over those of the preceding year. This has resulted from four contributing factors: (1) placing the membership on a calendar-year basis as suggested by a previous Auditing Committee, thus advancing the payment of some annual dues; (2) a drop in the number of cancellations; (3) a marked increase in membership; and, finally, (4) there have been a larger number of sustaining and contributing memberships. The decrease in cancellations may in part be due to the *Directory*, which has made a personal appeal to individual members to retain their membership in the Association. As to the increase in new members, the Secretary-Treasurer is to be commended for his diligence in maintaining a spirited campaign to this end. Total receipts during the year have amounted to

\$25,797.63. Disbursements have amounted to only \$17,819.89, thus leaving a balance of \$7,977.74. The Committee recommends that the Secretary-Treasurer be authorized to invest such of this amount as may not be needed for current expenses. The existing Trust Fund of the Association, amounting to \$8,100.00, has remained at the same figure as that reported by the Auditing Committee two years ago."

The report of the Committee on Audit was accepted and its recommendation approved. The report of the Secretary-Treasurer was approved and the budget adopted.

The Secretary-Treasurer made appropriate remarks regarding members of the Association whose death had occurred during the year. In accord with recent practice, memorials in honor of deceased members are published in the REVIEW shortly after their death rather than held for presentation at the annual meeting.

The report of Frederic A. Ogg, Managing Editor of the REVIEW, indicated that Volume XXXVIII (1944) contained 1268 pages as compared with 1160 in 1943. The number of pages devoted to leading articles was 210, and the departments were represented by the following number of pages: (1) American Government and Politics, 274; (2) Constitutional Law, 46; (3) Public Administration, 10; (4) Rural Local Government, 25; (5) Municipal Affairs, 0; (6) Foreign Government and politics, 33; (7) International Affairs, 86; (8) Instruction and Research, 59; (9) News and Notes, 69; (10) Book Reviews and Notices, 259; and (11) Recent Publications of Political Interest, 167. Special features included 14 pages devoted to the list of Doctoral Dissertations in Preparation and 16 pages to the Index. Three issues during the year included grouped articles, or symposia. Two are in prospect for 1945, one in the area of European governments and the other in that of Latin American affairs. The printers have cooperated faithfully in the effort to have numbers of the REVIEW appear before the close of the scheduled month, and except in the case of the recent December issue, there have been no serious delays. Printing conditions are not improving, and all that can be promised for 1945 is honest effort. The Managing Editor urged members of the Association to submit suggestions and criticisms.

The Executive Council reflected Messrs. Kenneth C. Cole, Clyde Eagleton, Pendleton Herring, Walter H. C. Laves, and Donald C. Stone for a one-year term on the Board of Editors of the REVIEW; and elected Messrs. Robert E. Cushman (Cornell University), Fritz Morstein Marx (Queens College), Lennox A. Mills (University of Minnesota), Carl B. Swisher (Johns Hopkins University), and Miss Louise Overacker (Wellesley College) for a term of two years.

President Leonard D. White announced the appointment of Charles E. Hyneman (Federal Communications Commission) as representative of the

Association on the Social Science Research Council for the term of 1945-47; and of Joseph P. Chamberlain (Columbia University) as delegate of the Association to the American Council of Learned Societies for the term of 1945-48. The Secretary-Treasurer reported that the twenty-fifth meeting of the ACLS in Boston, Massachusetts, on January 25-26, 1945, considered the following subjects: publication of a history of science in the United States, project of a multi-disciplinary study of American history, assistance to individual scholars by grants-in-aid of research and by assistance to publication, the protection of cultural treasures in war areas, the Intensive Language Program, area studies by the Ethnographic Board, plans for histories of the impact of war on American intellectual life, and plans for international intellectual coöperation. The Executive Council adopted a resolution requesting the American Council of Learned Societies to seek funds for grants-in-aid of research and assistance to publication of scholarly manuscripts.

The Executive Council ratified the following amendments to the Constitution of the ACLS, approved by the Council in Boston in January 25, 1945:

"Article 6. *Voted*, To amend Article 8 of the Constitution by affixing the letter (a) to the present paragraph, and by adding a second paragraph, lettered (b), as follows: (b) The Council may, by by-law, create an Executive Committee, and delegate to it such powers and authority as the Council may see fit.

"Article 10. *Voted*, To amend Article 10 of the Constitution by striking out the entire article and by substituting therefor the following: 10. The Council shall maintain such representation in the Union Académique Internationale as may be prescribed by the statutes of the latter, shall cause the annual dues of the United States of America in the Union to be paid, and shall in general be the medium of communication between the Union and the Constituent Societies of the Council."

In the absence of representatives of the Association on the Social Science Research Council, William Anderson informally indicated that the SSRC is now engaged in a search for a new Executive Director to succeed Dr. Robert T. Crane, a member of the Association, who has served the Council in that capacity for a number of years and with distinguished success. While this search goes on, the regular activities also go forward, but no major new undertakings are being started. Two committees of the Council are of special interest to the APSA. These are the Committee on Government and the Committee on Public Administration. The former was appointed in 1941, and its members include Robert E. Cushman, Simeon E. Leland, Charles McKinley, Thorsten Sellin, and William Anderson (chairman). J. R. Hayden was appointed to the Committee, but was unable to serve on account of his participation in the war effort

in the Pacific. It was the function of the Committee to explore the research needs and possibilities in the field of political science, with emphasis on the areas that need most attention, and to report its findings to the Council. Its report was finished in 1944 and has been mimeographed. Under the heading of "Research Areas" the report emphasizes (1) civil liberties; (2) freedom of association and the formation of pressure groups; (3) the organization and operation of government, under the headings of (a) federalism: national and international, (b) legislative-executive relations, and the legislative process, (c) public administration, (d) local government and administration, and (e) international government and administration; (4) the functions of government (trends, causes, and consequences); (5) the fiscal and economic functions of government under the headings: (a) the financing of government (and fiscal policy) and (b) governmental controls over business, labor, and agriculture; (6) social functions of government; (7) civil-military relations; (8) church-state relations; (9) the voter and his government. Under "Research Methods" the report deals with (1) the comparative method, (2) the analytical and theoretical approach, (3) the experimental method, (4) the quantitative method, (5) collaboration between political science and other social sciences. In order to check its own findings, the Committee sent out over two hundred letters of inquiry to leading American political scientists. From this effort over 120 thoughtful replies were received. These made some very important suggestions, and reinforced effectively the findings of the Committee. Consequently the Committee classified them, made liberal extracts from them, and included them under appropriate headings in an Appendix of 51 pages to the report, which consists of 42 pages. In this Appendix, therefore, one can read the minds of a good cross section of the American political scientists of today.

The Committee on Public Administration was originally appointed in 1928. Its first chairman was Leonard D. White, and he was followed by Luther Gulick, then Louis Brownlow, and finally, William Anderson. During 1944, a comprehensive report on the work of this Committee was prepared for the Council by its chairman. This report will be published, probably in 1945, and is expected to include a report prepared for the Committee on Public Administration by John M. Gaus on developments in public administration since 1930, when his earlier report on Research in Public Administration was published. Although the Committee on Public Administration report and the Gaus memorandum deal mainly with past developments, both contain suggestions for research in the post-war era. Both the Committee on Government and the Committee on Public Administration are now in a state of almost suspended animation. Their funds will expire on June 30, 1945, and there has been no request for renewal. It is fully expected, however, that the SSRC under its new

Executive Director will continue to give support to work in the field of political science. Mr. Cushman remarked that the report of the Committee on Government by Mr. Anderson was an extremely important and statesmanlike analysis of the areas and problems of research in the whole field of government. It is bound to have genuine influence in stimulating and directing research activities.

Ernest S. Griffith, representative of the Association in the American Documentation Institute, reported that the ADI serves as an important potential instrument for the promotion of research, particularly in making available somewhat inaccessible materials by means of microfilm. W. Reed West, chairman of the Committee on Publication of Election Statistics, reported that so long as the war is in progress it is not likely that the Bureau of the Census will obtain funds to carry out the project for an elections yearbook desired by this Association. However, soldier voting has created some problems that are related to elections statistics, and a number of publications have been issued by the Bureau of the Census that are related to the war effort and at the same time have been the basis for experimental surveys. In October, 1944, the Bureau of the Census published *Elections Data in State Documents* (State Documents No. 2) under the supervision of Dr. E. R. Gray of the Governments Division. This publication is mute evidence of the need for federal elections statistics, inasmuch as 216 publications containing elections data are listed, and these are not standardized either as to areas and offices covered or as to time of issue. All of these publications together do not cover elections for all offices. However, these are the sources of data needed by the student of elections so far as they are available in official sources. The references cover elections, primaries, votes upon measures, and compilations of election laws. The elections calendar for 1944 was expanded over those for 1942 and 1943, and the Bureau continued its publication of data on initiative and referendum proposals. The Bureau has in process for publication early in 1945 a list of county and state elective offices, including terms, and planned to publish in January statistics on soldier voting in the elections just concluded. It may be possible for the Bureau to publish in the spring or summer of 1945 some information on voter participation in the elections of 1944. The Executive Council ordered the Committee on Publication of Election Statistics to be continued as a standing committee.

