

THE PROFESSION

A Further Note On The Discipline

ONE SWALLOW DOES NOT MAKE A SPRING

NORMAN WENGERT

Pennsylvania State University

One swallow does not make a Spring, particularly when seen in November. In the Winter issue of *P.S.* Professor Heinz Eulau presented data which he felt indicated the wave of the future with respect to fields of interest of members of the association. He stated “. . . ordering the fields by the size of the proportions of members in the youngest cohort . . . would tell the story. . . .”

Percentages are seldom of great significance and in this case Professor Eulau has attempted to compare percentage distributions by age in one field with percentage distributions by age in each of the remaining 26 fields. To arrive at percentages, he treats each field as a distinct universe. Thus percentages give a picture of distribution by age within a field but provide no logical basis for comparison among fields. If perchance a field had only one person in it and that person were under 40 years old, the technique used would result in a rating of 100%, and a ranking of number one.

Fortunately, Professor Eulau provided data which could be reordered by absolute numbers of political scientists indicating the several fields as their first choices. On this basis even the younger members cluster with the older, and it is noteworthy that the number of young political scientists in each of the first nine fields (the top third when ranked by numbers listing these fields as first choices) exceed by 50% to 500% the number of young political scientists in the one field which Pro-

fessor Eulau ranked first. Wave of the future indeed!

This kind of listing has limited utility for a number of reasons. Many of us list as our first field that field in which we teach most frequently and the fields we teach are indirectly, at least, influenced by student interests and demands. How else can one explain the popularity of international relations and foreign policy?

It would be more useful, perhaps, if fields of concentration were tested in terms of criteria of social relevance. Elsewhere in the Winter issue of *P.S.* data is presented which suggests that the primary role of political scientists is the teaching of more political scientists. This is a disturbing basis for the focus of attention of a discipline.

Perhaps the Political Psychologists might analyze the behavior of the young members in stimulus-response terms, not insignificant being economic and status rewards generally controlled by “the establishment” of the discipline including editors and department heads. It is interesting to speculate, in this context, on the significance and likely results of a Committee for an Exploratory Study of Graduate Education in Political Science (announced in the Winter issue of *P.S.*) to which no representatives of the great public universities have been appointed.

But enough. Here is Professor Eulau's table reordered:

FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION
OF POLITICAL SCIENTISTS
(Ranked by numbers of first choices)

Rank (By Total Nos.)	Field of Specialization	N =	No. Born Before 1930	No. Born in 1930 and After	Rank (By No. Born in 1930 and After)
1	International Politics	827	265	562	1
2	Political Parties and Elections	745	268	477	2
3	Foreign Policy	725	329	396	3
4	Administration: Organization, Processes, Behavior	573	287	286	4
5	Constitutional Law	472	251	221	7
6	Metropolitan and Urban Government and Politics	380	128	252	5
7	Legislature: Organization, Processes, Behavior	342	99	243	6
8	Historical Political Theory	318	149	169	10
9	State and Local Government and Politics	314	151	163	12
TOTALS (FIELDS 1-9)		4696	1927	2769	
10	Normative Political Theory	310	104	206	9
11	Empirical Political Theory	301	84	217	8
12	Executive: Organization, Processes, Behavior	236	118	118	13
13	Political Socialization	196	31	165	11
14	International Organization and Administration	176	103	73	19
15	Political and Constitutional History	175	106	69	21
16	National Security Policy	154	69	85	18
17	International Law	140	74	66	22
18	Revolutions and Political Violence	132	38	94	17
TOTALS (FIELDS 10-18)		1180	727	1093	
19	Judiciary: organizations, processes, behavior	130	31	99	15
20	Political Psychology	129	17	112	14
21	Methodology	125	27	98	16
22	Voting Behavior	94	24	70	20
23	Public Opinion	75	30	45	23
24	Budget and Fiscal Management	56	32	24	24
25	Administrative Law	45	30	15	26
26	Personnel Administration	44	32	12	27
27	Government Regulation of Business	43	26	17	25
TOTALS (FIELDS 19-27)		741	249	492	
GRAND TOTALS (ALL FIELDS):		7257	2903	4354	

Data from APSA Biographical Directory Survey responses, 1968.

The Editor wishes to thank those whose comments and information contributed to this article: Howard H. Hines, Director of the Social Sciences Division, National Science Foundation; Charles R. Foster of the U.S. Office of Education; and Henry W. Riecken, President of the Social Science Research Council; Heinz Eulau, Stanford University; also, political scientists who are or have been on Advisory Panels for the National Science Foundation, Frank Munger, Syracuse University; James W. Prothro, University of North Carolina; and William H. Riker, University of Rochester.

PREPARING PROPOSALS FOR FUNDED RESEARCH IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

The political scientist who wishes to conduct research needs resources. This article will discuss one way of obtaining those resources—the proposal for a grant to a funding agency, whether governmental or private. This is not intended as a guide to “grantsmanship,” or the tactics of eliciting money—although this is probably what some of the suggestions amount to—but rather a discussion of some of the considerations that the scholar should keep in mind as he plans his proposal. To the experienced proposal writer, these suggestions may be clichés, but they may help the younger or inexperienced political scientist to follow his research ideas with a proposal that may mean the difference between conducting or not conducting productive research.

The literature in most scholarly disciplines represents the work of a small proportion of the total membership in the discipline. With approximately 30,000 psychologists for example, one foundation executive estimates the creative contributors at no more than 2,000. In discussions for this article, the same type of estimate for political science ranged from 250-500 people. This is less than 10% of those professionally engaged in political science occupations who have received a doctorate, and an even smaller percentage if the total individual membership of the APSA is considered as the population. Although the size of the group of contributing scholars is not limited to a certain proportion of the discipline, the size of the group may never be great. There is no doubt, however, that the size of this group can expand. One of the ways in which the group can be expanded is by increasing the number of grant proposals from the “other 90%.”

Part of this situation is due to the socialization of students into the discipline. At institutions where the significance of support funds for study and research is recognized, students are informed and encouraged to submit applications and proposals. (Looking over the list of graduate NSF fellowships elsewhere in this issue, for instance, indicates that the larger, traditionally “prestige” institutions, received a preponderance of the fellowships.)

Some institutions now require the dissertation prospectus to be written in the format of a grant proposal. This obviously tends to acclimate the graduate student to the rigor and style—and the possibility of approval—of research proposals. One administrator describes a grant proposal as an “adult thesis project.”

The most important resource the political scientist brings to his research is himself—his intellect, his training, his energy. Productive and important research often needs no more than this. For the individual may do research in his home, office or library. But even to do this requires support for time and salary—either from the institution with which the scholar is affiliated or another source.

