

The Southern Political Science Association has recently published two reports by its Committee on Research. The first, entitled "Research, Public Service, and the Political Scientist in the South," develops in a dozen pages the thesis that the political scientist has an obligation, especially in wartime, ". . . to demonstrate that his training was a profitable investment . . ." and that this demonstration can best be made through active participation, as consultant, adviser, and researcher, in the every-day administration of government at all levels. While the Committee's argument of this thesis may not impress all members of the profession as sound, the report will nevertheless be generally found both provocative and challenging. The second report, "Governmental Problems of the Postwar Period," carries a sub-title which reveals its nature, namely, "Research Suggestions for Southern Political Scientists"; and it performs the service of suggesting twenty-eight research projects which might well engage the attention of political scientists during both the war and the postwar periods. The Committee's comments are aimed particularly at Southern political scientists, although they should prove suggestive to persons interested in research on public problems everywhere. Members of the committee making the two reports are Lawrence L. Durisch, Tennessee Valley Authority; Stuart A. MacCorkle, University of Texas; George A. Shipman, Bureau of the Budget (on leave from Duke University); Raymond Uhl, University of Virginia; and Charles S. Hyne-man, Bureau of the Budget (on leave from Louisiana State University), *chairman*.

Thirty-ninth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. The thirty-ninth annual meeting of the American Political Science Association was held at Washington, D. C., on January 20-23, 1944, with the Hotel Statler as headquarters. This was a joint meeting with the American Economic Association and the American Society for Public Administration. Although held in 1944, it was viewed as the 1943 annual meeting. At the request of the Office of Defense Transportation, the meeting was held in January instead of the Christmas recess, and no effort was made to bring members from all parts of the United States.

The joint program was prepared by Dr. Marshall E. Dimock (chairman of the Washington Committee of the American Political Science Association), Professor A. B. Wolfe (president of the American Economic Association), and Dr. G. Lyle Belsley (representative of the American Society for Public Administration). There were 1,922 registrants, most of them from the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. About one hundred of the members present from the three societies came from more distant parts of the United States. At the thirty-eighth annual meeting, held in Washington, D. C., in 1943, there were 566 registrants.

One unique feature of the meeting was a nation-wide radio broadcast by the National Broadcasting Company at 3:30 P.M. on Saturday, January 22, in which a summary of the proceedings of the annual meeting was given by Messrs. Robert E. Cushman, A. B. Wolfe, Louis Brownlow, and others.

At least one regional meeting of political scientists was held. On January 22, John M. Piffner, president of the Pacific Southwest Academy, presided over a session of political scientists, economists, and public administrators at the University Club in Los Angeles, and listened to the broadcast from Washington. The officers of the Southern Political Science Association were present at the Washington meeting. A breakfast session of this Association was held on January 22. On the same day, Roscoe C. Martin, president of the Southern Political Science Association, presided at the luncheon session of the three societies at which Representative Robert Ramspeck made the principal address.

The Program Committee attempted, in the words of Marshall E. Dimock, to secure an integration of the contributions of economics, political science, and public administration in the field of the significant problems of the postwar era. This undertaking was achieved with conspicuous success. Some of the papers and addresses of the political scientists as well as of the economists will be published in the *Proceedings of the American Economic Association*. Others will appear in this *REVIEW*.

The program as actually carried out was as follows:

Thursday, January 20

PUBLIC MEETING

Chairman: Robert E. Cushman, Cornell University.

J. B. Condliffe, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace—"The Economic Organization of Welfare."

Clarence Berdahl, University of Illinois—"United States Leadership in the Post-War World."

Friday, January 21

THE IMPLEMENTAL ASPECTS OF PUBLIC FINANCE

Chairman: Stacy May, War Production Board.

Roy Blough, United States Treasury Department—"Public Finance, Economics, Politics, and Administration."

Harold Groves, University of Wisconsin—"Needed Changes in the Post-War Federal Tax System."

Discussion: William Anderson, University of Minnesota; Walter S. Salant, Office of Price Administration; Gerhard Colm, Bureau of the Budget; Ralph Flanders, Jones & Laughlin Machine Company, Springfield, Vt.

POLITICAL SCIENCE, POLITICAL ECONOMY, AND VALUES (FIRST SESSION)

Chairman: Leon C. Marshall, Washington, D. C.

Raymond T. Bye, University of Pennsylvania—"Some Criteria of Social Economy."

John M. Gaus, University of Wisconsin—"Common Ground and Common Tasks."

Discussion: J. J. Spengler, Duke University; Horace Taylor, Columbia University.

POLICY FORMATION

Chairman: V. O. Key, Johns Hopkins University.

Harold D. Lasswell, Library of Congress—"The Intelligence Function in Policy Formation."

Ernest S. Griffith, Library of Congress—"Changing Patterns in the Formation of Public Policy."

Discussion: James L. McCamy, Foreign Economic Administration; Harold F. Gosnell, Bureau of the Budget; Stanley K. Hornbeck, Department of State; Lyle Belsley, War Production Board.

LUNCHEON MEETING

Chairman: Joseph S. Davis, Stanford University.

Joseph Eastman, Director, Office of Defense Transportation—"Public Administration of Transportation Under War Conditions."

THE EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION OF ECONOMISTS AND POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

Chairman: Arthur N. Holcombe, Harvard University.

Leaders: John M. Clark, Columbia University; Frank H. Knight, University of Chicago; Robert D. Leigh, Federal Communications Commission; William Anderson, University of Minnesota.

Discussion: Carl Swisher, Johns Hopkins University; Roscoe Martin, University of Alabama; Leon C. Marshall, Washington, D. C.; Lester Chandler.

HUBS AND SPOKES FOR PLANNING: CONGRESS, THE EXECUTIVE, THE INTEREST GROUPS—A STOCK-TAKING PANEL DISCUSSION

Chairman: Arthur Macmahon, Columbia University.

Thomas Blaisdell, War Production Board.

Robert K. Lamb, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

E. J. Coil, National Planning Association.

John F. Fennelly, Committee for Economic Development.

Avery Leiserson, Bureau of the Budget.

Helen Fuller, *New Republic* Washington Bureau.

Congressman Estes Kefauver.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Chairman: Ewan Clague, Social Security Board.

Eveline M. Burns, Washington, D. C.—"Social Insurance in Evolution."

Edwin E. Witte, Chairman, Regional War Labor Board, Detroit—"What We Should Expect from Social Security."

Discussion: J. Douglas Brown, Princeton University; E. W. Bakke, Yale University; Emerson Schmidt, Committee on Economic Development.

DINNER MEETING

Chairman: Amos Taylor, Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Leon Henderson, Research Institute of America—"Changing Contours of Government and Business."

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Chairman: Edwin G. Nourse, Brookings Institution.

A. B. Wolfe, President, American Economic Association—"Economy and Democracy."

Saturday, January 22

BREAKFAST MEETING, SOUTHERN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

BUSINESS MEETING, AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

PROBLEMS OF BUREAUCRACY IN BUSINESS, LABOR, AND GOVERNMENT

Chairman: Pendleton Herring, Harvard University.

Lincoln Gordon, War Production Board.

Herbert Emmerich, Federal Public Housing Authority.

John Corson, Social Security Board.

Wayne Coy, Bureau of the Budget.

Lloyd Reynolds, Johns Hopkins University.

Joseph Juran, Foreign Economic Administration.

Clinton Golden, War Manpower Commission.

Walton Hamilton, Yale University.

POLITICAL SCIENCE, POLITICAL ECONOMY, AND VALUES (SECOND SESSION)

Chairman: B. F. Haley, Department of State.

Arthur Salz, Ohio State University—"The Present Position of Economics."

Herbert von Beckerath, Duke University—"Interrelations Between Moral and Economic Factors in the Post-War World."

Francis G. Wilson, University of Illinois—"Ethics in the Study of Democratic Politics."

Discussion: Frank D. Graham, Princeton University; Wesley C. Mitchell, Columbia University; Frank H. Knight, University of Chicago.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS OF BROADENING UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION
IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Chairman: Luther Gulick, Foreign Economic Administration.