On motion of Howard White, the Executive Council adopted the following resolution regarding publications of the Department of State: "Whereas, the foreign policies of this country are now of more vital concern to our citizenry than ever before; and Whereas, the successful execution of policy in a democratic state requires the consistent support of an intelligent public opinion, which support is not forthcoming unless the public is currently informed of developments in our foreign relationships; Therefore be it resolved that the American Political Science As-

sociation recommend to the Congress and to the Department of State the continuation of the present publication program and its expansion along lines which will facilitate the education of our citizens in the nation's foreign policy, both past and present. The Association particularly commends the recent improvements in format and contents of the *Department of State Bulletin*. Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the chairman of the House of Representatives and Senate Committees on Appropriations, of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and of the sub-committees on the State Department of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, and to members of the American Political Science Association."

William Anderson, chairman of the Committee on Endowment, presented the text of a brochure outlining objectives and projects of the American Political Science Association and soliciting funds and bequests for such purposes. The Secretary-Treasurer announced that two ex-presidents of the Association had already arranged for substantial bequests to the Association. The discussion developed a consensus of opinion that the purposes of the Association would be promoted by funds for civic education, research, publication, conferences, expansion of the REVIEW, and meetings of committees and other agencies. The Executive Council instructed the Committee on Endowment to prepare a brochure and authorized the Secretary-Treasurer to arrange for the publication and circulation of the same.

The report of John E. Briggs, chairman of the Committee on Regional and Functional Societies, is published in the Appendix of the present proceedings of the Executive Council. Remarks by Messrs. Ernest S. Griffith, John M. Gaus, and Clyde Eagleton stressed the need of keeping fields of international relations and local government in the APSA annual meetings rather than abandoning these subjects to societies in the field of international law and public administration. The Executive Council instructed the Committee on Regional and Functional Societies to study and report to the Council recommendations regarding joint annual meetings and the general character of annual meetings of this Association.

George B. Galloway, chairman of the Committee on American Legislatures, submitted a report of its findings and recommendations as to the Congress of the United States. This report consists of a printed pamphlet of 89 pages bearing the title *The Reorganization of Congress* and will be reviewed in an early issue of the REVIEW.¹ The comprehensive and constructive work of the Committee which culminated in this document was

¹ Members of the American Political Science Association may obtain copies at \$0.75 each from the Public Affairs Press, 2153 Florida Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C.

made possible through the financial support of Dr. Benjamin B. Wallace. The report was accepted and the Committee was continued with a view to extending its activities to the field of state legislatures. In the discussion of this report, Arthur N. Holcombe raised the question whether the acceptance of the report by the Executive Council included leave to print. The opinion was expressed that any Committee, unless its mandate prohibited such action, had leave to print, but not necessarily leave to publish. Clarence A. Berdahl regretted the fact that such a report as *The Reorganization of Congress* could not have the endorsement of the Association. The APSA would prove a more effective educative organization if it could courageously support a report of this character. Robert E. Cushman replied that while he was eager to have the report received, he desired to say that neither the Constitution nor the time-honored tradition of the APSA authorized the Executive Council to endorse any views, policies, or proposals submitted by any committee of the Association. In law, a favorable vote by the Executive Council on the recommendations of the Committee would be nothing more than an expression of the individual views of the members of the Executive Council. No one is empowered to speak for the Association as such. Ernest S. Griffith, while agreeing with these views, held that reports would have more influence if endorsed rather than accepted, and suggested that a procedure for a mail vote by the membership of the Association might well be devised.

In connection with this discussion, James W. Fesler called attention to the consensus reports offered in the annual meeting of the American Economic Association. The AEA appoints several committees, each composed of about five members, to draft a report expressing the expert judgment of its members on some major problem of public policy, such as (1) the function of government in the postwar American economy, (2) agricultural price supports and their consequences, and (3) international monetary and credit arrangements. The draft report is then submitted to a panel of consultants for initial comment. The final report may be made the subject of a section meeting on the annual program, as was planned this year, and would be released to the press or otherwise published. A major premise of this procedure is the belief that this method would contradict the general opinion that experts disagree on every phase of every public policy and that they have no real contribution to make to the solution of local, national, and international problems.

A report from Marshall E. Dimock, chairman of the Committee on Citizenship Education, recommended that the American Political Science Association broaden its interest in citizenship education and raise its sights. There are three areas to which attention should be given: citizenship education of aliens; adult education of the citizen population; coöperative arrangements in the field of secondary education. The work among

aliens is already well organized—the National Citizenship Education program may be relied upon to take care of that; it does, however, deserve any coöperation we may be able to give in the future. The third area involves a closer collaboration with administrators and social science teachers in secondary education. High school students are not adequately prepared for citizenship. An astoundingly high percentage still graduate without a single course in civics. Few matters are of greater professional interest to our Association. "I wish we could obtain the means of arranging a series of conferences with the secondary school people in which we could get over to them the conviction that citizenship—in the comprehensive sense which includes all subjects, but emphasizes civic duties and the necessity of participation—is the unifying factor in all education and is infinitely preferable to vocationalism, classicism, or any of the other alternatives that are being advocated." In this time when goals and methods are everywhere being revised, the Association might possibly meet with a greater degree of success than in the past. If the above-outlined program appeals to the members of the Association, the Committee on Citizenship Education might conceivably appoint three of its number to concentrate upon the three aspects that have been mentioned, namely, citizenship education for aliens, citizenship education for the adult population, and more attention to citizenship in the high schools and public schools generally. Perhaps, however, because of the importance of the last-mentioned subject, a special committee should be appointed for this purpose, or next year's officers themselves should take up the matter and give it priority of attention.

In connection with this report, Russell H. Ewing, of the U. S. Army Service Forces, was invited to present a statement to the Executive Council regarding his proposal for a Committee on Civic Organization and Leadership Training which would be instructed to investigate the methods used by the Army and Navy and by business and industry in discovering and developing leadership and all other methods for the promotion of leadership training. The Executive Council approved the report of the Committee on Citizenship Education, ordered the continuance of the Committee, and referred the communication of Mr. Ewing to that Committee.

A report from Benjamin F. Wright, chairman of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction in Political Science, showed that the Committee had been able to hold one meeting during the year in Chicago, as guests of the University of Chicago. The activities of the Committee have resulted in the preparation of two studies, one on "The University of Chicago Sequence in Social Science" and the other on "The Contemporary Civilization Course at Columbia University." Important as is the problem of the relations of political science to the other disciplines of the

social sciences, the Committee desired to concentrate its attention upon proposals for new types of introductory courses. President Leonard D. White indicated that the continuance of the Committee would depend upon the procurement of funds for further conferences.

Howard White presented the report of the Committee on Social Studies, which was accepted by the Executive Council. Coöperation in the planning and execution of the program of the National Conference of the Social Studies and in the Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies were the two principal activities of the Committee.

Franklin L. Burdette, editor of the *Directory of the American Political Science Association*, reported that the publication is ready to go to press. As of January 31, 1945, members of the Association have ordered 1256 copies of the volume. Of these orders, 446 are for cloth-bound copies and 810 for paper-bound. Advance payments received total \$849.00, and the revenue anticipated from copies already ordered is \$1702.00. In addition to biographical sketches of more than 1800 members, the *Directory* will include a classification of members by primary fields of interest, a geographical list of members and of subscribers to the REVIEW, and other data about the Association and its membership. Three letters enclosing questionnaires were sent, whenever necessary, to each member of the Association in order to obtain biographical information. While it was necessary to send follow-up letters to a majority of the membership, more than three-quarters of the members have submitted information, and at least the name and address of every member will be printed. Extensive editorial work has been necessary to assemble material from many of the questionnaires. Advance copies of biographical sketches have been submitted for approval. Editorial expenses have been covered by a grant from the National Foundation for Education.