Increasingly, however, the scholar who sets out to investigate social phenomena needs more than simple support for living. He needs support for computer programming and machine time, travel to data sources, survey research and analysis, and research assistance.

“The heart of the matter is having an idea.” This is the way a large foundation grant administrator describes the primary criterion for the evaluation of a grant

proposal. Funded research plays an important part in the development and testing of ideas in political science, as the footnotes in the *American Political Science Review* and the prefaces to books increasingly indicate. Just as important to the individual scholar is the opportunity to gain resources to advance both the discipline and his professional career.

Every specific grant program has its own procedures for applications or proposals. Privately funded proposals are usually less demanding in format than government agency requirements, but the *substance* of the proposal is the important consideration regardless of source. Thus no "nuts and bolts" instructions appear here. These are usually available in the form of guidelines or manuals, and should be obtained from the granting institutions. Also, books such as David R. Krathwohl's *How to Prepare a Research Proposal* (Syracuse University Bookstore, \$1.00) can be consulted.

Both government and private foundations are sources of research funds. The amount of available funds allocated to political science often depends largely on the demand placed on the organization by members of the discipline. A leading example is the National Science Foundation, a major source of political science research support since NSF recognition of the discipline. The Division of Social Sciences approved 38 political science grants totaling \$788,098 from July, 1967 through June, 1968. This contrasted with 130 grants in anthropology for a total of \$3,608,630; or 47 grants in history and philosophy of science totaling \$829,000. The point is not that political science received less support while these other disciplines have many fewer members, but that fewer proposals were made, e.g. 275 in anthropology as against 94 in political science. These differences can be traced to disciplinary emphases, such as the traditional need for foundation support for the field work necessary to "commit" anthropology, or an aggressive strategy for obtaining support as in history and philosophy of science. While political scientists have sometimes complained about such figures as those above, and the disparity between the social sciences generally and other scientific divisions of the NSF (\$36,968,000 in obligations in 1968 of a total of \$505,228,000), only when proposals are received can it be said that the Foundation has had an opportunity to do more for political science.

A common feeling among political scientists who have served on NSF evaluation panels is that "there weren't enough quality proposals." While some of this feeling may be attributable to a highly developed critical sense, it is substantially accurate. These political scientists indicate that there is less need for more sympathy from the NSF than there is for more good proposals. The same may be said for the other types of NSF support, such as fellowships, which do not come under the Division of Social Sciences. The Civics Institutes sponsored by the Office of Education are subject to the same kind of competition, since there is no categorical allocation of available funds among more than 10 disciplines eligible for institute funds. The number and quality of political scientists' proposals have an important weight in the amount of funds available for them.

The broader questions of research support needs in political science have been, and are being, studied by three groups. The Advisory Committee on Government Programs in the Behavioral Sciences issued a report in 1968, *The Behavioral Sciences and the Federal Government*. The report's summary and recommendations appeared in the Fall, 1968, *P.S.* Another group is the Special Commission on the Social Sciences, established by the National Science Board in 1968. The largest undertaking was the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey, whose report will be available shortly. Activities of these groups are covered in *P.S.*

Departments and institutions benefit from grants, through overhead costs and faculty advancement, as well as individuals, but the motivation usually must come from scholars with ideas. The following suggestions may be helpful to the political scientist who wishes to translate his idea into funded research.

Be Informed

Every grant-making organization has its own system for recruiting, evaluating and deciding on proposals. The prospective researcher must often think well over a year ahead of the present. He must be concerned with deadline dates and the con-

tingencies of his own professional life. This necessitates keeping informed about the schedules of such major sources as the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Office of Education, Department of Defense, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Department of State, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the larger private organizations such as the Ford Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Social Science Research Council. Other sources which specialize in certain types or areas of research should be followed through announcements, newsletters and P.S.

Make Informal Initial Inquiries

Most grant administrators welcome the opportunity to discuss the applicability of particular programs or standards of judgment to be applied with prospective applicants. A telephone call, letter or visit may be the way to determine whether a planned proposal falls within the guidelines established for a program, or whether an initial idea about subject or method seems feasible. Direct questions about receptivity, however, will often be answered indefinitely since administrators will depend on professional advice for evaluation, and especially because *originality* is often a key consideration and the administrator does not wish to inhibit it. Annual meetings of professional associations are attended by representatives of funding organizations, and they often set aside time to talk with interested political scientists. This is a convenient setting for an exchange of information and test of ideas with these representatives.

Look Over Previous Grant Award Announcements

One way of getting the flavor of the types of research funded by an organization is to look over the lists of grants made in the past. Each organization has this type of information in press releases or annual reports, and many of these awards are announced in P.S. This method has limitations however, for it must be kept in mind that each particular list of grants awarded reflects the proposals made during a certain competitive period, and the types and quality of proposals submitted on identical subjects may vary over time, as well as emphasis on the part of the organization. The National Endowment for the Humanities, for example, is now charged with supporting significant research on current social relevance. On the other hand, some organizations like NSF resist being "fashion-conscious" like some private foundations.

Write as one Professional to another.

Write the proposal for eminent, though not aged, members of the profession. Write it as if to a respected colleague who has asked you how you will go about your project. You need not "write down," since your real audience is a group of political scientists whose own work has been substantial. Regardless of the mechanics of the evaluation process, a group of "peers" in the profession will judge the substance of the proposal. One grant administrator described the typical reviewing committee as "fair-minded and fearless." The staff criteria for reading the proposals include an appreciation of where the proposal fits into the greater scholarly and social milieu, and an awareness of the strategic problems of research.

The aim of the proposal should be to elicit this sort of statement from the evaluator, suggested by a grant administrator:

I consider this an unusually fine proposal. The questions to be dealt with are significant. The applicant lets us into his thinking enough so that we can see how his proposed work is related to the current state of knowledge as reflected in the literature. And his suggestions for work to be done seem to be feasible and show imagination and good judgment.

The research director of an institution may be helpful in obtaining information about schedules, technical requirements, and the administrative details of proposals and grants, but most funding organizations prefer to work "professional to professional" on the substance of the proposal. Avoid the "promoter" influence on proposals undertaken chiefly to enhance a school's image, but do not hesitate to utilize the research office expertise in administration.

On bibliographies, proposals are judged by the standards of the discipline. From NSF experience, economics and mathematics bibliographies are usually short, whereas in the history of science panel members usually look for "every last article." The style in political science has tended toward longer bibliographies, but this is not a necessity if the references are "relevant and recent." Empirical research proposals often have shorter bibliographies than more traditional studies. One important class of references to include are those which might be cited as work already done on the same subject.