W. E. Mosher, Foreign Economic Administration.

Rupert Emerson, Lend-Lease Administration.

Eugene Staley, Foreign Economic Administration.

Brig. Gen. C. F. Robinson.

Paul H. Appleby, Department of Agriculture.

Walter H. C. Laves, Bureau of the Budget.

Harry D. White, U. S. Treasury Department.

Walter Sharp, College of the City of New York.

Louis Brownlow, Public Administration Clearing House.

Adolf A. Berle, Department of State.

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AFTER THE WAR

Chairman: Luther Evans, Library of Congress.

Arthur Flemming, Civil Service Commission.

Kenneth Warner, Foreign Economic Administration.

Floyd Reeves, University of Chicago.

Lt. Comdr. James M. Mitchell (formerly Civil Service Assembly).

John McDiarmid, Civil Service Commission.

Samuel May, University of California (Berkeley).

THE STRUCTURE OF POST-WAR AMERICAN BUSINESS

Chairman: W. H. S. Stevens, Washington, D. C.

Theodore N. Beckman, Ohio State University—"Large and Small Business After the War."

Theodore O. Yntema, University of Chicago—" 'Full' Employment in a Private Enterprise System."

Julius Hirsch, New York City—"Facts and Fantasies Concerning Full Employment."

Discussion: Edwin G. Nourse, Brookings Institution; Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard University; Chalmers Hamill, Anti-Trust Division, Department of Justice; J. Raymond Walsh, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

LUNCHEON MEETING

Chairman: Roscoe Martin, University of Alabama.

Congressman Robert Ramspeck—"The Responsibility of Bureaucracy to the People."

JUDICIAL CONTROL OF ADMINISTRATION

Chairman: Charles Hyneman, War Department.

Carl McFarland, Secretary, American Bar Association's Conference on Administrative Law—"Limitations Upon Judicial Review Other than those Respecting Questions of Fact."

Charles Collier, George Washington University—"Limitations upon Judicial Review of Issues of Fact."

Kenneth Cole, University of Washington—"Judicial Limitations on Wartime Administrative Authority."

Discussion: F. F. Blachly, Brookings Institution; Avery Leiserson, Bureau of the Budget.

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN WARTIME

Chairman: Harold W. Stoke, University of Wisconsin.

Max Lerner, Williams College—"The Police State and the Myth of Encirclement."

Benjamin F. Wright, Harvard University—"How Much Civil Liberty?"

Victor W. Rotnem, Civil Rights Section, Department of Justice—"The Constitutional Right to Ingress to or Egress from a State."

Discussion: Thomas M. Cooley, II, Department of Justice; James Fesler, War Production Board.

THE IMPLEMENTAL ASPECTS OF PUBLIC FINANCE (SECOND SESSION)

Chairman: Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard University.

Carl Shoup, Columbia University—"The Future Federal Interest Charge in Relation to National Production and Taxable Capacity."

Simeon E. Leland, University of Chicago—"The Management of the Public Debt After the War."

Discussion: A. P. Lerner, New School for Social Research; Simon Kuznets, War Production Board; Dan T. Smith, Harvard University; Lawrence Seltzer, Wayne University.

POST-WAR LABOR PROBLEMS

Chairman: William M. Leiserson, National Mediation Board.

Carroll R. Daugherty, War Labor Board—"Union Policies and Leadership After the War."

George W. Taylor, Chairman, War Labor Board—"Wage Regulation in Post-War America."

Lewis L. Lorwin, Washington, D. C.—"Labor's Post-War International Organization."

Discussion: David Kaplan, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; D. A. McCabe, Princeton University; Ernesto Garzala, Pan-American Union; Robert J. Watt, American Federation of Labor.

BUSINESS MEETING, AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

BUFFET SUPPER, AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

BUSINESS MEETING, AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

Chairman: Frederic A. Ogg, University of Wisconsin.

Robert E. Cushman, President, American Political Science Association—"Civil Liberty After the War."

Louis Brownlow, President, American Society for Public Administration—"Public Administration in the Post-War Period."

Sunday, January 23

INTERNATIONAL POLICING

Chairman: Quincy Wright, University of Chicago.

Leaders: Senator Joseph H. Ball; Arthur O. Lovejoy, Universities Committee on Post-War International Problems.

Discussion: Grayson Kirk, Yale University; Ely Culbertson, New York City; Payson Wild, Harvard University; Theodore P. Wright, Director, Aircraft Resources Control Office.

A FEDERAL SOLUTION FOR EUROPE

Chairman: Arnold J. Zurcher, New York University.

Arnold Brecht, New School for Social Research.

Count R. N. Coudenhove-Kalergi, New York University.

Senator Elbert D. Thomas.

Egon Ranshofen-Wertheimer, American University.

Feliks Gross, Central and Eastern European Planning Board.

TREATY-MAKING

Chairman: Edwin Borchard, Yale University.

Leaders: Senator John A. Danaher; Denna Fleming, Vanderbilt University; Walter F. Dodd, Chicago, Ill.

Discussion: David Levitan; H. M. Clokie, University of Manitoba.

POST-WAR DOMESTIC MONETARY PROBLEMS

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

C. R. Whittlesey, University of Pennsylvania—"Problems of Our Post-War Monetary and Banking System."

Karl R. Bopp, Federal Reserve Bank, Philadelphia—"The War and the Future of Central Banking."

Discussion: John K. Langum, Federal Reserve Bank, Chicago; Lawrence Seltzer, Wayne University.

ECONOMIC THEORY IN RELATION TO THE LONG-RUN POST-WAR SITUATION

Chairman: Albert G. Hart, United States Treasury Department.

Z. C. Dickinson, University of Michigan—"The Problem of Incentive in a Regulated Capitalistic Economy."

Maurice A. Copeland, War Production Board—"How Achieve Full and Stable Employment?"

Discussion: John C. Baker, Harvard University; R. A. Gordon, University of California; John H. G. Pierson, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: C. F. Remer, Office of Strategic Services.

Jacob Viner, University of Chicago—"Economic Relations Between Divergent Economic Systems."

Corwin D. Edwards, Anti-Trust Division, Department of Justice—"International Cartels as Obstacles to the Regulation of International Trade."

Percy W. Bidwell, Council on Foreign Relations—"Problems of United States Commercial Policy After the War."

Discussion: Arthur Uppgren, Federal Reserve Bank, Minneapolis; Eugene Staley, Washington, D. C.

LUNCHEON MEETING

Chairman: Clyde Eagleton, New York University.

Sir Arthur Salter—"From Combined War Agencies to International Administration."

REGIONAL PROBLEMS

Chairman: Kenneth Colegrove, Northwestern University.

W. L. Holland, Institute of Pacific Relations—"The Political Economy of the Pacific."

Dana Munro, Princeton University—"Our Post-War Economic Relations with Latin America."

Discussion: George Wythe, Department of Commerce; Amos Taylor, Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; Harold M. Vinacke, University of Cincinnati; S. R. Chow.

THE POST-WAR LEGAL AND ECONOMIC POSITION OF AMERICAN WOMEN

Chairman: Eveline M. Burns, Washington, D. C.

Viva B. Boothe, Ohio State University—"The Post-War Gainful Employment of Women."

Mrs. Rebekah Greathouse, New Orleans, La.—“The Effect of Constitutional Equality on Working Women.”

Mary Anderson, Director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor—“The Post-War Rôle of American Women.”

Discussion: From the Floor.

POST-WAR REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL FUNCTIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Chairman: Walter H. C. Laves, Bureau of the Budget.

Senator Joseph H. Ball.

Senator Harold Burton.

Senator Carl A. Hatch.

Senator Lister Hill.

Congressman Walter Judd.

Arthur Sweetser, Office of War Information.

Donald C. Stone, Bureau of the Budget.

Philip C. Jessup, Columbia University.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY PROBLEMS

Chairman: E. A. Goldenweiser, Federal Reserve Board.

John H. Williams, Harvard University—“International Monetary Plans.”

Howard Ellis, University of California—“Can National and International Monetary Policies Be Reconciled?”