The report of the Committee on Research was presented by the chairman, Mr. Griffith. This year it dealt with opinions as to the state of research in the profession, together with suggestions for its strengthening. The text of this report appears in full in the Appendix. It was compiled as a result of consultation by the Committee with more than seventy political and social scientists who were available in and near Washington. Mr. Griffith pointed out that only a part of the recommendations of the report were directed to the Association, others being aimed at educational institutions and members of the profession. The report was accepted and referred to the President-elect of the Association for such action as he may see fit to take, looking toward its approval by the Association.

Mr. Griffith also indicated that the study of areas of research by panels of interested members of the Association had been continued during 1944, but that funds available for panel meetings were now exhausted. The President of the Association was authorized to approach the Social Sci-

ence Research Council for a grant of two thousand dollars to permit meetings of the four remaining panels working under the Committee on Research. The interest of certain members of the panel on Political Theory of the Committee on Research in the publication of a series of European texts in theory, paralleling the series on American Political Thought now being developed by the Committee on the Library of American Political Thought under Francis W. Coker, was commended. It was thought that this problem should remain a charge of the Committee on Research.

Mr. Griffith concluded his report by observing that two major items remain on the agenda of future research committees. The first of these is more adequate technical tools—such as a revision of the guides to research, coöperation with the American Documentation Institute, and bibliographical aids. The second is the formulation of a code on standards of research.

The report of the Program Committee for the 1944 meeting was presented by the chairman, James W. Fesler, and accepted by the Executive Council. The joint plans for the meetings of the American Economic Association, the American Society for Public Administration, and the American Political Science Association were complete, but the meetings were cancelled at the eleventh hour by agreement of the presidents of the three associations in order to comply with the recent request of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Some of the difficulties encountered in making program arrangements included: (1) the necessity of the chairman to make decisions in joint meetings with the representatives of other societies, (2) the use of broad topics of general interest instead of cultivating new and little explored areas, (3) the limited number of sessions available in the short time allotted to the meetings; and (4) pressure to schedule headliners from each group rather than use of new and untried talent. In view of these difficulties, it was suggested that consideration be given to alternating joint sessions with separate sessions. The committee also felt some need for better facilities for hearing of promising young scholars and of current research projects which the program committee might use.

The report on the Personnel Service was presented by the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer and accepted by the Executive Council. It indicated that the 1945 edition of the Service would be issued about March 1. The questionnaires submitted for the Directory will form the basis for a permanent personnel file for each number of the Association. The completion of a survey of war service of members of the Association was also reported. This will be published in an early number of the *REVIEW*.

The Washington Committee of the Association reported through its chairman, James W. Fesler, a wide variety of activities during 1944. Included were (1) a canvass of political science departments at institutions engaged in the ASTP program to determine the impact of the cut-

back of the program, (2) preparation of an explanatory article for the REVIEW on the "GI Bill of Rights," (3) solicitation of renewal of lapsed memberships in the Association among Washington area members, (4) inquiry as to the demand for political scientists in the federal civil service, (5) advice to the program committee, (6) appointment of a subcommittee on Washington meetings. Four discussion groups were set up in Washington, each of which held several sessions. These revolved around the following problems: (1) the return of political scientists to the campus from war work, (2) the place of Japan and Germany in the post-war world, (3) the reconciliation of powerful administration with democracy, and (4) education and foreign relations. This report was accepted by the Executive Council with sincere appreciation of the service rendered to the Association by this group in a difficult war-time situation.

The Secretary-Treasurer called attention to the unique advantages obtained from the use of the group of political scientists in Washington in the promotion of the professional interests of the Association.

In presenting the report of the Committee on Latin-American Affairs, the chairman, Mr. Fitzgibbon, emphasized the fact that there had as yet been no meeting of the committee, due to its recent organization. He remarked upon the committee's unique assignment, that of dealing with materials in a single geographical area, one of vital interest and importance to hemisphere understanding. For the present, he suggested, the committee's work is exploratory and definite recommendations must wait upon these inquiries. The report was accepted.

Lloyd M. Short, chairman of the Committee on Nomination of Officers for the year 1945, placed in nomination the following members: President, John M. Gaus (University of Wisconsin); First Vice-President, Robert T. Crane (Social Science Research Council); Second Vice-President, James K. Pollock (University of Michigan); and Third Vice-President, Dorothy Schaffter (Connecticut College for Women); and members of the Executive Council for 1945-47: Edward F. Dow (University of Maine); Robert J. Harris (Louisiana State University); John G. Heinberg (University of Missouri); Walter H. C. Laves (University of Chicago); and Chester C. Maxey (Whitman College). An advisory ballot was sent to all members of the Association on May 5, 1944. By June 15, the deadline for return of these ballots, 135 ballots were received. This return compared favorably with the 107 ballots cast in 1943, but obviously included only a small percentage of the total membership of the Association. In the selection of nominees, the Committee followed the usual practice of recognizing fields of specialization, geographical distribution, and types of institutions. The cancellation of the annual meeting of February 1-4 prevented holding the regular business meeting in which the officers for the ensuing year are usually elected. The Constitution of the Association (Article VII, sec-

tion 6) provides: "In the event of an emergency which prevents the holding of the Annual Business Meeting of the Association, the Executive Council shall be authorized to exercise all the powers of the Association, including the election of officers." Accordingly, the Executive Council proceeded to the choice of officers and duly elected the above-mentioned members.

The Executive Council expressed its appreciation to James W. Fesler (War Production Board) for his competent development of the Association's contribution to the program of the fortieth annual meeting, to Henry Reining (National Institute of Public Affairs) who had charge of arrangements, and to the officers of the American Economic Association and the American Society for Public Administration who coöperated with them. The Executive Council regretted the fact that the cancellation of the annual meeting prevented the public delivery of the presidential address by President Leonard D. White on the timely subject, "Can Congress Control the Public Service?" Following the regular practice, the address is published in the February issue of the REVIEW; and a limited number of reprints will be in the hands of the Secretary-Treasurer and can be obtained by members on request.

KENNETH COLEGROVE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

APPENDIX I

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL SOCIETIES

Presented to the Executive Council
February 1, 1945

During 1944, the activities of most of the regional groups of political scientists were still greatly curtailed. Restricted transportation and hotel facilities prevented the annual meetings of regional as well as national associations. The conference type of regional groups has been most seriously affected by wartime conditions. As in previous years, no meeting of the Midwest Conference or the Southwestern Social Science Association was held; the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Political Science and Public Administration Association was cancelled on account of travel difficulties; and a breakfast gathering in connection with the joint meeting of political scientists, economists, and public administrators at Washington in January, 1944, served as the fifteenth annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association. The movement toward the organization of regional groups has made no progress, though most if not all of those already established will probably revive under normal conditions.

Perhaps a new pattern for metropolitan areas is being designed by the Washington Committee of the American Political Science Association, which has appointed a subcommittee to arrange meetings of political scientists in and near Washington. The plan was inaugurated with a smoker attended by 83 persons on November 15, 1944. Smaller groups are being organized with selected leaders to discuss timely subjects at a series of meetings. Besides the opportunity for professional association, the program may produce influential judgments on current problems.

The Southern Political Science Association, most self-sufficient of regional societies, has maintained all its functions, including the publication of the quarterly *Journal of Politics*. Emphasis has recently been placed on research, particularly in relation to public administration in the South. Indeed, the field of public administration seems to be receiving the most active attention of Southern political scientists, if the establishment of the Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration and a conference in November at the University of Alabama on "research and training in public administration in the South" may be interpreted as indications of such interest. The Pennsylvania Political Science and Public Administration Association has also, quite naturally, recognized the importance of close association between academic students of politics and practitioners in the public service.

Inasmuch as the nature of regional groups and their relation to the American Political Science Association have been analyzed in previous reports of this committee, it seems unnecessary to repeat former conclusions and recommendations. No new developments demand attention at this time. With the end of the war, the national Association should be alert to disintegrating influences of regional as well as functional character. Special interests of either kind can be fostered within the national Association if constructive measures are adopted. Such innovations as the Washington Committee's discussion-group program and the various panels organized under the auspices of the Research Committee may provide a pattern and satisfy a need which will contribute so much to the vitality of the national Association that the organization of independent regional and functional groups will be unnecessary.