Be Specific

A proposal with well through-out, definite and concrete objectives and methods always reflects favorably on the proposer. Most proposals are not carried through as inflexible operations, and funding agencies recognize this, but they want to know what the proposer *thinks* he will do, and that he has clear plan as to how he will *start* if he obtains the funds.

Consider the Purpose of the Program

Keep in mind the ends and objects of the grant program. Then ensure that the proposal relates its substance to these ends. An administrator in the Office of Education says, for example:

The two weakest areas of proposals that cross my desk are usually the educational translation component (how can the substantive material be best translated into useful classroom units and materials) and the evaluation of the program.

These are the elements that would relate the proposal to the program.

Do Not Assume Your Proposal Will be Cut

Anyone who works with budgets faces the decision whether to request what he "really" needs or an amount which could be pared. Most grant making organizations naturally want the former, and most take proposals at their face value. It is preferable, particularly if the applicant is younger or if it is a first application, to be "modest." In the NSF, for instance, renewal grants are made readily if the promise of the initial proposal has been confirmed through a grant.

Do Not Anticipate Rejection

If political scientists anticipate the reception their proposals will engender because of their feelings (or usually someone else's) about who funds what, they may decrease their own opportunity for funding as well as contributing to a self-fulfilling prophecy due to a decrease in the very type of applications for which support is desired. As one NSF panel member states,

. . . it is quite untrue to believe that the only form of political science to which the NSF graduate fellowship program applies is mathematical political science. Exactly to the contrary, the instructions to the panels of referees explicitly state that the judgments are meant to reflect only the individual qualifications of the applicant, and are not to be guided by any considerations of the relative need for or desirability of specified types of academic programs.

The same principle applies if one is at a small, undergraduate, black, or "non-prestige" institution. Often a feeling of being "left out" inhibits proposals which might be of high enough quality to change this situation.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON "FOREIGN RELATIONS"

Each year the State Department convenes an Advisory Committee of distinguished scholars for its document publication series, "Foreign Relations." The Advisory Committee's report for 1969 is reprinted here for the information of the profession. Members of the Committee are drawn from the APSA, the American Society of International Law, and the American Historical Association.

The publication of "Foreign Relations" has been slipping chronologically ever since World War II. In 1962 this Committee recommended that the slippage be held at not more than 20 years. During the last seven years, the series has actually fallen back to 23 years behind the dates of the documents. Unless something is done about it, this gap will steadily lengthen toward 25 and even 30 years, despite the best efforts of the Historical Office. A number of reasons appear to conspire to this end: a shortage of historian-compilers in the Historical Office, very slow clearance procedures, uncertainties and delays in contracting-out procedures for editing, among others. In the Committee's view, these problems are quite soluble with very little cost and effort. While cognizant of budgetary and related difficulties, the Committee believes that underlying these, there has been perhaps less appreciation in the Department than there

should be of the importance of the early publication of "Foreign Relations".

This series, in our view, is an opinion-molder of no little importance, particularly in the area of major international political affairs. If the 20-year rule were actually being applied, for example, this year would have witnessed the publication of the year 1948, recording in significant detail Soviet pressures on Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Publication several years ago of the 1945, 1946 and 1947 volumes might have thrown into sharper relief some of the recent writings of historians of the origins of the Cold War, "revisionist" or otherwise. The Committee believes that a fuller appreciation of the contemporary significance of earlier publication of "Foreign Relation" might well provide a climate of opinion within the Department which would be more benign to the Historical Office's problems of manpower, clearance, and editing.

Stanley D. Metzger (ASIL)
Chairman;
U.S. Tariff Commission

Inis L. Claude (APSA)
University of Virginia

Hardy C. Dillard (ASIL)
Dean, School of Law
University of Virginia

W. Stull Holt (AHA)
University of Washington

Ernest R. May (AHA)
Harvard University

Elmer Plischke (APSA)
University of Maryland

J. Wallace Sterling (AHA)
Chancellor
Stanford University

Paul L. Ward (AHA)
Executive Secretary
American Historical Association

RESEARCH ON CONGRESS

In response to comments to the Association from political scientists, Members of Congress and Congressional staff, the Editor surveyed these groups on the problems of research on Congress. The results are reported in P.S. for the information of the discipline.

A recent review of research on Congress by Robert L. Peabody (in Ralph K. Huitt and Robert L. Peabody, *Congress: Two Decades of Analysis*) noted the impact of a broad and questioning scholarly interest in Congress, particularly over the last 20 years. Programs such as the APSA Congressional Fellowships and the Study of Congress series have played a part, but the desire to study Congress has had a broad base in the discipline. One of the most marked trends in Congressional research has been the use of techniques for close observation of Congress such as participant-observation, extensive interviewing and regular attendance at Congressional proceedings. This trend reflects both the emphasis in social science research on empirical study, and an awareness by teachers and students of the opportunity for personal contact with elected officials.

One of the results of this continuing, and perhaps increasing, focus on Congress is probably inevitable in a field of study where the institution studied (unlike, for instance, local government) is unique and limited in size. That is the feeling of the subjects themselves and some scholars who are longtime students of the institution that they are being overwhelmed by the apparent popular interest in the area. Many Congressmen, Congressional staff members and researchers have perceived the corridors of the Capitol and Congressional office buildings becoming crowded with students, interns, teachers and researchers of all kinds. Not only are students more mobile and financially able to come to Washington; comments are also heard that the mail is heavy with requests for questionnaire completion, letters requiring detailed answers on legislative proposals and congressional behavior for term papers. Some scholars wonder whether academic researchers generally are not hurt by these demands, especially those of high school and undergraduate students. Congressional staffs resent completing questionnaires which their employers will never see.

But comments made in passing often reflect the circumstances in which they were made. What may seem like an avalanche to one person may not dent the attention of another. To probe the research situation on Capitol Hill, *P.S.* has informally surveyed both political scientists with experience in congressional research, and congressional offices, and the results are conveyed to political scientists here.

The situation, as seen by one thoughtful Congressman, is this.

Every year I and other members of Congress are besieged by pleas from political science students, graduate and undergraduate alike, to complete long (and often open-ended) questionnaires, to agree to 15- or 30- or 45-minute interviews on subjects having only peripheral interest for us and having no connection with our districts and for research papers we will never see, to assign staff to aid in huge data collection projects, to circulate "Dear Colleague" letters to the entire membership of the House soliciting information or assistance on research projects—and so it goes ad infinitum.

