

The Profession

tioned as a Congressional Research Service when the Bundestag was in session.

I also confronted the statute of limitations problem. I knew there were restrictions on the access to federal documents and was prepared to find substitute sources, and so was not surprised when the Federal Archives said they regretted they could not help me. I was rather baffled when I received the same response from the Protestant Church, however. They took their status as a "state" church rather seriously, it appeared, and their negative response made it easy to conclude that they had reasons for concealing information. They did say that if I made formal application and could wait for 2-3 months, they had a committee which processed requests, but they gave no assurances that I would be successful.

Rule 6: Getting access to information may be harder to obtain than you thought. If you can't get it at all, be inventive about alternative sources (interviews, biographies, newspaper accounts, histories, etc.).

Of course, one reason to do research abroad at all is to examine the contents of various libraries. I have been in reputable libraries in Europe where the books are catalogued according to date of acquisition, or shelved according to size, or placed on the shelves so the numbers run from bottom to top and right to left, or where the concept of open stacks is regarded as so avant-garde that it can't possibly be introduced for another 20 years. The university library where I was had a computerized system, but it was organized so that you brought in the slip with your book request, the library took several days to a week to see if they had it, and then you could go and pick it up if they did indeed find it. This was so enervating for the researchers in the institute I was attached to that they had hired a number of undergraduate slaves whose main occupation was to run back and forth to the library.

Rule 7: Few people who read your work will have any idea of what kind of libraries you were using.

There is perhaps no great lesson which can be drawn from such experiences. The difficulties of any given research project are naturally rather specific—but when you get back home and see your fellow graduate students, you may find yourself wondering why you didn't choose to do a library dissertation at home instead. On the other hand, you have no one but yourself to blame for having become interested in doing research elsewhere.

About the Author

John Bendix is assistant professor of political science at Lewis and Clark College. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Indiana, Bloomington, and has a special interest in West European politics.

Notes

1. See G. Spindler, *Being an Anthropologist* (1970); P. Golde, *Women in the Field* (1970); M. Freilich, *Marginal Natives at Work: Anthropologists in the Field* (1977); and R. Georges and M. O. Jones, *People Studying People* (1980). Richard Shweder, "Storytelling Among the Anthropologists," *New York Times Book Review*, Sept. 21, 1986.

Social Scientists and Rural/Agricultural Policy

Don F. Hadwiger

Iowa State University

A community of social scientists has grown up around the study of agriculture and rural affairs. This community is providing an interdisciplinary experience for scholars from economics, sociology, anthropology, home economics, history, philosophy, and political science. Its research agenda includes major subjects in political science, including theories of political community, representation of inter-

ests, political leadership, bureaucratic politics, administration of small communities, LDC development policy, and international trade policy.

Political scientists are now being invited to take a larger role in this interdisciplinary community, in part because it has been increasingly recognized that politics, rather than economics, is triumphant in fields such as agricultural trade and technology development; and it has also become obvious that political leadership is of crucial importance for regional and community development.

Traditionally, agricultural issues were studied by "rural" social scientists within the colleges of agriculture (mainly agricultural economists and rural sociologists) and home economics. These "rural" or "agricultural" social scientists created strong disciplinary subfields which in time made major contributions to theory, to methodology, and to problem-solving. Today social scientists expect to have expanding roles in agricultural and rural development, but they are in turn obliged to look beyond the traditional subfields for an understanding of the dynamic rural environment.

The effort to expand the research community and its research agenda has been nurtured through interdisciplinary conferences, foundation funding, joint publications, new journals, and now by specific efforts to create an omnibus "agricultural agenda." For example, an Agriculture and Humanities project organized by philosopher Richard Haynes at the University of Florida repeatedly brought together social scientists, humanists, and natural scientists on numerous occasions, culminating in the creation of a journal, *Agriculture and Human Values*. Also, the Social Science Agricultural Agenda Project (SSAP), sponsored by major foundations and by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, is currently organizing an interdisciplinary agenda. SSAP and other committees are moving strategically to open new financial support for rural social science.

One result of these initiatives has been to build participation from among "non-traditional" rural scholars particularly in the disciplines of philosophy, political science, history, and geography. These "non-traditional" scholars may find appreciative

audiences for their works, and outlets in authored and edited books, and in scholarly journals, the articles in which are reported in the Social Science Citations Index. Finally, there is the prospect both for small grants for individual research and also for public funding of large grants for group and interdisciplinary research and symposia. Further inquiry may be made to Don Hadwiger, Department of Political Science, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011; phone (515) 294-4144.

The Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation

Bradford Perkins

University of Michigan

The Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation met in Washington on January 7 and 8, 1988. The Committee considered the implementation of President Reagan's so-called "1960 by 1990" order of November 1985, and broader questions about the future of the *Foreign Relations* (FRUS) series and the perennial problems of declassification.

"1960 by 1990"

Last year the Committee expressed concern that President Reagan's directive that all FRUS volumes covering the years down to 1960 be published by 1990 might not be fulfilled; this year it is even more deeply concerned. The schedule established in 1986 to fulfill the President's order called for publication of nine FRUS volumes in 1987. In fact, although nine (including a two-part publication delayed from 1986) were actually published in 1987, five volumes planned for publication did not appear; two of them are still held up at the declassification stage. The shortfall experienced in 1987 is certain to be compounded in 1988, when, according to the schedule laid down in 1986, thirteen volumes are to appear. The President's objective will not be achieved.