Discussion: Redvers Opie, British Embassy; J. W. Angell, Columbia University; Frank D. Graham, Princeton University.

SYMPOSIUM BY PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

Chairman: James W. Bell, Northwestern University.

Topic: “What Should Be the Relative Spheres of Private Business and Government in Our Post-War American Economy?”

The Executive Council of the American Political Science Association met in morning and afternoon sessions on January 20. The Annual Business Meeting was held after a buffet supper on Saturday evening, January 22, preceding the presidential address. In an attempt to eliminate routine details and to discuss only the principal policies of the Association, the agenda of the Business Meeting was limited to a few topics, under a plan initiated by Marshall E. Dimock, chairman of the Washington Committee. The agenda included: (1) an abbreviated report of the Managing Editor of the REVIEW and of the Secretary-Treasurer, (2) a report of the Committee on the REVIEW, (3) discussion of the reports of the Committees on Congress, on Research, and on the Social Science Research Council, and (4) the election of officers for 1944.

Besides the above-named items on the agenda of the Business Meeting, the agenda of the Executive Council included: report on the acts of the President; report of the Audit Committee; adoption of the budget for

1944; memorials; election of the Secretary-Treasurer, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Managing Editor of the REVIEW, and Board of Editors; report of representatives on the Social Science Research Council and on the American Council of Learned Societies; together with reports from ten standing and special Committees of the Association.

The Secretary-Treasurer reported that the membership and subscriptions of the Association on December 15, 1943, totaled 3,025. This figure, however, did not indicate an increase of membership over the 2,902 members reported in 1942. There had actually been a decline of 78 in membership during the year. The figure 3,025 was obtained by counting as members in 1943 the 201 members who were delinquent in paying their 1943 dues. Some of these members are serving in the armed forces of the United States. There were 2,739 paid-up regular and associate members and subscribers, 32 sustaining members, and 8 contributing members. Life members numbered 45. During the year 1943, there were 436 new members and 514 resignations and cancellations. This made a net loss of 78 members. These figures showed that the sharp decline in membership as described in the report of 1942 (see the REVIEW, February, 1943, pp. 113-114) had been arrested. The slowing up in membership losses was due not so much to the diminution of resignations and cancellations as to a vigorous campaign for new members. In 1940, there were 597 new members and 182 resignations and cancellations; in 1941, the new members numbered 578 and the losses, 327; in 1942, the new members were 363, and the losses 569; in 1943, the new members were 436 and the losses 514.

It was believed that in view of the totalitarian and global war, as well as the planning for the postwar era, there is more need than ever before for the study and discussion of governmental problems, both domestic and international. If the activities of the American Political Science Association are to be continued in the field of assisting in the teaching and training of young men and women for government service and in the field of public discussion of government and politics, it will be necessary to maintain the membership of the Association at least at its present level. Almost the entire revenue of the Association is received from membership dues and subscriptions to the REVIEW. Barely two hundred dollars are received each year as interest from the Trust Fund.

In view of these facts, it was held necessary a year ago to engage in a vigorous membership campaign. Conspicuous assistance in this recruitment of new members was rendered by the Washington Committee under the chairmanship of Marshall E. Dimock. Ernest S. Griffith served as chairman of a special committee to procure the nomination of new members from the personnel in all government and research agencies in the national capital. These nominations resulted in a high rate of return. At the end of the year, the campaign for new members in the District of

Columbia was about half completed. It will be continued throughout 1944.

The financial report of the Secretary-Treasurer showed that the expenditures for 1943 amounted to \$16,710.83, while the income was \$16,520.92. This meant a deficit of \$189.91. The small deficit, however, did not affect the solvency of the Association. The bank balance on December 15, 1943, was \$3,316.77, while the accounts payable amounted to only \$4.46. Throughout the year the principal activity of the Association, namely, the publication of the *REVIEW*, had been maintained at its usual high standard without appreciable reduction in size of the volume. Indeed, the principal cause for the deficit was the purchase of an unusually large supply of paper stock at a favorable price for the Association.

The expenditures for 1943 showed an outlay of \$9,243.05 for the *REVIEW*, and \$7,467.78 for the office of the Secretary-Treasurer. The latter item included a sum of \$860.00 for the Committee on Congress. The income for 1943 showed the receipt of \$13,982.02 from membership dues, \$828.84 from the sales of publications, and \$1,710.06 from other sources. Income included a gift of \$860 from Dr. Benjamin B. Wallace for the use of the Committee on Congress.

The budget of the Association for 1944, as approved by the Executive Council, calls for an expenditure of \$15,460.00 and an estimated income of \$15,464.03. The proposed expenditures include \$9,040.00 for editing and publishing the *REVIEW*, and \$6,320.00 for the expenses of the office of the Secretary-Treasurer. The estimates of revenue include \$13,825.00 to be received from membership dues, \$775.00 from sale of publications, and \$864.03 from other sources.

The assets of the Association include a bank balance of \$3,316.77 and \$1.16 in petty cash. The Trust Funds include \$8,100 in United States Treasury Bonds and \$719.14 in the Trust Fund Account. Office equipment is valued at \$213.28; paper stock for the *REVIEW* at \$669.65; and the estimated capitalization of the *REVIEW* at \$8,000.00; making a total of \$8,882.93. Accounts receivable were \$133.44 and accounts payable \$4.46, leaving a balance of \$128.98. The securities held in the First National Bank of Evanston and comprising the Trust Fund of the Association include: 3% U. S. Treasury Bonds of 1951-1955 with par value of \$1,500; 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ % U. S. 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; 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 December 23, 1943, by Frank E. Kohler and Company (1 La Salle Street, Chicago, Illinois). The Committee on Audit, composed of Messrs. Leonard D. White and John D. Larkin, reported as follows: "We have examined the accounts of the Secretary-Treasurer of the American Political Science Association and have approved the audit report prepared by Frank E. Kohler and

Company which is attached hereto. We found the statement of accounts as prepared by the Secretary-Treasurer to be correct. The financial condition of the Association during the current year has been satisfactory, with receipts of \$16,520.92 and disbursements of \$16,710.83. The excess of expenditures over income was \$189.91. At the same time, there has been no serious curtailment in the size or expense involved in the publication of the REVIEW. The loss of memberships has been largely due to enlistments in the armed services. The Committee finds that this represents no serious blow to the Association's financial position. The special Committee on Congress has submitted a detailed report of its expenses during the preceding year, with receipts of \$860.00 and disbursements of \$683.23, leaving a balance on hand December fifteenth in the sum of \$176.77. The Committee discussed the problem of delinquent members, as to an appropriate time for dropping them from our rolls. We recommend that at the end of one year memberships be canceled if current dues have not been paid."

The report of the Committee on Audit was accepted and its recommendation approved. The report of the Secretary-Treasurer was also approved and the budget adopted. The Executive Council instructed the Secretary-Treasurer to arrange for the editing and publishing of a *Directory of the American Political Science Association*, giving professional data regarding its members. For this purpose, if necessary, the Secretary was instructed to borrow from the cash on hand in the Trust Funds a sum not greater than one thousand dollars, to be repaid at three per cent interest out of monies received from the sale of copies of the *Directory*. The Secretary-Treasurer was also instructed by the Executive Council to arrange with the Managing Editor and the George Banta Publishing Company for the publication of the *Directory*, if feasible, as a supplement to the REVIEW. It is expected that the publication of the *Directory* will partially meet the need for the Personnel Service, and will assist the Secretary-Treasurer in meeting inquiries of the appointing officers of colleges, universities, research institutions, and governmental agencies for the purpose of recruiting personnel.

On motion of the Secretary-Treasurer, the members of the Executive Council stood in silent tribute to members of the Association whose death occurred during the year. In accord with recent practice, memorials in honor of several of these members had been published in the REVIEW shortly after their death, rather than held for presentation at the annual meeting.

The Executive Council reappointed Frederic A. Ogg Managing Editor of the REVIEW for a three-year term. It also reappointed Kenneth Colegrove Secretary-Treasurer and Harvey Walker Assistant Secretary-Treasurer for three-year terms. The President announced the appoint-

ment of Charles E. Merriam as representative of the Association on the Social Science Research Council for the term 1944-1946.