For my own part, I've always tried to satisfy reasonable demands on my time and my staff's by students, and I applaud the growing interest in public policy problems as a visible dividend of our improving educational systems. However, I must report that in recent years student requests have simply flooded my office, and the demands on my time have forced me to pick and choose between research projects not on the basis of their potential value, but rather on whether a particular request by chance fit into my busy schedule.

Political scientists asked to comment for this survey were Richard F. Fenno, University of Rochester; Randall B. Ripley, Ohio State University; and John F. Manley, University of Wisconsin. Members of Congress contacted were Gerald R. Ford, Morris K. Udall, Bill Brock, William J. Green, Lawrence J. Burton and F. Bradford Morse. Several Congressional staff members were also consulted. The survey should not be taken as "representative," but indicative. The Editor appreciates each of the responses. Although the focus was on the House of Representatives, comments in most instances are generally applicable to the Senate, although obtaining interviews is more difficult in that body.

One staff member reports receiving a questionnaire in practically every mail—though another office estimates one a week—and the common feeling is that questionnaires have been increasing over the past few years. One political scientist with much experience in Congressional research comments:

The problem lies partly with the First Amendment to the Constitution, having to do with the right of petition, free speech, etc. Every schoolboy and school girl has the Constitutional right to talk to his or her Congressmen. Teachers teaching citizenship in grades K-16 encourage the exercise of the right. And Congressmen, left to their own devices, would rather talk to any constituent than to any Ph.D. candidate in political science or professor thereof. We tend to be seen as one more claimant on their time—and a non-constituent claimant at that. More seriously,

NEW CHALLENGES IN CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH



—B. DOUGLAS HARMAN, American University

“I merely said to the Congressman that I was a student taking a survey. . .”

in the teaching of citizenship, many students—high school and college at least—are encouraged to write or talk to Congressmen for the purpose of writing papers. Congressmen lump all those who want information into one undifferentiated group. They do not distinguish professors from Ph.D. thesis writers from undergraduates from high school students. All are “writing a paper on something or other.”

Another perspective is provided by another political scientist.

By and large, I have never felt that this problem is as serious as some of my colleagues say. While the number of serious students of Congress has increased so too has the access of those who have both the stamina and financial support to engage in extended field research on Congress. What is really impressive is not that a few Congressmen are tired of seeing political scientists but that so many have become allies of those who want to understand the institution better.

Political scientists and Congressmen are agreed on at least one thing: the problems of questionnaires. One political scientist put it forcefully.

I think questionnaires are worse than useless in research on Congress. They are useless because return rates are low and in most offices a relatively low-ranking staff member answers them if they are not thrown out. Many members simply have a standing policy of discarding all of them they receive. They are worse than useless because their continued arrival antagonizes both members and staff members alike. Their use tends to make members and staff members suspicious of the entire academic enterprise as it relates to Congress and certainly can make them personally hostile to academics seeking interviews.

This view is confirmed by the remarks of Congressmen.

I would say that I answer about one-half of the questionnaires. The questionnaires that are well constructed so that the answer can be given quickly are answered. Where the questionnaire is not well constructed or the questionnaire is vague, I just don't have time to work it out.

This is often a bothersome thing for the simple reason that the questionnaires tend to be extremely detailed and lengthy and it requires considerable thought and time to answer them properly. The amount of paper work that comes into a Congressional office is staggering and often I fear questionnaires are put to the side, covered up, and have to work up to the top of the heap. Often by the time we can give them attention, they are of no use to the researcher.

If I receive a request for any written, subjective statements I generally relegate them to the circular file, primarily because they would be too much of a drain on time. If the questionnaire is short, with yes or no questions, I will probably answer it, though I expect that type of inquiry is of the least value to productive scholarship.

Congressmen respond favorably to interviews, but cannot always allot the time necessary for them.

When it has been possible for me to do so, I have enjoyed sitting down with students and answering their questions. However, that is not always possible from my standpoint, and it is not always possible for a student to be in Washington.

I think the most effective way to gain information is through interviews, the technique to which I am most apt to respond.

On the one hand, the demands on my time might force me to refuse an interview with a doctoral student writing a dissertation on Congress while, on the other, granting an interview to an undergraduate attending one of the local universities because he happens to drop in to my office at the right time.

While many Congressmen and scholars recognize the problems of congressional research, fewer have considered possible solutions. The goal of any professional effort toward dealing with these problems should be to clarify to Congressmen the different levels of research, as one of the scholars suggests.

All that we can do—and I'm not sure how to do it—is to assist the Congressman in differentiating between bonafide scholarship on Congress by Ph.D. candidates and professors from all the rest. I don't think we can coordinate this academic research on Congress or screen it or anything else. But if we could let the legislator know that there is a stratum of academic research different from all other requests for information, maybe we would be part way home in solving the problem.

Self-restraint is mentioned by political scientists, especially on the part of teachers:

I think academic political scientists should use great restraint in urging their students to travel to Washington for purposes of interviewing members of the House and Senate. Interviews are obviously useful for many studies and necessary for some studies. I would urge my colleagues to decide after long thought whether interviews on the Hill are really necessary and not just useful for their research endeavors. If they are necessary, the only course open is to plow ahead. If they are only useful, then restraint may well be in order. If and when interviewing is done, normal rules of courtesy should be observed: obtaining the appointment well in advance, informing the member or staff member of the nature and length of the interview and the use to which it will be put, trying to interview at relatively slack periods in the legislative cycle, thanking the interviewee with a short note afterwards, etc. Obviously interviews should be undertaken only when the interviewer is ready. By this I mean, for example, that an interviewer should get *all* that he can from documents and other printed materials before conducting the interview.

I myself will not allow an undergraduate to go to Washington to interview legislators. Insofar as I can I discourage graduate students from interviewing legislators unless they are writing Ph.D. theses.

And a Congressman suggested that teaching political scientists discourage

students, and especially undergraduates, from seeking special assistance with research projects from Congressional offices. I would suggest as a general rule that instructors urge students writing term papers on topics relating to Congressional activity to choose topics which can be thoroughly researched at local libraries. Perhaps the most egregious demand on Congressional time is presently made by undergraduates who commonly ask for detailed political and legislative analyses relating to term paper topics.

Another suggestion, made by a Congressman, is for a review committee

which would review all proposals made by graduate and post-graduate researchers which concern Congress and require the assistance of Congressman and their staffs. The committee (possibly, two political scientists and a Congressman or Congressional staffer) would review all research proposals and make judgments as to their potential academic value and relation to how much time and effort they would require on the part of Congressional offices.

This is similar to the idea, periodically discussed by Congressional scholars, of having an omnibus questionnaire circulated periodically to Members of Congress, which would include questions submitted by researchers to a committee of scholars.