Relations of the American Political Science Association to Cognate Societies

Last year, the program chairman, Marshall E. Dimock, proposed that the number of sessions at the annual meeting be reduced, that the American Political Science Association meet only with the American Economic Association for a period of several years, and that the programs of the two associations be closely integrated through joint participation in each session. When the discussion of this recommendation seemed likely to be indecisive, John M. Gaus moved that the problem be referred to the Com-

mittee on Regional and Functional Societies for special study. For this purpose President White appointed a large, representative committee to consider such matters as overlapping membership (which is a measure of the degree of kinship), general character and size of various associations in the social science field, time and place of meetings, and program traditions. We have also inquired about the feasibility of planning meetings two or three years in advance, of joint regional meetings, and of integrated programs.

In terms of duplicate membership, the American Political Science Association is more closely related to the American Society for Public Administration than to any other national society. The American Society of International Law appears to be next in kinship, while only about five per cent of the members of the American Political Science Association also belong to the American Economic Association. More political scientists belong to such organizations as the National Municipal League than to other social science associations which are less interested in political phenomena. The membership of political scientists in cognate societies is inversely proportional to the remoteness or specialization of the field. Thus, political scientists in cognate societies seem to be more closely identified with economists, sociologists, and historians than with statisticians, psychologists, and anthropologists—to name the groups represented on the Social Science Research Council. But the connection between any of these major associations, so far as membership is concerned, is too small to be of any significance.

Associated with each of the principal national societies are specialized groups in the same general field which customarily meet at the same time and place. For example, the Agricultural Historical Society, the American Association for State and Local History, the American Catholic Historical Association, the American Society for Church History, the Economic History Association, the Society of American Archivists, and others usually meet with the American Historical Association. The American Economic Association customarily holds its annual meeting jointly with a large group of related associations known as the Allied Social Science Associations, which include the American Association for Labor Legislation, the American Association of University Teachers of Insurance, the American Business Law Association, the American Farm Economic Association, the American Finance Association, the American Marketing Association, the American Sociological Society, the American Statistical Association, the Econometric Society, the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, and the Rural Sociological Society. (The economists regard the meetings in Washington with the political scientists and public administrators since 1942 as "local or regional rather than national.") Homogeneity of subject-matter appears to be the dominant factor in

determining the affiliation of associations in their national meetings, although the organizations in specialized branches of political science operate more independently than those in other fields.

The factors of time and place impose no insurmountable difficulties in the way of regular meetings with other major social science associations. Most of them, like the American Political Science Association, normally meet between Christmas and New Year's Day. Selection of the place would depend upon negotiation with the officers of the several associations, and the plan of the American Political Science Association, adopted in 1939, to meet in Washington, Chicago, and a variable third city in a regular cycle would be abandoned. Since the American Political Science Association is not one of the larger societies, our influence would probably not be decisive in naming the place of meeting. An investigation in 1941 by this committee indicated that meetings in Chicago and Washington are best attended by political scientists. Accessibility of the place of meeting, apparently, has more influence upon attendance than the cognate societies with which we meet.

If regular meetings with closely related associations such as the American Society for Public Administration, the American Society of International Law, the National Municipal League, the International City Managers Association, the Civil Service Assembly, the National Council for Social Studies, and regional societies like the Southern Political Science Association should be contemplated, both time and place of meeting would have to be unified, for wide disparity exists. Perhaps the suspension or curtailment of national conventions during the war has served to weaken meeting traditions so that closer organized contacts could be established with these naturally affiliated groups. Two members of the committee (Harvey Walker and Thomas I. Cook) favor holding the annual meeting at some other time than Christmas, perhaps late in the summer at a resort hotel. A formal alliance might unify the profession of political science and check the trend toward individualistic subdivision. At present, however, no tendency toward federation can be discerned, though no hostility to closer contact has been discovered. One member of the committee (Howard White) is particularly anxious for political scientists to become more definitely associated with the National Council for Social Studies.

Assuming that joint meetings with cognate associations would foster better understanding and intellectual cross-fertilization, these advantages are most likely to be secured if the programs are carefully integrated. But the organization of sessions combining subject-matter and personnel that will command general attention requires long-range planning and whole-hearted cooperation. It is impracticable for more than three closely affiliated associations. Even under the most favorable circumstances, there is

little opportunity for specialists to discuss their own peculiar problems. In normal times the large number of collateral groups associated with the historians, economists, and sociologists, each intent upon its own field, would seem to impose insuperable obstacles in the way of an integrated program. A compromise, providing for technical roundtable meetings as well as general coördinated sessions has been suggested. The alternative to some sort of integrated program is an independent schedule of sessions by each association, which results in conflicting attractions and such general confusion that many advantages of a joint meeting are nullified. Nevertheless, in spite of the difficulties involved, the consensus of opinion in the committee favors broader contacts with social science associations, provided that the vitality of the American Political Science Association is not impaired:

Most of the committee members feel that meetings with other social science groups on the regional level would be profitable. This, however, would depend upon circumstances. There is a general recognition of the need for coöperative study of current problems. Perhaps mutual understanding and intellectual stimulation can be achieved best by the more intimate acquaintance that is possible in smaller groups.

The proposal that meetings be planned two or three years in advance, so as to secure an orderly sequence of association with our social science neighbors, does not appear to be feasible.

Conclusions

If the American Political Science Association should adopt a policy of meeting with other major social science organizations, the following factors should be considered:

1. The duplication of membership between the American Political Science Association and other major social science organizations is too small to be of any significance.

2. Since the American Economic Association and the American Historical Association are normally surrounded by numerous collateral societies in closely related fields, the independence and identity of the American Political Science Association would tend to be lessened among so many organizations.

3. The influence of the American Political Science Association would not be decisive in selecting the place of meeting, although attendance is affected by accessibility of the meeting place.

4. Integration of the program by joint participation in each session would be very difficult and unsatisfactory, if not utterly impossible.

5. Regular meetings with associations more closely related to political science would involve radical changes in the time of the annual conventions as well as narrowing rather than broadening the area of contact.

6. Regional conferences might provide organized contacts with related social science groups if national joint meetings are not developed.

PHILLIPS BRADLEY	CHARLES C. ROHLFING
THOMAS I. COOK	CHARLES H. ROHR
ELMER D. GRAPER	CYRIL B. UPHAM
THORSTEN V. KALIJARVI	HARVEY WALKER
ROSCOE C. MARTIN	HOWARD WHITE
MATTHEW C. MITCHELL	HERBERT WRIGHT
H. C. NIXON	JOHN E. BRIGGS, <i>Chairman.</i>

APPENDIX II

REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION ON OPINIONS AS TO THE STATE OF RESEARCH IN THE PROFESSION, TOGETHER WITH SUGGESTIONS FOR ITS STRENGTHENING

I. The Setting

It is incumbent upon a professional and scholarly association, or for that matter, any organization, to conduct periodic audits of its adequacy and usefulness. Such an audit is particularly appropriate, if its timing can be related to some turning point in the association's history.

The end of the present war seems likely to be such a turning point for the American Political Science Association, and especially for the research activities of its membership. Without attempting to document this statement in detail, it is perhaps sufficient for our present purpose to indicate the wartime influx of our members into governmental positions and the tremendously enhanced importance of government operations as two major factors affecting the course of research in our field. To this we must add the uneasiness, sharpening at times into profound dissatisfaction, which pervades our profession in its more introspective moods. Even those who do not share this dissatisfaction—and there are many—welcome self-criticism as a healthy corrective to undue complacency and also as likely to reveal new and even sounder channels for development.

These considerations and many others led the Executive Council of the Association to charge the Association's Research Committee with the function of reporting on handicaps and aids to research in political science. The Committee has considered this assignment at some length, taking counsel with more than seventy other political and social scientists. The report which is here presented owes whatever merit it may have to the wholehearted coöperation of these many members of the profession

who have given generously of their time and thought. Funds were lacking for systematic exploration. The report throughout must therefore be regarded as a composite statement of opinion, of value if it articulates and crystalizes the thoughts of hundreds of others; still more valuable if it provokes to criticism; most valuable of all if it stimulates to thought and action the colleges and universities, the government, the foundations, and the individuals, whence research must come.¹

The major transition which is taking place in the social order—a transition from atomistic effort to collective, organized, coöperative or administered activity—is reflected in countless aspects of the contemporary culture. Research in the social sciences generally and the microcosm which is research in politics and government in particular are not divorced from or insulated against this trend. The sheer magnitude of many governmental problems is too tough a nut for the isolated researcher to crack. While some dissented, one after another of those consulted by the Committee pleaded for or predicted the day of group or coöperative research. To them, this was the only research that could hope to conduct most of the major inquiries upon the findings of which contemporary statesmanship must base its policies. The anarchy of the lone scholar has had a glorious place in our intellectual history; and still must and will continue. It must continue in part at least as a protest against and a critique of the collectivistic vortex that is sucking into itself so much even of our intellectual life. But there is surely also needed the team play, the combined wisdom of a group, if major problems are to be explored with the thoroughness, the detachment, and the extensive coverage which they need. Yet nowhere is there systematic graduate training for such group research; and there are few evidences of the willingness of the individual scholar to subordinate his own private projects to a wider and more significant coöperative endeavor.