The report of Frederic A. Ogg, Managing Editor of the REVIEW, showed that Volume XXXVII (1943) contained 1,160 pages, of which 192 pages were devoted to leading articles. The departments were represented as follows: (1) American Government and Politics, 157 pages; (2) Constitutional Law, 46; (3) Public Administration, 25; (4) Local Government, 11; (5) Municipal Affairs, 14; (6) Foreign Government and Politics, 13; (7) International Affairs, 146; (8) Instruction and Research, 16; (9) News and Notes, 70; (10) Book Reviews and Notices, 267; and (11) Recent Publications of Political Interest, 167. Special features included 6 pages devoted to the Constitution of the American Political Science Association, 15 pages to the List of Doctoral Dissertations in Preparation, and 19 pages to the Index.

The Managing Editor also stated:

"As is well known, an immense amount of investigation, including a good deal of serious research, has been, and is being, carried on in Washington by political scientists who are there permanently and also by the even larger number working there more or less temporarily during the war years. In the course of the past summer, a group of our younger Washington members prepared a memorandum—designed in the first instance for the use of the Association's special committee on the REVIEW—in which were offered numerous suggestions of subjects and topics on which it would be desirable that the REVIEW publish articles or other materials. This memorandum came into my hands, and has been exceedingly helpful. Arrangements have already been made for several of the articles proposed, and negotiations for others are in progress.

"There are, however, difficulties. One of them is that a large proportion of the men whose personal experience and contacts fit them preëminently for contributing articles coming directly out of the studies referred to are not free—at least not now—to write and publish. Later on they may be differently situated; but not yet. A second difficulty is that of persuading those who might write that they can find the time in which to do it. In other words, there are many people with suggestions (often excellent), but few prepared to commit themselves actually to produce. A third difficulty is that some of the things proposed would, if obtainable, be so space-consuming as to raise serious problems for a journal mortgaged as heavily as is the REVIEW to regular and permanent features which our readers presumably would not want omitted or seriously curtailed. Hence, while, as a general proposition, the REVIEW unquestionably should draw as heavily as possible upon the special resources referred to, too much should not be expected immediately. Every opportunity that opens up will be explored eagerly. But the sorts of materials sought will become available

only gradually. All possible coöperation is solicited in the form of information about how particularly good articles can be obtained, and especially in that of actual contribution of manuscripts. And of course this applies generally—not simply in connection with the special situation now existing in Washington.”

Clarence A. Berdahl, chairman of the Committee on the REVIEW, presented a report which is printed in full on pages 141–150 below. This report was received, its recommendations approved, and the Committee terminated. Messrs. Kenneth C. Cole, Clyde Eagleton, E. Pendleton Herring, Walter H. C. Laves, and Donald C. Stone, were appointed members of the Board of Editors for terms of one year. The Secretary-Treasurer was instructed to place on the agenda of the annual meeting of the Executive Council in 1944 the question of the size and functions of the Board of Editors.

On motion of Leonard D. White, the Executive Council instructed the President to appoint a committee to consider systematically undergraduate instruction in political science with special reference to objectives, content, methods, preparation of college and university teachers, relationships with other social sciences, and evaluation of results of instruction. In connection with this proposal. E. Pendleton Herring called attention to the new opportunity and challenge presented to the political science profession by the increasing importance of a knowledge of government for professions such as law, engineering, and social sciences, whose members are entering the public service in great numbers. Can political scientists develop teaching materials for such professional groups in the field of government, or will this instruction be left to the law professors and economics teachers? A new field of usefulness is offered our profession. If we do not meet the need, it will be met by other professions, perhaps less well prepared from the standpoint of political scientists. We cannot correctly assume that in the future the teaching of government will be left in the hands of political scientists to the extent that it has been in the past. Harvey Walker urged the need for study of programs of education for men discharged from the military forces.

William Anderson, chairman of the Committee on Endowment, asked members of the Association to seek gifts to the Trust Fund of the Association. Donations of war bonds would be gratefully received.

John E. Briggs, chairman of the Committee on Regional and Functional Societies, offered a report, with the recommendation that the American Political Science Association should: “(1) Encourage regional groups of the conference type; continue to send representatives to their annual meetings; explain the services of the American Political Science Association at regional meetings to recruit members. (2) Encourage permanent organization of round-table groups at the national meetings. Let the

political scientists who usually attend a particular round table form a continuing group, so that the annual discussion may be conducted on a progressive plan and projects of coöperative research may be instituted. Such groups should plan with the Program Committee. (3) Develop standing committees, with membership available to qualified persons, to conduct investigations in particular subjects. These might eventually take the form of subsidiary functional groups within the Association. (4) Continue the Committee on Regional and Functional Societies, particularly to cope with problems relating to the formation of new groups when normal activities are resumed and transportation facilities are less congested." The Secretary-Treasurer called attention to the fact that the budget for 1944 contains small items for the programs of the annual meetings of the Southern Political Science Association, the Mid-West Conference of Political Scientists, and the Connecticut Valley Political Science Association.

The following resolutions, drafted by a committee under the chairmanship of Herbert W. Briggs, were adopted:

"Whereas, the publications of the Department of State and, in particular, the publication of the volumes on the *Paris Peace Conference*, the volumes on *Japan, 1931-1941*, the documented edition of *Peace and War: United States Foreign Policy, 1931-1941*, Hackworth's *Digest of International Law*, and the *Department of State Bulletin*, have been of incalculable utility to political scientists, international lawyers, and historians, and through them to large groups of Army, Navy, and civilian students, and to the informed citizenry interested in preparations for the postwar world, *Therefore*,

"*Be it resolved* by the American Political Science Association: (1) That the Congress be commended for restoring the appropriations necessary for the adequate realization of the publication program; (2) That the Department of State be commended for publishing current materials of such immense importance for the development of an informed citizenry; (3) That the Congress and the Department of State be respectfully urged to expedite the publication of the *Paris Peace Conference* records, to close the fourteen-year gap in the regular *Foreign Relations* series, and to expand the current offerings in the *Department of State Bulletin*; (4) That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Secretary of State, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the chairmen of the House 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 the members of the American Political Science Association."

Another resolution, offered by V. O. Key, was adopted in the following

language: "Resolved that the American Political Science Association urges the importance of the analysis and recording of the experience of the Federal Government in discharging its responsibilities during the present war, commends the efforts currently made by the Bureau of the Budget and the war agencies to develop such accounts of war experience, and recommends the publication early after the war of such accounts and related documents, to the end that in future national emergencies the United States may build upon the lessons currently being learned, and that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and heads of war agencies."

Marshall E. Dimock, chairman of the Committee on Citizenship Education, presented a report that is printed on pages 150–151 below. The report was accepted, the President was authorized to appoint a standing Committee on Citizenship Education, and the Managing Editor was requested to publish the report in the REVIEW.

George B. Galloway, chairman of the Committee on Congress, indicated that twenty-two Representatives, eight Senators, and five newspaper men had been guests of the Committee at various sessions. The topics discussed at these meetings included: (1) proposals for improving legislative staff aids, (2) proposed changes in the structure of Congressional committees, (3) methods of collaboration between the legislative and executive branches; (4) Representative Dirksen's resolution (H.Res. 19) to create a select committee on Congressional reorganization, (5) revision of the seniority system and (7) the rôle of public opinion in modernizing Congress. The report concluded: "We believe that legislative reform is coming, albeit slowly. Prospective changes in the political climate and party control may facilitate it. Meanwhile, public study and discussion of criticisms and proposed remedies should help to ensure that effective reforms are ultimately adopted. If our form of government is to function efficiently in the postwar world, it will require good machinery, good men, and good-will. The postwar world will certainly require some changes in our political institutions either deliberately or hastily made. Congress will have a continuing vital rôle to play in a victorious, powerful democracy taking a leading part in international reconstruction. Its ability to play its rôle successfully will depend upon its willingness to appraise and modify, not merely its internal machinery, methods, and customs, but the whole question of its place in our scheme of government, including its relations with the Executive, on the one hand, and with the people, on the other." This report was accepted, the Committee on Congress was continued, and the Association expressed to Benjamin B. Wallace its appreciation of his generous financial support of the Committee.