Most Congressmen do not follow the political science literature, and many undoubtedly have a limited notion of what researchers seek.

Some of the research is obviously better in quality and in terms of its contribution to knowledge. But I don't think I have seen enough to pass judgement.

As to the value of the information gathered, much of it is doubtless valuable, but often one gets the impression that whoever framed the questions was not too familiar with political realities and everyday conditions in politics.

One suggestion on this point from both Congressional and scholarly groups is that students provide, out of courtesy, information on the outcome of their research to those they questioned.

In conclusion, whether anything could be done to "organize" Congressional research is doubtful. Scholars develop their own techniques for successful research, and would resist attempts to limit their efforts. On the other hand, a sensitivity and awareness of possible problems may reduce their negative impact on future research. As one scholar summarized,

Only by husbanding the scarce resource of Congressional good will and accessibility can political scientists hope to continue some lines of research on Congress. And only if academic political scientists take the necessary responsibility will this husbanding be successfully achieved.

PENN GRADUATE PROGRAM

The University of Pennsylvania has received a grant of \$100,000 from the National Science Foundation in support of a revised Ph.D. program developed by the Department of Political Science. Its purpose is to provide broader instruction in new methods of political analysis and to enable students to gain greater first-hand experience in independent research under direction of the faculty. The new curriculum was initiated on a transitional basis during 1968-69 and is now fully in effect.

The program was designed to remedy certain deficiencies which were believed to characterize predoctoral studies in political science at the University of Pennsylvania and most other universities. A self-analysis undertaken by the Department of Political Science during 1966-68 highlighted several problems. The existing program, it was felt, gave Ph.D. candidates insufficient preparation for research. The traditional field structure had become increasingly irrelevant, and there was an over-reliance on formal courses. Such subdivisions as comparative government, American government, and international relations were open to criticism for being atheoretical and for failing to represent the context in which research was actually conducted. Formal courses all too frequently embodied an authority relationship that was inimical to the involvement of students in the process of inquiry.

The structure of the new program makes it possible to incorporate new methods of political analysis and newly discovered knowledge more readily into the curriculum. It also enables each student to design his own course of study

and determine his own professional identification.

One innovation is the elimination of all but a handful of formal graduate courses. Instead of taking courses, predoctoral students work with faculty members in directed reading and research programs, either individually or in small groups. This pattern of student-faculty relations not only permits students to engage in individually tailored programs of study but also gives them apprenticeship research experience.

A second major change is a substantially increased exposure to the modes of political analysis and to the political concepts employed by researchers currently doing much of the significant work in political science. During each semester of the first two years, students attend a weekly Colloquium which deals with fundamental intellectual problems facing the discipline. Members of the Pennsylvania faculty, as well as visiting lecturers, address Colloquium participants on such topics as systems analysis, process analysis, mathematical modeling, and policy analysis. Faculty members also conduct three-to-five-week Symposia, which focus on major concepts in political science (e.g., conflict, consensus, decision-making, political culture, and urbanization) and are open to all graduate students and faculty.

The preliminary examination for the Ph.D. degree, usually taken after the completion of two years of graduate study, no longer emphasizes fixed subfields of political science, such as American government, public administration, and international relations. Instead students are examined over conceptual and sub-

stantive areas of their own choosing, subject to prior approval by the faculty.

In the third year, students normally spend half their time as teaching or research assistants, the remaining half being devoted to independent study. The fourth year is given over to writing the doctoral dissertation. The current enrollment for graduate study in political science at Pennsylvania is approximately 100. Oliver P. Williams is chairman of the department. Henry Wells is Director of Graduate Studies.

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER

The Cross-National Program

Recently, there has been a growing interest in cross-national research using survey techniques. One of the most extensive research programs of this sort—the Cross-National Program in Political and Social Change—has moved its home base to NORC. Sidney Verba, the director of the program, and Norman Nie have both moved from Stanford University to the University of Chicago, where they are members of the Department of Political Science and Senior Study Directors at NORC.

The Cross-National Program is a collaborative research project involving groups in three other countries: the University of Ibadan in Nigeria, the University of Tokyo in Japan, and the Center for the Study of Developing Societies in New Delhi, India. The field work in the United States was done by NORC. The main purpose of the Cross-National Program is to study processes of political development in the four participating nations—India, Japan, Nigeria, and the U.S. The main research interests are on such questions as: What kind of people become interested and active in the political life of their nations? What modes of political participation do they use? What channels of access are available and are used in contacting the government? And what are the types of needs and problems that citizens are likely to take to the government? This study is carried out in four widely differing nations in order to find whether there are uniformities in processes of political development across such wide cultural and developmental gaps. In each of the participating nations, approximately 2,500 interviews were conducted with a cross-section sample of the population, as well as interviews with a sample of local political leaders in the communities from which the cross-section samples were drawn. In addition,

information of a noninterview nature about these communities was gathered. In this way the attitudes and behavior of respondents can be linked to characteristics of their environments, and the attitudes of leaders and ordinary citizens can be linked to each other. The program is organized as a fully cooperative venture among the four national groups involved. The theoretical framework, the research design, the research administration, and the data analysis have been the joint responsibilities of the participating groups.

The field work has been completed in the four nations and data analysis is currently in progress. There is also some possibility that the research program will be expanded to other countries. This program will bring NORC into closer contact with research groups engaged in similar work in other nations.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), originally developed at Stanford University, is now being maintained and distributed through NORC. SPSS is an integrated system of computer programs for the analysis of social science data. It is designed to provide the social scientist with a unified and comprehensive package enabling him to perform many different types of data analyses in the most convenient way and with a great deal of flexibility in data format. SPSS provides a comprehensive set of procedures for data transformation and general file manipulation and offers a large number of statistical routines commonly used in the social sciences.

Besides the usual descriptive statistics, simple frequency distributions, and cross-tabulations, SPSS contains procedures for simple and partial correlations, multiple regressions, and Guttman scaling. The factor analysis program is undergoing final debugging and is scheduled for release late this summer. The data management facilities, which can be used to permanently modify a file of data and can also be used in conjunction with any of the statistical procedures, enable the user to generate variable transformations, recode variables, sample, select, or weight specified cases and to add to or alter the data or file defining the information.

SPSS is fully operational and is currently in use at twenty-six universities and research organizations. At the present time the system is operational for IBM 360's, model 40 and above. However, Northwestern University is in the process of converting SPSS to CDC

6000 series equipment, and an exportable system completely compatible with the 360 version is scheduled for release by October 1, 1969.