Perhaps half the members of the Association and more than half of its really creative and productive minds have participated in some aspect of the war effort. Most of them have participated as social scientists, and

¹ This report deals with the problems of research. Not only its content but its emphasis is upon facilitating a better research product. For this it offers no apologies. However, it is well at the outset to state explicitly that the Committee thereby intends no reflection upon those members of the Association whose gifts and whose interests lie more in the fields of teaching, administration, or civic activity. We do not regard it as either necessary, appropriate, or even possible to pass judgment on the relative social values of these various outlets for employing the abilities of our colleagues. Quite the contrary, we condemn the tendency in certain institutions to make its faculty conform to a single pattern in emphasis—whether that emphasis be upon research, teaching, administration, or civic activity. Each member of a faculty should, so far as practical considerations allow, feel the maximum freedom to develop his own peculiar genius.

have seen what team effort at its best can or could do. Many, perhaps most of them, have caught a glimpse of the modern government in action; and in their exchange of the cloister for the maelstrom of administration or warfare have seen also how precious a quality is added to research when it is both significant and responsible. Some have gone further, and see a rôle ahead for the political scientist which has done with little things; which senses the fact that a project does not have to be useless, futile, or insignificant in order to be scholarly. The point which the Committee wishes to underscore is that these experiences have stretched the minds of all of us and make imagination, disciplined imagination, far more widespread among our number than ever before. It is in this atmosphere that our graduate schools should rethink their programs in political science. The world of government and the world of scholarship should effect a liaison. To this end, the Research Committee is making herewith a series of recommendations to those institutions and those persons in a position to exercise effective leadership.

II. Scope of the Report

This present report does not concern itself with the subject-matter, the particular inquiries that need to be made, the areas of political behavior which ought to be explored. For this task, as difficult and as far-reaching as it is vital, the Committee has added to existing facilities a series of panels in various broad subject fields—comparative government, political theory, communications, public law, state and local government, representative government and the legislative process. These panels are commanding the interest and support of many of the keenest intellects in the profession in the evolving of their reports. These reports, it is hoped, will serve as terms of reference for many years to come to large numbers of scholars. Nor is the Research Committee alone in its efforts. The study outlines and other projects of the Social Science Research Council are invaluable in marking out particular topics to be explored. Its Committees on Government and on Public Administration have made their contribution to the statesmanship and strategy of research by presenting reports on the fields most worthy of inquiry.

This report does not deal with fields of research, but attempts rather an audit of the institutional and cultural setting within which political scientists function. What are the handicaps to research—handicaps financial, social, psychological, ethical? What are the handicaps in the lack of tools? What aids are within the realm of possibility? What are the underdeveloped types of research, its limitations, its false starts, its dangers? Who should do what? To answer such questions as they deserve answering is beyond the possibilities of your Committee unless in the effort the fine coöperation thus far extended by so many political scientists is followed

by scores of others willing to comment upon and criticize and try out the suggestions that follow.

Two other major aspects of the problem of research in political science have been largely excluded from this report. These are the criteria for research standards and the rendering of research findings accessible and understandable. Their virtual omission is accounted for, not by any lack of awareness of their importance, but rather by the fact that this report is in answer to a specific mandate from the Executive Council of the Association, a mandate which did not include these aspects of the over-all problem. Some day, as time and ability permit, the Committee may well turn its attention to them.

III. Types of Research

Your Committee gave some attention to the question of a definition of research, but reluctantly concluded that the individuality and subjectivity of the profession made the formulation of such a definition of doubtful value. Members have been inclined to exercise their scholarly prerogatives and use the term for a wide variety of inquiries and explanations and for the results thereof. The Committee has no desire to apply a strait-jacket. With the full knowledge that the somewhat loose use of the term will reflect itself in the nature of its report, it prefers to take the risk, rather than to appear to place outside the pale some useful intellectual activity which any respectable group of members may regard as research.

The definitions in Webster's and the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences are relevant:

Webster: "Studious inquiry or examination; specifically and usually critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation having as its aim the discovery of new facts and their correct interpretation, the revision of accepted conclusions, theories or laws, in the light of newly discovered facts, or the practical application of such new or revised conclusions, etc.; also a particular investigation of such a character or a book, article or the like presenting the investigation discoveries."

Encyclopedia "Research is the manipulation of things, concepts or symbols for the purpose of generalizing to extend, correct or verify knowledge."

The Committee does, however, believe that there is value in noting the various main types of activity to which the term "research" has usually been applied. Roughly these break down somewhat as follows:²

1. A considerable amount of research is done in American colleges and, we suspect, in universities too, of which the primary purpose is the stimu-

² The analysis in Section III is largely the work of Carl B. Swisher.

lation and invigoration of the mind of the teacher rather than publication. Teachers of foreign languages go to foreign countries to establish more vital contact with their subject-matter. Geologists make field trips for the same purpose. Economists make tours of industrial establishments. Political scientists survey government in all its variety to enable them to rise above the level of repetitive textbook performance.

2. Closely allied to the first kind of research is that which leads to the publication of sporadic articles on isolated subjects in which the researcher happens to develop an interest. This type has not merely the value of stimulating the thinking and teaching of the individual concerned, but also that of adding to the information of those readers who may happen to find the subject one of interest. Such research does not call for an integrated program of research on the part of the investigator or for the coöperation of other investigators in the field.

3. Research of a very different character is that which consists predominantly of the synthesis of factual findings and their interpretation in terms of ideas. It finds explanations which lie as a rule in the interstices of factual materials already available or not too hard to find, materials which have not previously been organized in such a way as to reveal their significance. To make the point in somewhat different language, this type of activity is not research in the sense of the discovery of factual information not previously brought to light, but in the sense of discovering within available factual materials the meanings which ought to provide guides to thought about government and to governmental activity.

4. Another type of research is that which is involved in keeping up with current events in fields wherein the basic historical information has already been collected. Examples are the annual reports of developments in federal and state constitutional law, annual reports on the activities of Congress, periodic studies of changes in governmental information, and so on. The ease or difficulty with which such work can be done and the amount of time and the variety of skills required vary with the dimensions and character of the projects.

5. A type of research growing increasingly important is that involved in the accumulation of tremendous masses of factual material usually to discover whether or to what extent or in what way government intervention is called for in a particular field, or to measure the effects of government operation. In this category are cost-of-living studies such as those sponsored by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor, studies of civil liberties in industry such as that carried on over a number of years by the LaFollette Committee, studies of race problems such as that which recently came to fruition in a two-volume work by Gunnar Myrdal, and so on. Such projects are beyond the scope of the powers of any single individual. They call for the combined efforts of considerable

numbers of skilled investigators. They call for the use of specialists in many fields and for the careful integration of the fruits of the efforts of specialists.

6. Closely related to this, in that it is frequently based upon it, is research designed to achieve some public purpose. Such research is customarily stimulated by a growing awareness of some serious problem which may call for change in governmental policy. This type is discussed more at length elsewhere in the report.

7. Finally, we have research which is carried on primarily for the purpose of educating the younger scholar in the methods of research. Such is the purpose of most graduate theses, even though the work is done under the polite assumption that the major goal is that of making a "contribution to knowledge."

The reappraisal of research in political science as carried on by members of the profession ought to be made in terms of these several purposes. Research for one purpose ought not necessarily to be measured by the same standards as those applicable to research for another purpose. We regard all the purposes listed as not merely legitimate but important. The discontinuance of action along any of the lines mentioned would be tragic for the profession. As to the first type mentioned, the Committee on Research can do little more than to suggest hearty approval by way of encouragement. Not much advice can be given beyond the insistence that teaching in political science would operate on a much higher level if all teachers engaged in continuous research of some kind in order to keep in touch with the vital processes of government.

As to the second type of research, the Committee can do little more than offer a gesture of approval in the same fashion. It calls attention, however, to research outlines which are appearing or have appeared in a number of fields and to suggestions of the panels of the Research Committee on the subject of investigations which ought to be made, investigations which are of such dimension as to be within the scope of the activities of individual investigators. It is believed that no loss of spontaneity need be suffered through the survey of potential topics of research which have been suggested by other men. We would say nothing by way of an attempt to discredit the faith in "divine flashes of inspiration" by which some political scientists claim to be guided to their several subjects of research, but we do recommend that members of the profession give aid to divinity by putting themselves in contact with fruitful topics.