Howard White, chairman of the Committee on the Social Studies, made

a progress report. The report was accepted, and the Committee was ordered continued and was requested to maintain its coöperation with the National Council of the Social Studies.

W. Reed West, chairman of the Committee on Election Statistics, offered a report commenting on the elections calendars for 1942 and 1943 published by the Bureau of the Census. The report was accepted, and the Committee was ordered continued and was requested to inform the members of the Association regarding the analyses of voting made by the Bureau of the Census.

Charles E. Hyneman, chairman of the Committee on the Army Specialized Training Program, offered the following resolution: "Resolved that the President of the Association be authorized to consider ways and means for analyzing and recording the experience of college and university relations with the Federal Government during the present war, and that he seek to have representatives of the American Political Science Association participate in any study and investigation of this subject." This resolution was adopted.

Marshall E. Dimock, chairman of the Washington Committee of Political Scientists, presented a report indicating the activities of the Committee in promoting the interests of political scientists in Washington. Among other things, the Committee had offered constructive suggestions in the procurement of articles for the REVIEW. Again, the Committee undertook to canvass the various agencies for new members of the Association. "It was decided that each member of the Washington Committee should send a list of names of persons who might undertake to canvass each major agency of the Government. The course followed was to ask a person in each of the major agencies already a member to meet with two or three of his colleagues and between them to work out a list of prospective members. These lists were to be drawn chiefly from four groups as follows: (1) policy men who feel themselves custodians of the 'public interest'; these are to be found among the administrators, lawyers, and board members in the upper echelons; (2) researchers, dealing with political and governmental data, including international and foreign affairs; (3) administrators—professionals usually of lower ranks than those in Class 1 above—scientific management men, in personnel, organization, and budgeting; (4) young men and women who have had a year or more of graduate work in political science and who, but for the war, would normally be teaching or continuing graduate work or research. These will often be found among the so-called 'junior technical assistants.' The members of the Association gave most generously of their time, but in half of the agencies it was discovered that the Association apparently did not possess a single member. All told, 14 lists were received, and 11 more have been promised."

The Secretary-Treasurer called attention to the importance of the

Washington Committee during the war. The Committee has initiated the greater number of the new activities of the Association since Pearl Harbor. Again, for the last two annual meetings the chairman of the Committee has accepted sole responsibility for constructing the program, while another member of the Committee has carried the burden of making local arrangements for the meetings of 1942 and 1943. The report of the chairman of the Washington Committee was accepted and the Committee was ordered to be continued.

On motion of John M. Gaus, recommendations offered by the chairman of the Program Committee were referred to the Committee on Regional and Functional Societies for exploration and report to the Executive Council at its next annual meeting as a basis for long-time planning of programs with special reference to meetings with related societies.

Frederic A. Middlebush, chairman of the Committee on the Social Science Research Council, offered a report which will be published in the April issue of the REVIEW. The report made the following recommendations: "(1) Your Committee recommends that the Nominating Committee of the APSA submit to the president of the Association the name of the person to be nominated each year as the APSA representative on the SSRC. It is understood that this name is to be selected from the names appearing on the SSRC panel. (2) We recommend that the outgoing representative of the APSA on the SSRC submit the report on SSRC activities during the past year to the annual meeting. We further recommend that the report be given a more important place on the annual program, namely, the subject for a luncheon meeting. (3) We recommend that the Committee on Research of the APSA be directed to present at the next annual meeting a progress report on the adequacy of present research facilities in political science and on the ways and means by which they can be improved. (4) We recommend that the SSRC be requested to sponsor: (a) a survey of the research needs of the several fields represented by the cooperating associations, with special emphasis upon those which involve close interrelation with the other social groups; (b) a thorough study of the means by which the research committees or other organizations in the respective social science fields may be more closely integrated with the work of the Council. (In our opinion it would be advisable to have this survey, sponsored by the SSRC, made by a committee composed of non-council members designated by the presidents of the respective cooperating associations.) (5) We recommend that the president of the APSA appoint as one member of the APSA Committee on Research one of the political science members of the SSRC."

This report was approved with the exception of the first recommendation, which was referred to the next annual meeting of the Executive Council.

Francis W. Coker, chairman of the Committee on the Library of Political Philosophy, offered a report, copies of which will be furnished members who desire to receive the same. James Hart, chairman of the Committee on Nomination of Officers for 1944, discussed the procedure for nomination of officers of the Association. Of the some 1,800 members of the Association (not counting subscriptions), only 107 returned ballots suggesting names for nomination. In selecting officers and members of the Executive Council, the Nominating Committee attempted to secure an adequate representation of every geographical region of the United States and every field of political science.

The Committee on Nominations placed in nomination the following persons, who were duly elected as officers for the year 1944: President, Leonard D. White (University of Chicago); first vice-president, Charles G. Fenwick (Bryn Mawr College); second vice-president, Clarence A. Berdahl (University of Illinois); and third vice-president, Cullen B. Gosnell (Emory University); and members of the Executive Council for 1944-1946: Arthur W. Bromage (University of Michigan); Frederick S. Dunn (Yale University); J. A. C. Grant (University of California at Los Angeles); Charles C. Rohlfing (University of Pennsylvania); and E. E. Schattschneider (Wesleyan University).

The Association adopted resolutions expressing its appreciation of the services of Marshall E. Dimock, chairman of the Program Committee, and of W. Reed West, chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements, in planning and carrying out the thirty-ninth annual meeting.

KENNETH COLEGROVE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW¹

In accordance with a suggestion made by the Managing Editor, and with action taken by the Executive Council, in December, 1941, President William Anderson appointed a committee to survey the problems of the REVIEW and to assist the Managing Editor and the Board of Editors in the solution of those problems. The committee, as finally constituted in September, 1942, consisted of Frederick F. Blachly (Brookings Institution), Ben M. Cherrington (University of Denver), Arthur N. Holcombe (Harvard University), John W. Manning (University of Kentucky), and Clarence A. Berdahl (University of Illinois), *chairman*. It made a preliminary and tentative progress report to the Executive Council during the course of the Annual Meeting in Washington in January, 1942, and

¹ Submitted by Clarence A. Berdahl, *chairman*.

was continued with the same membership by President Robert E. Cushman.

The exigencies of the war have greatly hampered the work of the Committee. It has not been possible to hold a single meeting of the full committee, nor has it been possible for any number of the Committee to meet as a group with the Managing Editor and discuss the problems of the REVIEW with him. Two meetings have been held in Washington, with one different member absent on each occasion, and to this limited extent it has been possible to exchange views within the Committee and to reach certain very general conclusions. The chairman has made use of every opportunity to discuss the REVIEW and its problems with members of the Association. In October, 1942, he met with a group in Chicago, including some of the officers of the Association and particularly the chairman and some members of the committee on the Association's constitution; in November, 1942, he met for several hours with a small group of colleagues in Charlottesville; in May, 1943, he had a luncheon conference with about a dozen of the younger members of the so-called Washington Group, all of them in active government service, and some of whom later submitted a memorandum of helpful comments and suggestions; in June, 1943, he attended a two-day conference in Chicago at which considerable attention was given to the REVIEW; he has discussed the REVIEW with numerous individuals and groups in Washington; and he has particularly conferred on several occasions with the Managing Editor and with the Secretary-Treasurer, both of whom have also been most coöperative in furnishing reports and other pertinent materials with respect to the REVIEW.

The Committee has, however, had to conduct its studies largely by correspondence, and a very heavy correspondence has been carried on, between the members of the Committee, with the Managing Editor, with officers of the Association, and with numerous members. It did not seem possible to circularize the entire membership of the Association, but the views, criticisms, and suggestions of members were invited through the pages of the REVIEW, and personal letters were written to a considerable number of members selected to represent different sections, institutions, fields of interest, age-groups, etc. These individuals were in turn particularly urged to discuss the problems of the REVIEW with other members in their departments or sections, and send the Committee both their individual and their group views. The response was gratifying, and the Committee believes that it has in these various ways secured a reasonably representative expression of feeling about the REVIEW from the general membership of the Association.