SPSS has a user's manual, which is a complete instructional guide to the system and makes it easily accessible to users with no prior computer experience. The manual will

be published by McGraw-Hill in Spring, 1970. A preliminary version is available for \$6 from NORC. The IBM 360 version of the system can be purchased, including one-year maintenance and service. For further information, contact Patrick Bova, Librarian, NORC, University of Chicago.

Volume X
Number 1
January-March 1969

Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia

Decimo anno. — Camillo Pellizzi, *Materiali per una sistematica della sociolinguistica.* — Paolo Ammassari, *La mobilità ascendente nella società avanzata.* — Enrico Ressiga Vacchini, *A proposito del fenomeno dell'autorità.*

NOTE E DIBATTITI: Bruno Rizzi, *La contestazione marxista ed i suoi precursori.* — Giacomo Sani, *C'è davvero bisogno di una nuova sociologia politica?*

RICERCHE: Thomas H. Greene, *Il partito comunista in Italia e in Francia.*

SEGNALAZIONI BIBLIOGRAFICHE.

ENGLISH SUMMARIES.

Published four times a year by Società editrice il Mulino, Via S. Stefano 6, Bologna (Italy). Annual subscription: Lit. 6.000 or the equivalent in other currencies.

PROFESSIONAL NOTES

ORGANIZATIONS

Groups of political scientists are invited to submit statements about their organizations. The following statements have been received.

CAUCUS FOR A NEW POLITICAL SCIENCE

The Caucus for a New Political Science is an organization of political scientists within the American Political Science Association. It was founded at the 1967 APSA convention in Chicago in the conviction that the program of that convention amply illustrated the degree to which the APSA itself, its journal, and the political science profession generally had come to neglect the political and social problems and crises of the day.

The objective of the Caucus is the reformation of American political science. It hopes to stimulate a redirection of the scholarly energies of the profession into a sustained and critical concern for what is happening in America today. To this end, the Caucus believes that the organization and workings of the APSA must come up for thorough and critical examination. The Caucus is not committed to any orthodoxy, either in political ideology or methodological persuasion. It believes only that, in the light of our contemporary situation, political scientists should be asking serious, even shocking, questions—questions which for too long went unasked, much less answered.

Since its founding, the Caucus has sponsored, first for the 1968 convention and again for the 1969 convention, programs of panels of its own devising. It has also sponsored resolutions submitted to the APSA business meetings. The most notable of these was an amendment to the APSA Constitution charging it with promoting study of critical issues in politics and society, no matter how subject these might be to partisan discourse in the community at large. This year the Caucus plans to submit a slate challenging the official nominees for the elective offices of the Association. The Caucus has also issued from time to time a newsletter for its more than 800 members.

The Caucus is governed by business meetings held during the course of APSA Conventions. Between conventions its affairs are

managed by an executive committee whose current membership is:

M. Brownstein (Yale), A. Gottfried (U. of Washington), P. Green (Smith), R. Hawkins (Fordham), R. Hummel (Fordham), H. Kariel (Hawaii), D. Kettler (Ohio State), S. Levinson (Ohio State), L. Lipsitz (North Carolina), T. Lowi (Chicago), C. McCoy (Lehigh), J. McDermott (New University Conference), P. Minkoff (City U. of N. Y.), D. Morris (Inst. for Policy Studies), M. Parenti (Yale), H. M. Roelofs (NYU), J. Rothschild (CCNY), M. Surkin (Adelphi), M. Walzer (Harvard), A. Wolfe (SUNY-Old Westbury).

The Caucus will have a headquarters at the 1969 convention where memberships can be taken out or renewed. Dues are from \$5.00 to \$10.00 according to ability to pay.

The current address of the Caucus is: Caucus for a New Political Science, Department of Politics, University College, NYU, University Heights, Bronx, N. Y. 10453.

AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR THE POPULAR VOTE AMENDMENT

The Ad Hoc Committee for the Popular Vote Amendment has been formed. The co-chairmen of the Committee are Stephen K. Bailey, Lucius Barker, Samuel Cook, David Fellman, Donald G. Herzberg, Samuel C. Paterson, and James A. Robinson.

The purpose of the Committee is to gather support for the changes in the APSA Constitution proposed by Donald G. Herzberg and a number of other political scientists. These changes are designed to prevent any minority at any time from capturing control of the Association through an unrepresentative business meeting attended by a small fraction of the members.

The Ad Hoc Committee has already attracted a large membership. At the Convention in September, they will have a suite of offices. Anyone wishing further information or who wishes to help, should contact the Committee at their suite upon registering at the Convention, or write to the Committee at Box 200, 4401 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016.

CONFERENCE FOR DEMOCRATIC POLITICS

The Conference for Democratic Politics (CDP) is nonpartisan. Its principal objectives are to (a) encourage meaningful dialogue and (b) investigate problems associated with the maintenance of democratic institutions. Our concerns in these respects are both national and international.

Though George W. Carey has assumed to duties of acting secretary, CDP has no formal organization. Professors Edna R. Fluegel, Walter D. Jacobs, James P. McClellan, and Stanley Parry (those who joined in urging the Executive Council to allow the CDP panels) have served as an advisory council. We have invited Karl A. Wittfogel and Gordon Tullock to participate with us in drafting some procedures whereby we can allow for broader participation and representation of those inter-

ested in the goals and purposes of CDP. James B. Williams of Ohio State University will serve as our graduate student representative. For further information, write in care of George W. Carey, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. 20007.

We seek to provide members of the APSA with panels of the highest caliber. We are dedicated to preserving the professional integrity of the Association. We *will* resist the efforts of factions intent upon dominating our Association at the expense of our professional goals.

On behalf of those who have helped to launch CDP, let me take this opportunity to extend our profound thanks to the many members of our profession who have offered their assistance and moral support. The response to CDP has been overwhelming. Without the help of so many, our task would have been impossible.

NATIONAL AUDIOVISUAL CENTER

The National Audiovisual Center is the recently established Federal Government audiovisual service facility in Washington, D.C. The Center serves as the principal information, sales, and distribution coordinating point for most Government audiovisual materials, including motion pictures, film strips, slide sets, audio and video tapes, and special audiovisual packets. As a central information point, the Center is the main contact between the general public and the Government regarding what audiovisual materials are available from Federal agencies and where and how they can be obtained. Detailed information is gathered on all relevant materials produced by or for the Federal agencies, and is made available on request to the agencies, educational institutions, commercial companies, and individuals.

