

take. The group, which began its sessions in mid-June, includes the following political scientists: Werner Levi of the University of Minnesota; George Belknap of the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan; Harold Engle, graduate student and former instructor at Columbia University; and R. W. Van Wagenen, director of the Center. The other members of the group are a social psychologist, an anthropologist, and a philosopher.

The second annual conference of the American Association for the United Nations was held in Chicago, February 17-19, 1952. Attended by delegates from approximately one hundred national organizations, including educational, agricultural, business, labor, youth, fraternal and women's groups, the

conference had as its general theme "United States Responsibility for World Leadership in 1952: A Profession of Faith and a Call to Action." Sessions were held on collective security, disarmament, peaceful settlement of international disputes, technical assistance to underdeveloped areas, and the position of the United States in world affairs. Among the political scientists who participated in the program were: Ralph J. Bunche, director of the United Nations Trusteeship Division; Quincy Wright, professor of international law, University of Chicago; Clyde Eagleton, professor of international law, New York University; and Clarence Berdahl, professor of political science, University of Illinois. The conference was addressed by Senator Blair Moody of Michigan and Senator Ralph Flanders of Vermont.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

The *Institut fuer Sozialforschung* was formally reopened at the University of Frankfurt on November 14, 1951. It had been forced to suspend its activities in Germany during the Nazi regime, and its headquarters were moved to the United States. Reestablished as an autonomous body affiliated with the University of Frankfurt, it will occupy a new building, the funds for which were made available by the American High Commission, the City of Frankfurt, The Government of Hesse, and private sources. The international aspects of its activities were stressed in the dedication ceremony. The major research projects on which it will be engaged in the immediate future will relate to the intellectual and emotional effects of the Nazi period on Germany, German attitudes toward America, and the impact of foreign propaganda on postwar Germany. The director of the *Institut* is Max Horkheimer, professor of philosophy and sociology, and currently rector, of the University of Frankfurt.

A seminar on "Methodology in the Social Sciences" was conducted at the University of Utah during January, February and March, 1952. Opened to faculty members and graduate students in the various social science disciplines, the seminar included faculty members of the departments of anthropology, economics, geography, history, law, philosophy, political science and sociology. The status of methodology was reported on for each of the several disciplines. In addition, papers, followed by discussions, were presented on such

topics as "Methodological Positivism" and "Statistical Method in Social Science." The seminar was under the direction of G. Homer Durham of the University of Utah.

Acting in response to a suggestion from a Committee on the Mathematical Training of Social Scientists, the Social Science Research Council is sponsoring a small group to work during the summer of 1952 on the preparation of problem and source material for the mathematical training of social scientists. This group will attempt to compile from the literature of the various social sciences lists of problems, extracts from sources, and references to sources that illustrate varieties of uses of mathematics in the social sciences. Among the ends which are expected to be served by the lists are those of providing mathematicians with material for use in texts and courses designed for social scientists, affording an indication of the general dimensions of the mathematical training appropriate for students of the social sciences now and in the future, and facilitating the study of mathematics by social scientists for whom organized courses are not available.

Composed largely of representatives of professional associations in the social sciences, the Committee on the Mathematical Training of Social Scientists has already been at work for some time. This Committee has made an appeal for suggestions from persons in the various social science disciplines to aid the summer work group. Although the Committee has indicated that it does not wish to limit the suggestions to specific types of material, it

has expressed a preference for the placing of greater emphasis on materials relating to the use of mathematics in the social sciences than on materials relating to statistics. The Committee has also indicated that it desires to be informed of places where programs of mathematical training intended for social scientists are now in existence or in process of development, and of places where mathematics at the level of calculus or higher is required for undergraduate or graduate courses in the social sciences or may be substituted for another requirement for a degree in a social science.

If mailed before August 15, information or suggestions intended for the Committee or the summer work group should be sent to Professor William G. Madow, the Committee chairman, Baker Library, Hanover, New Hampshire. After August 15, the address should be the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

The University of Michigan is sponsoring a special six-weeks summer program on the general subject of political science in the high school curriculum. The program, under the direction of Phillips Bradley of Syracuse University, is designed to aid social studies teachers in high schools. Separate workshops in connection with the program are being conducted by Henry Bretten, Arthur W. Bromage, Samuel J. Eldersveld and Joseph E. Kallenbach, all of the University of Michigan.

The Social Science Research Council is sponsoring a summer faculty seminar at Northwestern University on research and analysis in comparative government. Participants in the seminar include Karl W. Deutsch of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harry Eckstein of Harvard University, Kenneth W. Thompson of the University of Chicago, Robert E. Ward of the University of Michigan, and George I. Blanksten of Northwestern University. The seminar is under the immediate direction of Roy Macridis of Northwestern University.