That feeling is clearly one of general satisfaction with the REVIEW. There are individuals who dislike and would throw out this or that feature, such as the bibliographical section, or the notes on Congress, or the re-

views of constitutional law, or the summaries of legislation, or the occasional summary articles on local government; but the omission of any of these special features would immediately bring vigorous criticism from a much larger number. There are some who want more attention to political theory or to administration, while others want less; some want the leading articles written by the older and more experienced veterans in the field, while others want more opportunity for expression and recognition extended to the younger scholars; some want fewer and longer book reviews, others want a wider distribution of books for review and shorter and snappier reviews; some think too many of the articles are shallow, unrelated to the current realities of government, and even badly written, while others feel in general as does one of our most prominent historians, who wrote about a recent article in the REVIEW as "another example of the alertness and up-to-dateness of the political scientists in their mastery of current governmental problems"; some want a brighter cover and a different format, while others prefer things as they are even in these respects.

In a very few cases, the criticism has been both general and sharp, but these criticisms, whether general or particular, apparently represent a very small minority, and a minority which cannot possibly be identified as "the younger group" or "government group," or any other particular group. It is the considered judgment of the committee that the REVIEW is generally satisfactory to the overwhelming majority in the Association, and that any radical change in either content or format would be resisted by a considerable number. Particularly impressive is the extent to which members in the military service have written, quite voluntarily, to express their special appreciation of the REVIEW during their separation from the profession of political science. This general viewpoint is well indicated by the following statement made by one of our more critical members: "I have talked with my colleagues about the REVIEW, and there really isn't much criticism from here. In fact, none of us sees very much wrong with it as it stands. I have an idea that some people feel it should be 'brightened up' a bit, but, when one gets down to cases, I doubt whether he would find any good way to do this without embarking on a sort of journalism which I think we should avoid. I have long thought that perhaps the cover could be a little less drab and forbidding, but that, after all, is a minor criticism. It seems to us here that Ogg has done a good job both from the point of view of the distribution of the contents among the various fields and in the various specialized departments. If the 'upward and onward' boys want him or any other editor to ride a hobby or go tilting after windmills, I think they should be stopped. If the REVIEW is 'dull,' it is because it has to deal with some dull subjects to cover the field. And, of course, what is dull is a matter of taste. . . . Sometimes I have a feeling that the

REVIEW is a bit on the stodgy, 'theoretical' side, but I suspect that a survey of its contents over any extended period of time would prove my impression wrong. So our suggestions here simmer down to putting it in a blue or a pink or an orange cover and then going on much as at present!"

The Committee agrees that the REVIEW has been maintained as an exceptionally well balanced publication throughout the years, something amply demonstrated by the annual reports of the Managing Editor as well as by the most cursory examination of the REVIEW's contents over a period of years, and this no doubt explains the general satisfaction of the membership. This balance between the various interests of our field should by all means be continued, but its necessity also introduces at once certain problems and difficulties and limitations, particularly in view of the growth during more recent years of specialized journals in international law, in municipal government, in administration, in public opinion, in theory, that tend to draw off good manuscripts in those fields. Under the circumstances, it seems to the committee that the Managing Editor has preserved the balance remarkably well, with articles of reasonably high quality in all fields, and that the REVIEW can certainly be favorably compared with similar professional journals in the related disciplines. The recent development of symposia represents a skillful adaptation by the Managing Editor of this necessity for a balanced publication toward a somewhat more solid analysis of particular problems. It is a development to be warmly commended.

The more particular problems to which the Committee has devoted some attention, in addition to the general nature and contents of the REVIEW, are the general position of the Managing Editor, the nature and functions of the Board of Editors and its relations to the Managing Editor, and the matter of departmentalization. It may be noted, with respect to the first point, that the position of the Managing Editor, heretofore governed only by certain traditional practices, has been given express recognition in the new constitution of the Association and the tenure changed from indefinite to a fixed term of three years. This does not, and should not, preclude reëlection, and it would seem wise to maintain, so far as possible, the tradition of infrequent change.

The Board of Editors is also now given constitutional recognition, but the details of its composition are left to the Executive Council. This seems to the Committee a sound provision, since it makes possible a flexible policy adjusted to changing developments. It leaves open the question whether the Board of Editors should be large or small, and what should be the precise character of its functions. If the Board of Editors is large, as it has become, it cannot easily be of real or active editorial assistance to the Managing Editor, and its function will have to be that of affording representation to the different interests and sections within the Associa-

tion, and passing upon questions of general policy. A small Board of Editors, which many desire, could not be maintained on this representative basis, would probably tend to become relatively permanent or long-term in its membership, but might be a means of genuine assistance to the Managing Editor in soliciting, reading, and arranging for the publication of manuscripts, and in other editorial duties. The Committee is fully aware of the strenuous burden now imposed upon the Managing Editor, and of the utterly inadequate compensation or assistance afforded him. It feels strongly that relief should be provided, but it doubts that this can best be done through a radical change in the nature and composition of the Board of Editors. The present Board is more divided on that point than on any other, and it may be questioned whether the members of the Association are yet ready to abandon the representative type of Board for one that would be essentially professional; it may be questioned whether the division of responsibility involved in such a working Board might not increase the difficulties of the Managing Editor instead of easing them. The Committee does feel, however, that if the larger Board of Editors is retained, provision should somehow be made for occasional meetings with the Managing Editor, in order that questions of broad editorial policy might be discussed and determined, and ways and means of assistance by the Board or its individual members be fully canvassed. It is by no means the fault of the Managing Editor that this has not been sufficiently done in the past; in fact, he has held many such conferences during the course of the Annual Meeting, at his own expense; the difficulty is due entirely to the lack of funds.

The matter of departmentalization of the Review to some extent raises questions similar to those involved in the relationship between the Managing Editor and the Board of Editors. Members of the Board of Editors might be used as department editors, but whether members of the Board or not, the use of department editors and the further departmentalization of the contents are as likely to increase as to decrease the difficulties of the Managing Editor. If departmentalization means merely a classification of contents by subject-matter, and a classification not too rigidly maintained, that is quite useful to the reader; if it means using department editors familiar with the field involved and responsible for the production of good manuscripts, but always subject to the Managing Editor's decision with respect to publication, it may be of real assistance to the Managing Editor; but if it means more than this, and the balance of authority is always difficult to maintain, it may well involve additional problems of space, commitment to and priority of publication, appropriate recognition of diverse interests, etc.

The Committee feels that about all it can do is to call attention to these various problems, and to suggest that they are continuous problems for

which no simple solution seems possible, but whose continuous examination and reexamination is necessary. It is, and should be, the function of the Managing Editor and the Board of Editors to deal with these problems, always keeping in mind the views and interests of the members of the Association, to whom the REVIEW belongs. It is for the Association to choose a Managing Editor in whom it has confidence, give him a relatively free hand in association with the Board of Editors to determine the details of editorial policy and management, criticize him freely, give him suggestions still more freely, and in particular see that he is supplied with manuscripts of high quality. No Managing Editor can produce a REVIEW by himself alone, but the Association can well take pride in the Editors it has had the good sense to choose and in the journal that has been published through the joint efforts of these Editors and of the members. The journal can be improved in many respects, of course, and it is hoped that it will be continuously improved in the future as it has been in the past. A special tribute is owing to the present Managing Editor, who has carried an extraordinarily heavy burden under very difficult conditions, for an unusually long period of time, at enormous sacrifice of his own time and energy, and always within a most inadequate budget.

Letter from Frederick F. Blachly (a member of the Committee) to Clarence A. Berdahl (December 7, 1942):

Many such problems [connected with the REVIEW] are those inherent in the subject of political science itself; for it is not (as is mathematics, physics, or law) a fairly unified and coherent subject, but is a grouping together of a great many subjects which, while related, are fairly separate and distinct. For instance, political parties, constitutional law, taxation, and comparative government, political theory, public administration, administrative law, the housekeeping features of government such as the budget, accounting and reporting, personnel, garbage and sewage disposal, fire prevention, police, etc., are all phases of political science, but are somewhat remotely related. Each of them may constitute such a large field that one who specializes in it has little time for much else.

