

ical Scientists Group and others to a buffet at the Embassy. After feasting on delicacies from sushi to stuffed lobster, the thirty-some guests took seats around a fantastically long table at which the ceremony was reported and Minister Seiichiro Noburo led an amazingly frank, informative, and constructive discussion of current U.S.–Japan relations and political attitudes.

The money was raised through the much greater than expected response to a reunion at Ann Arbor, May 11–12, 1990, organized by Goodman and Totten.

At the reunion, these chubby and greying survivors reminisced about their past. After their service overseas in prisoner of war interrogation or battlefield document translation in Southeast Asia and the Pacific or else in quiet air-conditioned offices in Washington engaged in cryptanalysis, most of the school's graduates did not continue to use the language professionally and lost their ability to read it. But a dedicated minority of the Army school along with a similar minority at the simultaneously developed Navy school at Boulder used their language skills to make America

the foremost source of research on Japan in both the social sciences and the humanities.

Among the political scientists who went through the Michigan program besides Totten, were Rodger Swearingen, also of USC, and Hans Baerwald of UCLA, the late Joseph Sutton who became president of Indiana University, Kurt Steiner of Stanford, Austin Walter of Oregon State at Corvallis, Morton Auerback of Cal State at Northridge, and the late Wesley Fishel of Michigan State; among those who may be known to political scientists from sociology and anthropology are Herbert Passin of Columbia, the late Ed Norbeck of Rice, Paul Bohannon of USC, and John Cornell of Texas, Austin; of those in the State Department are Gaston Sigur, the late Richard Sneider (ambassador to South Korea), Ulrich Straus, Albert Seligman, Bud Klauser, Scott George, and James Hoyt; of those in Asian history, Grant Goodman of Kansas, the late George Lensen of Florida University, Robert Butow of the University of Washington, Arthur Tiedemann, who became president of CCNY, Fred Greene of Williams-

town, Chauncey Goodrich of UC Santa Barbara, Benjamin Hazard of San Jose State; of those in geography, Douglas Eyre of UNC; in Japanese law, Dan Henderson of the University of Washington; in philosophy, Robert Heilbroner, of the New School; and many others in these and other fields, especially in the CIA, where they could not publish openly.

The significance of this in 1991 is that it is fifty years since the surprise attack at Pearl Harbor. These men who learned Japanese in order to defeat Japan in World War II have since that time sought to strengthen U.S.–Japan friendship through deepening understanding of the Japanese and dispelling misunderstandings and distorted stereotypes.

Those who went into political science and had taken part in the “transference” of democracy to Japan in the early postwar years are now calling attention to what we can learn from Japan beyond “management,” and governmental “guidance” of industry, namely, “stability in a democratic context.”

## NSF Task Force Recommends Separate Directorate

**A** National Science Foundation (NSF) Task Force of the Directorate for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences (BBS) has recommended that a separate directorate be formed for the social, economic, and psychological sciences (SEPS). This move has been supported strongly by APSA and by the Consortium of Social Science Associations to which APSA belongs.

“Scientists in the SEPS disciplines need an environment within NSF which fosters the particular styles of research and education they practice and which meets their needs more exactly,” the Task Force concluded in a statement issued in mid-September. Further, the SEPS “need representation at the highest levels of decision-making in the Foundation through an Assistant Director,” the report said. Currently, the SEPS are

represented by biologist Mary E. Clutter and are not equal partners with biological, geological, and physical sciences and engineering.

The Task Force, chaired by biologist Paul Magee of the University of Minnesota, came to the conclusion that arguments against separation—that the SEPS would be too exposed as a separate entity or that interdisciplinary research might be impaired—were “not compelling.”

The report, “Adapting to the Future: Report of the BBS Task Force Looking to the 21st Century,” covered a series of other matters of concern to BBS, including the simultaneous organizational need for and intellectual obstruction caused by disciplinary boundaries. The Task Force made numerous recommendations to encourage inter-disciplinary and cross-directorate research. Also

addressed were ways to improve the infrastructure of the biological and behavioral sciences such as programs to involve primary and secondary teachers in science, establishing young investigator awards, and providing support to undergraduate institutions.

The Task Force made suggestions about how to increase science funding and visibility, and the report singled out social sciences in this regard. “It is particularly important for NSF to raise the visibility of SEPS and promote the need for basic research in these fields,” the Task Force asserted. Societies like APSA and COSSA were urged to “redouble their efforts to educate the public and the Congress about the unique role of NSF.”

In a discussion of priorities of research funding, the Task Force

argued that NSF should “take the long view” in part so that “fields in decline receive support before they are irretrievably damaged.” As an example, the group cited the possible loss over the next 50 years of half of the world’s languages, “priceless embodiments of the diversity of human culture and thought.”

The zero-sum funding environment necessitates priority-setting, according to the report. Starting new programs will require entrepreneurial activity both inside and outside NSF, and old programs will have to be terminated to make room for the new. Also,

large long-term data bases must be “held to strict standards.” Specifically, they must be “dynamic and responsive to changing science in their field,” if they are to warrant continued funding.

Harkening back to the National Research Council’s controversial effort to identify the frontiers of social science in “The Behavioral and Social Sciences: Achievements and Opportunities,” the NSF Task Force concluded its report with a chapter entitled “A Glimpse of Science Future.” The two areas discussed that would be of particular interest

to political scientists were the “exploration of political decision processes” and the “design of new economic organizations.”

Copies of the report are available from: Directorate for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550.

*Editor’s Note: October 11, NSF Director Walter Massey announced that a separate directorate for the social sciences would in fact be established.*