The third type of research—that of organization and synthesis to bring out significant meanings hitherto hidden or unnoticed—has value at least equal to that of any other kind. It calls for wisdom and imagination which cannot be brought into being in any short period by any recommendation which this or any other committee might make. Without men in the pro-

fession possessing these qualities, research of this kind will be done poorly or not at all. It can be facilitated by suggestions made elsewhere in this report, namely, by giving greater opportunity in the form of release from teaching obligations, in the form of fellowships providing opportunities for reflective study, and in providing association with other men who have the capacity to stimulate thought. Beyond these moderately specific aids we think it important that we state the ideal of developing not merely skill in the quasi-mechanical techniques of research and informational backgrounds, but also that we give thought to the development and encouragement of capacity for significant generalization about the store of factual material which, by means of one device or another, is being made available. It is preëminently intellectual activity of this type which best measures up to the definition of research cited from our Encyclopedia.

Keeping up to date with developments in varied fields calls for techniques and abilities as varied as the fields themselves. It calls for watchfulness and imagination, to the end that reporting will not necessarily continue in terms of old categories which may grow obsolete or at any rate become inadequate to the explanation of new phenomena in the respective fields. New techniques, whether they be statistical, biographical, psychological, or other kinds, ought constantly to be tried out in the effort to portray continuations in fields in which political scientists deem themselves to be masters.

More impressive because of the recency of its development and because of its need in connection with the current operations of government is research which is carried on by huge organizations on a dimensional scale completely out of line with research in political science as we have known it in times past. It involves work which can be done only by means of the collaboration of large numbers of persons who bring together varied skills and techniques. Without large-scale research, large-scale government as we know it today cannot hope to operate in terms of prompt and adequate knowledge of the results of its operations. Because recognition of this type of research is relatively new to the field of political science, it has not received the attention from the rank and file of our membership which research of other types has received. We need to develop a keener awareness of the importance of organized fact-finding to the intelligent operation of government in a complex economy such as ours. Important as it is, however, it is not pretended that organized research can take the place of research of other kinds. Groups of men can collect facts in the mass, but the significant ideas spring more frequently from the mind of an individual playing upon the results. Especially where such coöperative research involves not only fact-gathering but the analysis of the individual problems which go to make up the greater whole, the end product requires that there be in the group some one man with rare gifts of synthesis, whose contribu-

tion consists in integrating the findings of others into a unified whole. Inspiration as well as information can come from the inter-stimulation within such group. While men cannot think intelligently without the information on which sound thought must be based, furthermore they cannot collect information intelligently without careful thought as to the collection which needs to be made. Group research has value in proportion to the amount of careful thought which goes into its planning and which thereafter draws meaning from the factual materials accumulated.

In the light of the variety of purposes of research, that research which is carried on predominantly for the education of new members of the profession must be similarly varied in character. A project in terms of which the student learns to accumulate information by his isolated efforts may not be greatly helpful to him if he seeks to participate in group research. Conversely, participation as a cog in the wheel of a huge research machine may not develop in him any of the capacity for finding significant but hidden meanings within the mass of the phenomena considered. Research predominantly in terms of ideas and abstract concepts may be of little help in developing capacity to accumulate significant factual information, whether in the students' individual capacity or as a member of a research team. Every director of research, therefore, who claims to be a teacher of research as well as a participant in the process itself must give thought to the ends which he hopes to achieve through the training process. The student likewise ought to be made aware of the fact that there is no single route which leads to general competence in research in the field of political science. We believe that graduate departments of political science would improve their methods of teaching and promote the welfare of their students if they would examine critically the ends and aims which they hope to achieve and plan their programs accordingly.

IV. The Rôle of the College and University

The responsibility for conducting research is shared by government and by foundations, but the preponderant rôle for training researchers belongs to the universities and colleges. Differences of opinion exist as to how far short of adequacy the institutions of higher learning fall in performing this rôle; but that they do fall short is well nigh unanimously agreed among those consulted by the Committee. Good, yes, brilliant men lost to the profession altogether; apparently brilliant men entering the profession and becoming sterile, or, what is worse, superficial; research divorced alike from reality and need; researchers that cannot work in a team; research that limps to doubtful or even innocuous conclusions for lack of methodological equipment adequate to the task; researchers that do not recognize the irrelevant—these criticisms and others like them point to a state of affairs in the training of our scholars that should remove any

shred of complacency that may still lurk in our graduate schools. Probably 95 per cent of even moderately significant research turned out by members of our profession in the colleges and universities comes from 20 per cent or less of our number. Inasmuch as by the quality and quantity of the findings in our field, the opportunities for statesmanship in the future will largely be determined, we must take full account of this criticism and strive to remedy the conditions that evoke it.

Before turning to the training given in the graduate schools, a word is in order as to the rôle of the undergraduate college. We in political science have or should have a subject-matter which is potentially the most exciting of any in the curriculum. We are not suggesting that we engage in an undignified—or even a dignified—tug of war with our sister disciplines for the promising student. Nor are we suggesting a preoccupation with ever more departmental hours and courses even for our own majors. In fact, it is probable that the more we encourage our students to equip themselves with the concepts and principles of economics, geography, psychology, sociology, and the more we suggest the deep wisdom and insight that comes from the historical approach and the more we challenge the student to use these concepts, principles, wisdom, and insight in our ordinary undergraduate upper-class courses, the greater our chance of stimulating those potentially brilliant students who come our way to stay with our subject and eventually to join the ranks of the creative scholars therein.

Then, too, the experience of any number of colleges has demonstrated that the undergraduate can have the joy of the discovery of an idea or of fresh data—a satisfying experience and a joy which may well motivate his subsequent career. Research courses; thesis seminars; even the term paper for which ample time is allowed; special emphasis upon criteria for evaluating good work; laboratories—all are devices tried, and successfully tried, at the undergraduate level. Prizes and other forms of recognition are surely relevant as motivating factors. We recommend them.

The Committee is frank to admit that the factors motivating undergraduates to follow a research career are far from fully known. Therefore we recommend further inquiry, adequately financed, to ascertain from which colleges the most and the most successful graduate students come, and further inquiry to discover, if possible, what factors—curricular, financial, personal, and otherwise—seem to have accounted for such success. The publication of the results would in and of itself be well deserved recognition of the contribution of these institutions and of the particular professors therein who planted the seed corn. It is our opinion that the results would not stop at this point, but that with intelligence would come emulation.

Upon the graduate schools, their standards, their curricula, and their opportunities rests the major responsibility. Let us make clear at the out-

set that we do not advocate uniformity in graduate curricula. Quite the opposite; for we feel that so little is really known as to the ways and means of training for research in the new world that almost any experiment that is loyal to the basic values of all science is to be encouraged. However, there is a core—in methodology, perhaps more than in content—which seems to us to be vital. We have already mentioned literacy in the basic concepts of the other social sciences as vital to undergraduate instruction. We underscore this at the graduate level. Interdisciplinary coöperation is imperative in research into many, if not most, of the important contemporary problems. For example, it is difficult to mention any really important problem in government toward the understanding of which a knowledge of economics is not vital. Conciseness and clarity in expression are evidences of mastery; and the art can be acquired or even taught. The major approaches to the data of politics, such as the philosophic, quantitative, historical, cultural, psychological, descriptive, legal, of course must be mastered—not by rote, but instrumentally. Rigid criticism of a student's work for relevancy should be taken for granted; unfortunately, it cannot be. Some schools are not really equipped to give a Ph.D. They should consider seriously whether to strengthen their work or withdraw from the field.

The opportunities for experiment are many. We regard as particularly hopeful the extension of laboratory techniques into ordinary graduate seminars whereby the student is brought into contact with government in the raw. Let him criticize a budget, draft a charter, codify laws, conduct an opinion survey or a controlled experiment in changing opinion, discover the history—the real history—of how a controversial bill became a law. Where feasible, let the graduate student serve an internship as an administrator or in a legislator's office and recognize the experience—where intelligently interpreted—as coin of the academic realm.