This is particularly true where, as in large universities, political scientists have created many specialized courses in these various subjects, taught by persons who do almost all of their research and writing in a very limited field. As a result, one man may become a specialist in constitutional law and neither know nor care anything about parties. Another may become so immersed in historical political theory that he has no interest in personnel. Again, various persons specialize in the different units and levels of government: foreign governments, federal, state, and local governments. I find in my own work that when I am working on one of these units or levels, the problems are so many and the materials so

vast that I have little time or energy for anything except that with which I am immediately concerned.

At present, also, what we have been pleased to call political science is so tied up with economics that it is impossible to separate the two. The purpose of regulation of public utilities, for instance, is economic from one point of view, but as soon as regulation is started half a dozen or more pastures are opened up where the live-stock of political science are supposed to roam: constitutional law, administrative law, political theory, accounting and reporting, personnel, etc.

Can one magazine cater to all of these interests? Evidently those interested in special fields think that it cannot, for we have seen lately the growth of a rather wide variety of journals dealing with special phases of political science, some dozens of law journals dealing with legal aspects of the subject, the *Public Administration Review*, philosophical journals which often deal with political philosophy, the *National Municipal Review* and various journals of municipal leagues, the *Public Personnel Quarterly*, the *Public Utilities Review*, the *Journal of Comparative Legislation*, and the *Journal of Politics*, to mention only a few of them. Moreover, several local associations have established journals of one sort or another.

Several results deleterious to the POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW almost inevitably follow. In the first place, since it is much easier to place an article in one of these specialized reviews than in the POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, there is a decided tendency for those who are working on specialized subjects to send the fruits of their labors to the magazine which they consider most likely to publish it, rather than to the REVIEW. This situation is augmented by the fact that the specialized publications welcome articles that may be much too technical for the average political scientist. Again, each specialized magazine probably knows much more intimately than does the REVIEW who is a specialist along its particular lines and what work he is doing at any given time. Often a very good article may be a by-product of actual administrative experience or of a large piece of research, and so does not require the time and energy of *de novo* work, but it may be doomed for a magazine of general interest by the fact that it is technical. My own experience as well as that of others bears out these statements.

Thus the REVIEW is being continually robbed, not only of some of the most interesting branches of political science, but also of the authors who are most capable of turning out valuable articles. But this is not all; the fields that have been taken over by specialized journals are the very fields where the great conflicts as to policy and methods rage today, where new developments are taking place, and consequently mental interest and stimulation lie. If these fields are largely taken over by specialized journals,

the REVIEW must be content with articles which, for the most part, are merely descriptive, theoretical, or historical.

There is another reason why the REVIEW does not get as many significant articles as it should. This is the bifurcated nature of the REVIEW, which attempts to act at one and the same time as a handbook for teachers and as a journal dealing broadly with political science. The handbook aspect shows itself in several standard subject-matters, such as book reviews and notices of books and publications of political interest, government publications, constitutional law of the year, recent changes in government organization, and news and notes. Although this material may be of value to teachers, it takes a great deal of space that might otherwise be devoted to large articles. This leaves only about one hundred pages per issue to be divided among perhaps a dozen specialized fields of interest. Writers cannot entertain high hopes that many of their long articles will be published by the REVIEW. This is undoubtedly one reason why many specialized periodicals have been established; but this creates a vicious circle.

I have tried to outline the difficulties of the situation as I see them. What is the solution?

If what I have said is correct, the difficulties do not lie at all with the Editor or the Board of Editors, but rather in new and general situations: a wide and expanding subject-matter, intense specialization, and perhaps the need for a manual that will keep teachers informed with the least possible exertion on their part.

Three solutions would seem possible. First, keep things as they are. If there is need for all the material in the nature of handbook stuff, either because the majority of teachers have neither the time nor the facilities at hand to get it, well and good. But if such is the case, it brings about the difficulties that I have described above: little space for writers on specialized subjects, hence establishment of new periodicals, with the result of drawing off the cream into them and leaving the REVIEW with the skimmed milk. It may well be that even if all of the space in the REVIEW were given over to general articles, the centrifugal movement could not be stopped.

The second solution would be to make the REVIEW practically nothing but a trade journal and handbook. This could readily be done by enlarging the news and notes, the book reviews and notices of publications of political interest, the notes on reorganization and summaries of congressional action, judicial action, etc. For specialized articles one would have to look elsewhere.

The third solution would be to eliminate most of the material of a handbook nature, except possibly the book reviews, and to make of the REVIEW a journal of wide political interest instead of dividing the material among several narrow specialties. It may well be argued that the time has passed

for such aids to teachers. The *Government Manual* plus the *Federal Register* certainly are a much better basis for following changes in the federal government than are the articles by Mr. Schmeckebier.¹ The official monthly checklist of government publications is readily available and is more complete than the article in the REVIEW. It might be possible to have the Library of Congress get out a monthly list of books and periodicals of political interest, which would be far more complete than that found in the REVIEW. This would give much more space for articles.

It might then be possible to analyze some of the more important problems of general interest, and to invite those who are most familiar with these problems from governmental experience or research to write articles of authority. I have been rather impressed by many articles in some journals, such as *Law and Contemporary Problems*, the *Annals*, the *Iowa Law Review*, etc., which definitely ask for special articles, usually devoting each number to one large subject. It seems to me that in this manner the political scientists might have a definite place in helping to guide public policy in a way that is impossible at present where the few small articles are divided up among the dozen specialties of political science. Nor would this be incompatible with specialization, for each large problem might well be approached through these specialists. For instance, the problem of social security may involve historical factors, problems of social and political philosophy, constitutional law, administrative law, the relationship between the nation, states, and localities, personnel, statistics, accounting and reporting, and other phases of political science.

As I go over the back numbers of the REVIEW, I can find few large contributions toward the solution of the national and international problems with which we are confronted; but rather an agglomeration of small articles, perhaps interesting and well written, but largely descriptive and not tying into anything in particular. For instance, in one number we find a variety of subjects dealing with legislation, administrative regions, state constitutional development, primary legislation, parochialism, hearings, judicial influence, selection of judges, Nazi reform, and liquidation of the German Länder—all within a little over one hundred pages. Nearly every other number has a similarly variegated assortment of articles. This fragmentation may serve the purpose of getting a good many short articles into print, but it certainly does little to contribute to an understanding of the problems with which we are confronted. I doubt whether during war conditions it is warranted.

If political scientists are to become a leading force in the solution of governmental problems through the writings in the REVIEW, the scope of the REVIEW must be redefined. I believe that the book reviews should

¹ For the reason indicated, the articles referred to were discontinued a year ago.
MAN. ED.

be fewer, better written, and more selective, covering only first-class books. Out of every one hundred books received, perhaps twenty-five might be worth a first reading by some specialist, and ten might be worth a careful discussion. The REVIEW should devote most of its space to substantial articles, related to the special branches of political science which, after thought and discussion, the editors decide upon as representing the the general rather than the special aspects of the discipline.

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION²

Shortly before the outbreak of World War II, our Association recognized the urgent need for action in the promotion of citizenship education by creating in October, 1941, a committee to work out a practical and realistic program in this field. The creation of this committee followed establishment of the National Citizenship Education Program by the President of the United States, the purpose of which was the encouragement of citizenship education and the unification of the efforts of all agencies interested in that work.

The Committee on Citizenship Education of the American Political Science Association explored the work of the National Citizenship Education Program, and at a general meeting in December, 1941, with Dean William F. Russell, director of the Program, worked out a six-point program of coöperation and collaboration. These six areas were outlined in detail in last year's report. Briefly, however, they provided for the appointment of a committee of political scientists to review developments in the Program and to test materials; the establishment of a channel of review, advice, and consultation by scholars in the field; preparation of special material by political scientists and the fostering of local promotion activities; and teaching assistance and briefing of articles by outstanding men in specialized fields.