The Center will also function as a central sales and distribution point for completed audiovisual items. Copies of most U.S. Government motion pictures, film strips, slide sets, language tapes, and many other audiovisual materials may be purchased from this one place. Over 5,000 U.S. Government motion pictures and film strips are described in a sales catalog that will be available from the National Audiovisual Center in August. Most of these films can be useful in educational, training, and informational programs. For information write to the Center at the National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20409.

DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATIVE COMPUTER SYSTEM

The Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, has issued a description of the "Preparation of Committee Calendars by Computer." The description is by Walter Kravitz, of the American National Government division. The first user of the system is the House Banking and Currency Committee, and the publication discusses that arrangement as a possible forerunner to wider usage.

Another LRS study of interest to Scholars is "Technical Information for Congress" sponsored by Rep. Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Connecticut), Chairman of a House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development.

EDUCATION RESEARCH JOURNAL

The American Educational Research Association announces a major change in the editorial policy of the *Review of Educational Research*. Effective immediately, the *Review* will publish unsolicited manuscripts of a review nature on topics of the contributor's own choosing. Authors, who need not be AERA members, are free to define areas for review as they choose. Manuscripts will be referred to experts in the field under review, and will be judged on the basis of readership interest and on their representation of a scholarly integration and critique of published research. Articles will be published in the order of their acceptance. Persons wishing to submit review manuscripts for consideration for publication should write for directions to Gene V. Glass, Editor, *Review of Educational Research*, Laboratory of

Educational Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

URBAN SIMULATION AT ANNUAL MEETING

At the September Annual Meeting, political scientists will be able to play the game City II. The game will be presented by Envirometrics, Inc., of Washington, D.C., a non-profit research organization. The game has potential for both research and teaching. It is a computer-assisted simulation of the economic, social and political development of an urban area. The game will be played in the demonstration area at the Meeting. Those interested in signing up to play the game should contact Peter House or R.D.B. Laime, Envirometrics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. Manuals for play will be distributed at the Meeting.

PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS—1969 ANNUAL MEETING

A representative of the National Endowment for the Humanities will be available at the Annual Meeting for consultation and advice on Endowment programs for political scientists.

The National Science Foundation will also have representatives at the Meeting to discuss NSF programs for which political scientists are eligible.

In addition to the representative from the National Endowment and the NSF Information Center, the U.S. Office of Education will be represented at the Meeting. Those interested in contacting representatives should check the Final Program for details.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SOCIETY

Community development educators and practitioners are organizing an individual membership association for the advancement of the community development profession. The new association will be known as the Community Development Society. Its purposes are:

- advancement of the community development profession;
- provide a forum for the exchange of ideas;
- provide a medium for the publication of professional, scholarly work; and
- provide opportunity for the development of common interests among members.

Membership is \$10.00 for the calendar year and is open to anyone interested in community development as a profession. For information, write to the Society at 909 University Avenue, Columbia, Missouri 65201.

CONFERENCE ON COMMUNIST STUDIES

At noon on September 4, as part of the APSA Annual Meeting, the Conference on Communist Studies will hold a luncheon with the speaker Robert Scalapino, University of California, Berkeley. He will speak on "Asian Communism Revisited." If interested, contact John Lewis, Stanford University.

SOCIAL HISTORY JOURNAL

The *Journal of Social History*, now in its second year of publication, is eager to consider any work in the field of social history, broadly defined, regardless of area or time period. In addition to the standard monographic article, we are open to: articles on methodology or on work in progress; review articles on books on a relevant general topic; articles by graduate students and summaries of relevant dissertations; summaries of bulletins or newsletters or of the work of institutes in the field of social history; letters or comments on articles in the *Journal* or elsewhere or on other relevant matters. The *Journal* is always grateful for suggestions of books to review, including books in the social sciences that might not ordinarily come to the notice of historians, or of themes around which several articles might be grouped. The *Journal* is particularly interested in contributions of any sort by non-historians interested in social history; we would like to help bridge in practice the sort of disciplinary gap that is so often lamented in principle.

The address is Box 3009, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. 08903.

FOREIGN POLICY RECORDS ACCESS

The Department of state has temporarily modified its procedures for granting access to formerly classified foreign policy records of the years 1939, 1940, and 1941. Previous procedures would permit scholars access to records 30 years old, which would thereby open foreign policy records through 1938. The new arrangements would treat the years 1939, 1940, and 1941 as though they were in the "open period." The records are under the administrative control of the National Archives and may be consulted in accordance with its standard procedures.

For access to records of the years 1942-45, scholars who are American citizens may apply to the Director of the Historical Office, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

FACULTY GROUP FORMED

An organization to be called the College and University Faculty of America has been announced by its temporary chairman, Kenneth Hoffman, Morehead State University. Its purposes are to secure the recognition and appreciation of institutional and faculty accomplishments; to promote self study and orderly change of colleges and universities; to foster the development of faculty responsibility as a professional characteristic; and to encourage the use of study groups, advisory bodies, democratic processes and the seeking of consensus as part of the process of change. For information write to the temporary chairman at Morehead State University, Box 728, Morehead, Kentucky 40351.

WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS

Among the 18 new White House Fellows announced recently were three political scientists: they are Michael H. Armacost, Pomona College; W. Landis Jones, University of Louisville; and George S. Wills, Public Relations Director, Johns Hopkins University. The White House Fellows are selected annually to work as special assistant to cabinet and White House officials, and meet with speakers knowledgeable about national government and political issues.

ROPER CENTER

The Newsletter of the Roper Public Opinion Center, at Williams College, has announced that several data sets of the Center's holdings have been recoded and sprayed, eliminating multiple punch coding. Also included is a description of the Center's cooperative Survey Library Association, and recent data acquisitions.

Information on the Center, and its publications, services and procedures, can be obtained from the Roper Public Opinion Research Center, Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts.

EAGLETON MARKS TENTH YEAR

To note its tenth year as the Eagleton Institute of Politics, the Institute has issued the booklet "Ten To Grow On." This publication describes the history, activities and programs of the Institute and its role in training people for practical political service. The booklet, and further information, may be obtained by writing Director, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers—The State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

ARMS POLICY STUDY GROUP

Kermit Gordon, President of the Brookings Institution, and Joseph E. Johnson, President of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, have announced the formation of a Strategic Arms Policy Study Group under the joint sponsorship of the two organizations. Its object will be to stimulate the search for policies regarding both unilateral U.S. strategic arms decisions and U.S.-U.S.S.R. arms control negotiations that not only fulfill security requirements but also decrease the risk of nuclear war and avoid waste of U.S. resources.

The Study Group will be composed of about twenty-five persons from Congress, the executive branch, private industry, and academic and research institutions. Beginning in June it will meet over a period of about two years to engage in private discussions on a series of issues outlined by the study director and other experts in military technology, strategy, arms control, and resource management.