Among the most ready channels for experiment is training in the participation in and conduct of group research. We invite at least some of our graduate schools most earnestly to consider the introduction of such systematic training. Governmental research is mostly group research. Group research is also the hope of significant contributions on the part of hundreds of members of the small college faculty and in many universities. Moreover, many, if not most, of the major problems of government today are too extensive for the single individual to complete his research on them in time to be of practical use, not to mention the probability that the data themselves are so fluid as to be long out of date if the researcher is unaided. By out of date we mean not merely that situations will have changed, but that changes in one sector of the problem explored in the early stages of the inquiry will in all probability invalidate the findings in those sectors subsequently explored. Yet nowhere, so far as your Committee is aware,

is systematic, effective training given in the methods and attitudes which group research demands.

We close this discussion of graduate training with a word of warning. It is original, creative researchers that we most need. It has been suggested that such researchers are not likely to come from graduate schools where the students or younger faculty members are dominated or even domineered over by a particular senior faculty member's own prejudice or even approaches. Nor will they normally come from situations in which the graduate student is unduly exploited as a teacher to aid in balancing the budget, or exploited as a kind of research assistant to a professor who wants a particular job done for his own purposes and who is willing to award a Ph.D. as the bait for intellectually servile coöperation. These cases are not rare, if we are to judge by the experience of the younger men with whom the Committee took counsel.

Here again we suffer from want of a systematic study of the end product—our Ph.D.'s. How many Ph.D.'s produce their second book or an output of significant articles? From what institutions do they come? What elements in their selection, training, or placement were favorable or unfavorable factors in such continuation of scholarly effort? Were many of the candidates in certain of the schools quite unsuitable for work at the graduate level, and did these depress the level of work at these schools? Is there a vicious circle whereby certain institutions find their graduates favored in placements, in so far as a favored placement involves greater research opportunities? Does this overweight the reputation for success of the institutions in question? We recommend as scientific and as thorough a study of these questions as the data will permit.

V. Post-Doctoral Research

The absence of worth-while research from so many who, one might suppose, would be mature and fruitful scholars has been commented upon again and again. Why the blight which overtakes so many at the time at which one expects so much? Why do so many who produce even worth-while things so seldom produce them? Why is such an amazing amount, perhaps even a preponderance, of the best research the product of a relatively few institutions? If this criticism be deemed too severe, your Committee can only plead that it is performing the reporting function, for these views represent the views of the great majority of those consulted. True, there was dissent, thoughtful dissent, among a minority from such a pessimistic view. We are glad to record it.

The Committee at this stage must largely confine itself to hypotheses as to the reasons for the conditions lying back of the pessimism—hypotheses that obtain very wide acceptance, but which are unverified none the less. Such is the commonly held belief that a heavy teaching load is the princi-

pal handicap. It appears to be self-evident that research opportunities are far more limited for a man with a fifteen-hour load than for one whose load is nine hours only; for one with four or five different courses than for one with two or three. The extreme diversification of courses is particularly prevalent in the smaller institutions. Yet where the load is fifteen hours, there still remain the long summer period and the sabbatical leave, unless the heavy load is also accompanied by inadequate salaries which make teaching in summer or during the sabbatical virtually a necessity. It is easy for the Committee to recommend reduced teaching loads and higher salaries, but it is less easy to suggest to the administrator who bears the financial responsibility for the institution the ways and means for the financing of the same. Without advocating a counsel of perfection, we do call attention to the possibilities of educational devices, such as the "four course plan" and the "reading period," which have as their valuable by-product a measurable release of faculty time without any increase in expense. Even in those institutions unable to afford a sabbatical year, a little ingenuity will allow some course reduction occasionally to a limited number of faculty members who submit definite research projects. We urge our membership on the various campuses to support or initiate the formation of faculty committees to work on the problem herein suggested.

There are, of course, other handicaps to research quite apart from the heavy teaching load and the inadequate salary. In some individual cases the financing of research may be a serious obstacle, particularly at institutions which cannot provide funds for social science research. In this connection, however, it is important to note that the grant-in-aid program of the Social Science Research Council is specifically designed to aid mature scholars at such institutions in the completion of research projects. It is pertinent to note here also that the Social Science Research Council's post-doctoral training fellowships have as their primary purpose the broadening of the research training and equipment of promising young social scientists, not the facilitation of the completion of research projects or the continuation of investigations undertaken as doctoral dissertations. In general, the evaluation of the financial handicap to research is difficult; there is reason to believe, however, that a scarcity of funds is not a prime cause for the scarcity of significant research.

With respect to publication, there is a difficulty faced by the scholars who write *in extenso* in a non-popular manner or on a subject not lending itself to textbook treatment. Certainly this must be a marked factor in the relative absence of systematic, scholarly post-doctoral monographs among the profession. We doubt very much if more than 10 per cent of the profession ever achieve a book apart from their doctoral dissertation—other than a textbook, which, however excellent, seldom involves major research.

On the other hand, there is every reasonable expectation that the more

modest single article will find publication in one or another of the scholarly journals, if it is really worth while.³ This is one of the really bright spots on the research horizon. Yet, taken by itself, it contains a real danger that the scholar will be tempted to regard several, perhaps unrelated, articles as an acceptable substitute for the sustained, thorough exploration of a major area or problem in our field. This probably accounts for the relative absence of scholarly institutional histories—apart from constitutional law and the presidency—in our literature.

We therefore recommend that there be a fund for subsidizing the publication as well as the research thereon of monographs in political science. This fund should be administered either by the Social Science Research Council, if it is part of resources available for social sciences generally, or by the American Political Science Association, if it is available for our field alone.

Recognition is also coin of the realm in academic circles, whether or not it is associated with academic promotion. We therefore recommend that citations or even prizes be given annually for outstanding books or articles of research. Such awards could well be administered by a committee of the American Political Science Association after the model of the Winsor Prize of the American Historical Association. Such recognition we believe would be followed not infrequently by academic promotion as a by-product thereof.

The Committee found a widespread belief that the stimulation of associates played a major rôle in motivating research. In and of itself, it probably is a not inconsiderable factor in what is apparently a higher per capita output among the departments in the larger universities than among the small colleges. In certain even of these larger institutions, the senior men seem to discourage the younger men from research, partly because they, themselves, are not researchers. These statements obviously need further investigation before evaluation or even before acceptance. However, by way of illustration, more than one person called attention on the positive side to the remarkable success of the graduate school of the Brookings Institution in this regard during its relatively short existence. The Committee has gone a step farther and recommends that steps be taken experimentally on a regional basis to provide such stimulation, especially for the faculties of the small colleges. If this report is accepted, the Committee plans to invite the coöperation of one or more of the outstanding university faculties in carefully chosen areas in undertaking such an experiment in coöperation with near-by colleges.

Nor is such an experiment by any means the only avenue for stimula-

³ A possible exception is the apparent lack of a market for the valuable "interior report," a characteristic technique among natural scientists in order to obtain the criticism of their colleagues.

tion. We recommend that all colleges and universities pay at least the travel fare of a faculty member to the annual meetings of the national and regional professional associations. Thereby the faculty member, however isolated, can for a few days at least be brought into personal relationships with many of the members of the profession who are doing its creative research and thinking. Akin to this is service for a period in some branch of government, and we recommend in this connection the establishment of internships at the faculty level after the National Institute of Public Affairs model. Here the stimulation may come, not so much from fellow scholars, as from the impact of mind on mind—the mind of the skilled practitioner upon that of the mature scholar.

The heresy-hunters of the twentieth century are, not in the field of religion, but in the vast area of public affairs. We believe that timidity characterizes many of our colleagues, and that much of that timidity is unfortunately grounded in experience. We recommend, therefore, full support to the American Association of University Professors in their tireless campaign to promote the combination of tenure and freedom. Even more we recommend that those of our number in a position to do so make it their business to further the advancement, academic or otherwise, of the many political scientists who possess in full measure a moral courage which shies at no subject, however controversial, if it is also important, and who also never compromise their scholarly standards to become mere agitators.

So many of our colleagues have stressed ethical factors as stimulating research that we make no apology for stressing them also. Surely a sense of obligation to one's community, nation, or to humanity in general need not taint the ideal of pure science which we all strive after. It can and does affect the choice of subject; it can and does sustain the flagging will; it can and does lend a flair to the presentation of material—all this without any distortion or any faithlessness to the ideal of truth.

Your Committee has not yet considered in any systematic fashion the need for further aids to research over and above the ones already mentioned. Suggestions have been made that guides to the research facilities in Washington and perhaps other centers are needed. The gap left by the suspension of the Social Science Abstracts has never been filled. The bibliographical aids furnished by the REVIEW are invaluable, but your Committee would like to hear suggestions for increasing their usefulness and perhaps adding to them. Inter-library loan, microfilm, photostats, are potential rescue squads to the scholar otherwise condemned to inadequate library facilities, but we doubt if many are aware of them. Yet even with these aids, there is great need for building up the ordinary library in more institutions.