The Program made notable progress, and classes in citizenship education spread throughout the United States, enlarging activities previously in existence and initiating new programs elsewhere.

By the end of 1942, one of the coöperating agencies in the Program, the WPA, no longer existed as an operating part of the National Citizenship Education Program, but by that time the Immigration and Naturalization Service had developed its participation in the Program. The plan, with the full aid of the public schools, developed a permanent, long-range program of citizenship education.

The Program today is a vital and active one, and part of its success and accomplishments may be measured by the materials developed. Some

² Submitted by Marshall E. Dimock, *chairman*.

of these materials were written prior to the creation of the National Citizenship Education Program as such, but all are a part of the basic education-for-citizenship principle to which various groups—political scientists, public school authorities, social service groups, government agencies, and others—have long subscribed.

Under the "Constitution and Government" series is a textbook for advanced students—"Our Constitution and Government"—prepared by Dr. Catheryn Seckler-Hudson. A simplified edition followed this, written by Dr. John G. Hervey.

The National Citizenship Education Program made arrangements also to issue as a part of the "Constitution and Government" series the books, "On the Way to Democracy," which had been published under the direction of the University of Chicago. Also published is a second group of that series, "The Rights of the People," in three parts, with a teacher's edition.

Two basic groups of literacy readers (preliminary study to the Government series) also have been developed—"The Day Family" and "The Gardeners Become Citizens." These are for beginning adults. "Aids for Citizenship Teachers" is a handbook on problems for the teacher of citizenship education.

One of the most interesting sections of the Program is that devoted to a better understanding of the concept of democracy, out of which has grown the "American Democracy" series. Two pamphlets, "What We Have In America," by David Cushman Coyle, and "This Democracy of Ours," by Thomas H. Briggs, have been published.

One of the outstanding achievements of the Program this past year has been the development of a "Home Study" series. Because the factors of time, home conditions, and location prevent class attendance in many cases, there has been developed a course for home study. It covers the fields necessary for preparation for functioning citizenship. Dr. Henry Hazard, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and a member of this Association, is in charge of the citizenship education work within the jurisdiction of the Service. He is ably assisted by Dr. Glenn Kendall, formerly of Teachers College. Dean William F. Russell, of Teachers College, still serves as a part-time consultant. It is not too much to claim that the citizenship education program is now fully established, that it operates in every state, and that it has helped to create a new awareness of the importance to the nation of a sustained and integrated program of citizenship education.

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH⁸

The Research Committee of the American Political Science Association has now completed two years of activity. Its work has necessarily been

⁸ Submitted by Ernest S. Griffith, *chairman*.

limited by the exigencies of the war. The war has not only severely limited the time which the members of the Association can give to research, but has also drastically curtailed attendance at the annual meetings. Nevertheless, the Committee is able to report definite progress.

The most important part of the Committee's work has been the development of panels among the members of the Association designed to survey the strategy of research in major fields of interest. In order to understand what is involved, a brief summary of the panel technique is in order. Fields first selected were Comparative Government, Political Theory, Public Law, and the Rôle of the United States in the Post-War World. Recently it has been decided to add panels on Political Communications, Representative Government and the Legislative Process, and State, Local, and Municipal Government. Panels in certain other fields are contemplated also.

Once a field is selected, a convener of the panel is chosen. His function is to secure coöperation through membership on the panel of as many as possible of those members of the Association who have made significant research contributions to the field under discussion. Correspondence is invited designed to elicit the judgment of the panel members concerning those broad areas within the field which demand major attention of researchers. The results of such correspondence are then circulated among those accepting membership on the panel, together with such comment and interpretation as the convener may wish to add. Some additional correspondence may then take place in order to sharpen the issues revealed, and prepare the agenda for a conference. Such a conference is then scheduled, and sessions are extended sufficiently to permit a meeting of minds. Two days have been found to be required for this. The conference discussion, together with the earlier correspondence, is made the basis of a report drawn up by the convener. The report outlines the present thinking of the participating members of the profession as to the architecture of research and penetrating thought which the field seems to require for its development. One or more continuation committees are then formed to explore the possibility of implementing the judgment of the panel. Thus far, two of the panels, those on Comparative Government and Political Theory, have completed the stages of correspondence, conference, and report. The expense of their conferences was generously assumed by the Committee on Government of the Social Science Research Council. The sessions of both panels were held in Washington. Participation was active and vigorous. The participants included adequate representation both of the "established" authorities in the field and of the emerging scholars among the younger men.

Inasmuch as these two panels have both made extensive reports to

the Association,⁴ it is unnecessary to do more at this point than to call attention to the general opinion expressed by their members to the effect that the panel's activity should not stop with the issuance of a report, but should be continued as an important part of the Association's program. Whether such continuance should be under the auspices of the Research Committee or in an even more autonomous rôle is a question of policy to be decided presumably by the Executive Council of the Association. In any event, the panel technique has demonstrated a vitality which bids fair to earn a place for itself in the future development of the Association. Very great credit belongs to Karl Loewenstein and Francis Wilson, the conveners of the aforesaid panels, for the stimulating leadership and hard work which aided so much in bringing about these results.

The other three panels have proceeded less far. The one on Public Law (Carl Swisher, convener) has virtually completed the stage of correspondence and is awaiting a favorable time for securing the attendance of its members at a conference. The panel on The Rôle of the United States in the Post-War World (Phillips Bradley, convener) held an open session at the 1943 annual meeting of the Association, and correspondence is in progress. However, it is possible that prior activity of other organizations in this particular field may limit somewhat the usefulness of a separate report on the subject under Research Committee auspices. The panel on Political Communications is still in the blue-print stage. The majority of our outstanding scholars in this particular field are involved in exacting war work, and in all probability little or nothing will be done until the burden of this work has been lightened. However, there is a lively interest in its subject-matter, and the Research Committee believes that this panel should be organized as soon as feasible. Participation on the part of psychologists will also be invited.

Two other activities of the Research Committee deserve mention.

In the report of the Association's Committee on Wartime Services, the challenge was issued to the profession to abandon its customary individualism and concentrate its research upon the existing crisis. The Committee on Research, recognizing merit in this point of view, invited an expression of opinion of a number of members of the Association at present located in Washington as to priorities of research as affected by the war and postwar needs. In pursuance of this project, the chairman of the Committee consulted about twenty-five of our members actively engaged in the war effort, on the assumption that the judgment of these members would be peculiarly valuable. Their views were summarized in a report which appeared in the June, 1943, number of the *REVIEW*.

The Research Committee, while regarding the development of panels

⁴ In one form or another, these reports will appear in the *REVIEW*. MAN. ED.

as its primary function, has given some attention also to facilities and tools for research. In this connection, it recommended to President Cushman the appointment of a liaison man between the Association and the libraries of Washington. To our gratification, William Anderson was the man appointed, and he has agreed to undertake this particular responsibility. He has already held conferences with members of the Library of Congress staff on the matter. He has also been appointed an Associate Fellow of the Library of Congress, in which capacity he will make recommendations to the Library as to its acquisitions policy in the field of political science. This will put him in a strategic position to facilitate the building up of the Library collections so as to be of maximum service to researchers in political science and related fields. In addition, he is in a position to facilitate the issuance of bibliographies and other aids to research on the part of the Library.

The Research Committee believes that the results thus far justify the continuance of its activities as part of the program of the Association. The panel technique in the particular fashion in which it has developed is new to the Association, but it has already shown very considerable effectiveness. Considerable doubt was expressed at the time of its formation as to whether a research committee of a professional association could really accomplish much in the absence of funds to subsidize actual research projects. It is probably not too much to say that these doubts are being resolved. The program of such a committee must necessarily proceed at a tempered pace, but this very slowness may prove to be an asset if the results are the sounder thereby. The field of political science was never more important than today when governance is gathering a major share of human activity into its orbit. It is not the least of the responsibilities of our professional association to play a worthy part in stimulating and guiding the research that is imperative if such governance is to bear the stamp of intelligence and statesmanship.