The Study Group's deliberations will be primarily designed to illuminate issues and to stimulate informed discourse. The resulting publications will be the sole responsibility of the study director and other individual authors. The group will not be asked to assume collective responsibility for the published findings or to reach a consensus. Reports will be published under the joint sponsorship of Carnegie and Brookings.

Harold Brown, President of the California Institute of Technology and formerly Secretary of the Air Force, will serve as chairman of the group, and Franklin Lindsay, President of Itek Corporation, as vice chairman. Herbert Scoville, Jr., formerly Assistant Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and presently Director of the Carnegie Endowment Arms Control Program, will be the Study Director. Other members include A. Doak Barnett, Brookings Institution; George W. Rathgens, MIT; and Marshall D. Shulman, Columbia University.

DEVELOPING NATIONS COLLECTIONS

Central Michigan University has published the "Guide to the Dag Hammarskjöld Collection on Developing Nations," a selected bibliography of the Collection's holdings. The collection is part of Central Michigan's Interdisciplinary Program on the Developing Nations. A brochure describing the program is also available. Write to Ihor Kamenetsky, Chairman, Committee on Developing Nations, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48858.

LOUIS HARRIS CENTER

The Louis Harris Political Data Center, University of North Carolina, now has over 150 election studies representing an investment of several million dollars. The Center's most recent acquisitions came from Independent Research Associates, a firm in Washington. The contribution consists of 14 studies conducted in six states during political races in 1967-68. The Center is the official repository for survey data compiled by the Louis Harris firm. Further information is available from the Louis Harris Political Data Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

ICPR REPORT

The Inter-University Consortium for Political Research has issued a biennial report covering its fifth and sixth years, 1966-68. The report describes the broadening of the base of participating institutions and scholars, the use of the research facility by historians, the various seminars and training programs sponsored by the ICPR and Survey Research Center, and the growth of the data repository. For further information about its programs, write to the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

MISSOURI ASSOCIATION

Officers for the Missouri Political Science Association for 1969 are: President, Erwina Godfrey; Vice-President, Robert S. Sullivan; Secretary-Treasurer, Robert F. Karsch; Executive Council, above officers and Harold Sunoo, Senior Member, and DeLores J. Williams, Junior Member. The MPSA issues a semiannual newsletter which includes bibliographies of publications by its members, and works about Missouri politics. The annual fall meeting of the MPSA will be held at Holiday Inn, Lake Ozark, Missouri on October 17-18. Program chairman is DeLores J. Williams, Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Missouri 63301. Suggestions for program, including volunteering for papers and discussant roles, should be made to the Program Chairman.

READINGS SELECTION AVAILABLE

A 71 page booklet entitled "Specialists and Generalists" has been compiled by the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations of the Senate Government Operations Committee. Authors included range from Thucydides through Don K. Price. The booklet is available from the Subcommittee.

NEW JOURNAL

Authority in Crisis is published by political scientists at the University of Missouri, Columbia. "It comes into existence not just to duplicate the multitude of already existing general political science journals. Rather, we exist as an outlet for the writer who does not want to be bound by the conventions of style and content imposed by other journals."

Contributions are invited from students and faculty members in all disciplines. Scholarly articles of any style, personal commentaries concerning authority in our time, book reviews, political cartoons, and letters are invited. Length is limited to 15 pages—typed, double-spaced. Submit two copies. Write to Editor, *Authority in Crisis*, Department of Political Science, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65201. Issues are \$1.25 each. Annual subscriptions, three issues, \$3.75.

CHICAGO CIRCLE OFFERS M.A.

Starting in September 1969 the Department of Political Science at the Chicago Circle Campus of the University of Illinois will be beginning its Master of Arts Program. The major fields of specialization will be American Government, and Public Administration. An integrated group of courses on urban politics will be offered complementary to the major fields.

HARRIS DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

The Joseph P. Harris Dissertation Fellowship in Public Affairs has been established at the University of Kansas, through funds made available by Joseph P. Harris, professor emeritus, University of California, Berkeley, and a graduate of the University of Kansas.

GOVERNMENT AND PRESERVATION

A special issue of *Preservation News*, publication of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, has been issued on "Government and Preservation." The May, 1969, publication is available from the National Trust, 748 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE

The Department of Government at Indiana University will become the Department of Political Science on September 1, 1969.

GERMAN CONFERENCE GROUP ACTIVITIES

The Conference Group on German Politics, formed in 1968, has begun a *Newsletter* for its members. The first issue, May 1969, contains news of the Group's June Conference on "The West German Polity, 1969: The Parties, the Coalition, the Election." The conference, held in Eichholz near Bonn, West Germany, was devoted to exploration of political trends in West Germany twenty years after the founding of the Federal Republic. Attended by over eighty American and German political scientists, sessions and their planned chairmen were: "Constitutional Issues and the Grand Coalition," Carl Friedrich, Harvard and Heidelberg Universities; "The Party System and the Grand Coalition," Karl D. Bracher, University of Bonn; "The West German Electorate," Karl Deutsch, Harvard University; "The Internal Conditions of Foreign Policy," John Herz, City University of New York; "Dissent, the Society and the Political System," Kurt Sontheimer, University of Berlin.

The next meeting of the Conference Group will be held in conjunction with the Annual Meeting of the Association in New York. As part of the Group's service to members, Jeff Fishel, American University, has compiled a list, issued as a printout, of current research on German politics. Membership information can be obtained from the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles R. Foster, 200 C Street, Washington, D.C. 20003. Annual dues are \$3. Chairman of the Group is George K. Romoser, University of New Hampshire.

OLD DOMINION APSA MEMBERSHIP AWARDS

The Political Science Club of Old Dominion College initiated this year annual awards to the outstanding man and woman graduates in political science. The awards carry a year's membership in the Association. Recipients in 1969 were Richard Barry Dodson and Suzanne Beane.

GOSNELL DINNER

Those interested in attending a dinner in honor of Harold Gosnell at the Association's Annual Meeting, on September 2, should contact Frank J. Sorauf, University of Minnesota.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SERVICE

The Universal Reference System has announced a complete bibliographic service encompassing the ten major fields in the political and behavioral sciences. The service includes a ten-volume set of computerized bibliographies covering significant titles from the past, and a continuing series of quarterly Cumulative Supplements which update the service.

Books, journal and review articles, pamphlets and papers are individually annotated, then deeply indexed using the Grazian Index System developed by Alfred de Grazia. The material is then systematically organized by a computer.

Information is available from the Universal Reference System, 32 Nassau Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08450.