The state university has certain problems and possibilities all its own. We recommend that funds be made available for a study of the pattern of

research in political science in these universities. We should like to know more about the reasons why some of them provide liberal funds and facilities for faculty research. Does back of such provision lie a history of usefulness to the state government, a keeping off of controversial subjects, an enlightened electorate, or all three? We should also like to know why some state universities make no financial provision for such research. Were the state legislatures ever approached? Have faculty members been "indiscreet" or "stuffed shirts" or merely inert and timid? In increasing measure, our higher education is becoming public education. The state university carries far more of the future of research in its hand than many care to admit. We should know our problem and plan accordingly.

VI. The Rôle of Government

Government is a formidable albeit a friendly rival to the university in the research field. Its resources are so enormous, the avenues of information that are open to its staff are so far reaching, that one cannot but realize that its destiny is to play an ever larger rôle.

How far the American Political Science Association can influence or strengthen this government research program—at all levels, municipal, state, and national—is still uncertain. The Association's Committee on War Time Services has already done an admirable piece of analysis in this regard;⁴ and repetition of this analysis is scarcely justified. We do, however, strongly urge certain matters upon those in a position to influence the course of events.

We are convinced that much isolated research effort would be socially far more useful if it were part of a nation-wide group research program, led presumably by an interested arm of the federal government. Such an approach could give a most excellent picture, for example, of the workings of rationing boards or of programs of federal subsidy or of local attitudes toward the Fair Employment Practices Committee. Similar leadership ought to be forthcoming from organizations such as the Council of State Governments; and, if forthcoming, ought to be accepted by college and university departments of political science. Financial recognition for such assistance might be added, but this is distinctly a secondary consideration.

We recommend, subject to obvious exceptions, that all federal and other governmental agencies adopt the practice of many of them in allowing, or even in insisting that, published research bear the name or names of the members of the staff responsible for them. We support the program of most governmental agencies whereby results of research are published.

We recognize the limitations of government research, its insistence on deadlines, the existence of forbidden areas. It suffers likewise from fre-

⁴ See this REVIEW, Oct., 1942, pp. 931-945.

quent change in personnel and from excessive emphasis on clearances. Yet with all its limitations it has the supreme advantage of being responsible in the sense that it is designed to be translated into action. Glib generalizations, shallow reasoning, carry with them their own nemesis. When to this fact is added its enormous potential resources, it is small wonder that government-sponsored research commands the services, and after the war will continue to command them, of a not inconsiderable fraction of our keenest political analysts.

VII. The Rôle of the American Political Science Association

Suggestions whereby the American Political Science Association might aid its membership in their researches have been numerous. Many have already been mentioned.

Roughly, these suggestions fall under four headings: recognition, support, facilities, leadership. Under recognition, we have already suggested the merit of judiciously chosen awards and citations, and these need not be repeated here. We have also urged that the Association lend its weight to financing research where feasible, through foundations or otherwise, and that it should tirelessly urge such support upon colleges and universities and government. The efforts of the REVIEW to facilitate research are greatly appreciated. We make two suggestions at this point. One is that the list of doctoral dissertations be expanded to include notice of research projects undertaken by members of the Association who have completed their doctorate. An annual request for such topics, issued at the time of one of the fairly numerous circularizations of members would, we believe, bring results. Such a list not only would earmark fields but would create bonds of interest and mutual support among those working on related subjects. The second recommendation is that a certain quality of ruthlessness should find its way into the book reviews. We are too much a "protected" profession in this regard and lack the stimulus to high qualitative output which such reviewing would create.

Your Committee has not thought it advisable to include recommendations concerning the Social Science Research Council within its orbit, inasmuch as the Association has so recently sponsored a special committee on this subject. We do, however, most respectfully, but also most strongly, call the attention of the Social Science Research Council and its Committee on Government, and perhaps the foundations as well, to the numerous recommendations scattered through this report for investigation which almost necessarily will require funds to finance.

Finally, we have suggested that our Association furnish leadership in stimulating and guiding the research of its members. For this responsibility the Committee which submits this report must first of all itself be held accountable. But we have never and can never give this leadership in and

of ourselves. We have sponsored and are sponsoring panels in most of the major fields of interest in political science—panels designed to evolve a strategy for stimulating and guiding research in each of these fields for many years to come. But these panels have not succeeded and cannot succeed without the magnificent support which the membership as a whole has extended to them. Your Committee has also brought in a report on "Priorities in Research in War-Time," but the report was really the joint production of two score political scientists and not of the Committee alone. So also this report. It too represents, even in this its early provisional stage, the pooled wisdom of many times as many of the Association's membership as are on the Committee. In other words, leadership in the Association must come from all those with the will to give it, and who possess the thoughtfulness which makes respected the views they propound.

WILLIAM ANDERSON	CARL B. SWISHER
HARWOOD CHILDS	FRANCIS G. WILSON
KARL LOEWENSTEIN	ROLAND YOUNG
JOSEPH E. MCLEAN	JOHN SLY
ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, <i>Chairman</i>	

SUMMARY OF THIRTY-THREE PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Recommendations for Action

A. *Undergraduate Colleges—re Students*

1. See that political science majors equip themselves with the concepts and principles of the related social sciences.
2. Include in the curriculum projects designed to give the student the exciting experience of discovery of fresh data or a new idea.
3. Offer prizes or other recognition for undergraduate research.

B. *Graduate Schools—re Students*

1. Reëxamine the ends and aims sought for, and plan programs accordingly.
2. Make certain that the graduate student is or becomes literate in the fields of the other social sciences.
3. Insist upon relevancy, clarity, and conciseness in the student's seminar work.
4. Include in all student programs an instrumental knowledge of the major approaches to the analysis of the data of politics.
5. Experiment in training for group or coöperative research.
6. Avoid all forms of exploitation or domination of the graduate student, in matters such as point of view, choice of thesis subject, excessive teaching load.

C. *Colleges and Universities—re Faculty*

1. See that the teaching load is such as to permit research, es-

pecially in instances in which a faculty member submits proposals for a definite research program or project.

2. Institute faculty research committees charged, among other matters, with facilitating research opportunities.
 3. Pay the travel fare of faculty members to the annual meetings of the national and regional professional associations.
 4. Give priority in appointments and promotions to those exhibiting moral courage in the selection of research subjects and in the publication of the results thereof.
- D. *Mature Scholars*
1. Be influenced as to the subjects selected for research by the findings of research panels and committees.
 2. Reexamine old categories, and utilize concepts from the other social sciences.
 3. Cultivate a sense of obligation to the public interest in the selection of subjects for research.
 4. Be alert for opportunities to discover significant generalizations.
 5. Give full support to the American Association of University Professors in their efforts to promote the combination of secure tenure and academic freedom.
- E. *The American Political Science Association* (and/or the Social Science Research Council)
1. Secure funds for subsidizing the publication of scholarly monographs.
 2. Sponsor awards or citations for outstanding books or articles.
 3. Institute experiments (in collaboration with one or more of the outstanding universities) in facilitating professional contacts for the faculties of the smaller colleges in the area.
 4. Sponsor experiments (in collaboration with the National Institute of Public Affairs and/or the Civil Service Commission) in establishment of internships in government for members of college and university faculties.
 5. Include in the REVIEW advance notice of significant research projects other than doctoral dissertations. Where feasible, secure the publication either in the REVIEW, in mimeographed form, or otherwise, of interim reports on these research projects.
 6. Make the tone of book reviews in the REVIEW more constructively critical and less indiscriminately laudatory.
 7. Continue the research panels sponsored by the Association's Research Committee.
- F. *Government* (including the Council of State Governments)
1. Exercise leadership in enlisting the cooperation of political scientists in nation-wide group research projects.

2. Extend the practice of allowing its published research to bear the name of the author.
3. Extend the practice of publishing the findings of research.

II. Recommendations as to Questions for Further Investigation

1. From which colleges do the most, and the most successful, graduate students in political science come? What factors are involved?
2. From which graduate schools do those scholars come who produce a major study or a series of fruitful articles subsequent to obtaining their Ph.D.? What factors are involved?
3. As regards research in state universities, what factors lead to adequate or inadequate provision therefor in state appropriations and university policies?
4. What are the actual conditions as to teaching load and salaries in the colleges and universities, and how do these affect research?
5. What significant research projects fail of initiation or completion on account of non-assurance of publication? What completed research projects have failed to find a publisher?