A study of school governmental relations is being conducted at Stanford University under the direction of Robert A. Walker of the department of political science. The study is being conducted under a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, and is a part of the Pacific Southwest Project in School Administrator Education, which is centered in the School of Education at Stanford. Carl F. Stover,

who has been serving as a teaching assistant at Stanford, has been appointed as research assistant for the study.

A study of administrative factors influencing technical assistance to underdeveloped areas is being conducted at Stanford University as part of a Stanford program of research in social change, which is being carried forward under a grant from the Ford Foundation. The study is under the direction of Robert A. Walker of Stanford, while Richard F. Crabbs has been appointed as research assistant for the study.

H. Arthur Steiner, professor of political science at the University of California (Los Angeles), delivered a series of three lectures on Chinese communism and American foreign policy at the University of Utah in January, 1952. The lectures were delivered under the auspices of the Institute of Government at the University of Utah.

The Honorable J. Ruben Clark, Jr., former United States undersecretary of state and a member, since 1933, of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints, delivered the fourth annual Pi Sigma Alpha lecture at the University of Utah on February 13, 1952. The lecture, entitled "Our Dwindling Sovereignty," was sponsored by the local chapter of Pi Sigma Alpha and the Institute of Government of the University of Utah.

Edward S. Corwin, professor emeritus of Princeton University, lectured during the spring term of 1951-52 at the New School for Social Research and the New York University School of Law on the history of American constitutional interpretation. His audience at New York University comprised the newly arrived group of Root-Tilden scholars.

"Africa and the Modern World" was the topic of a series of five weekly lectures given in Chicago during March and April, 1952, under the joint sponsorship of Northwestern University and the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. Lecturers for the series were Melville Herskovits, professor of anthropology and director of the African Study Center at Northwestern University; William R. Bascom, associate professor of anthropology; Roland Young, associate professor of political science at Northwestern University and consultant to the United States Atomic Energy Commis-

sion; and Charles Fuller, Methodist missionary to Africa.

James Watson, executive director of the National Civil Service League, delivered a series of lectures at Florida State University during the week beginning March 17, 1952. The topics for the lectures were: "The Citizen's View of Civil Service," "Major Public Relations Problems Regarding Civil Service," and "A General Review of the Federal Personnel Administration Picture Today."

George B. Galloway, senior specialist in the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, gave the James Lecture at the University of Illinois, April 3, 1952, on the subject, "Next Steps in Congressional Reform." The James Lecture, in memory of Edmund James, former president of the University of Illinois, is given annually on some aspect of American government.

Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago delivered a series of six lectures under the auspices of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions at the University of Chicago between March 26 and April 4, 1952. The lectures were on the general topic, "From Political Philosophy to Political Religion."

John H. Hallowell of Duke University delivered a series of six public lectures under the auspices of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions at the University of Chicago, April 7-18, 1952. The general title of the lectures was "The Moral Foundations of Democracy."

Federal Judge Luther W. Youngdahl, former governor of Minnesota, was the principal speaker for the annual political emphasis week at Macalester College, April 27 to May 3, 1952. A mock national party nominating convention was an additional feature of the program.

Francis W. Coker, professor emeritus of Yale University, was awarded the LL.D. degree at the winter quarter convocation of Ohio State University.

PROPOSAL FOR NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS IN 1954

At its meeting in San Francisco, August 27, 1951, the Association's Committee on Political Parties adopted a statement recommending

that the Democratic and Republican National Conventions decide in 1952 to meet again in 1954. This statement had been prepared by a subcommittee consisting of Clarence A. Berdahl, University of Illinois, chairman; Hugh A. Bone, University of Washington; and Paul T. David, The Brookings Institution.

The statement was issued to the press on October 15, 1951, and was also brought directly to the attention of various political leaders, including President Truman and the chairmen of the two major party National Committees.

At a press conference soon after, President Truman stated that he had the proposal under consideration. On February 26, 1952, in a letter to Congressman Jacob K. Javits, President Truman commented on the problem of maintaining democracy within each party, and then endorsed the proposal for off-year conventions in the following statement: "It also seems to me that it would be an excellent idea to provide for holding National Party Conventions in the off years as well as in the Presidential years. Such a Convention would provide a platform for Congressmen and Senators running in the off years."

Chairman Gabrielson of the Republican National Committee commented on the proposal as follows in a letter to the Association dated October 16, 1951: "I shall be happy to present your proposal on the 1954 Convention to the Committee on Rules of the National Committee when it is appointed and recommend that the committee members give it careful study. I am sure you realize, however, that there are many important factors to be considered in connection with holding a National Convention in other than a presidential election year. Your committee's interest in seeking to promote greater party effectiveness is commendable, and I appreciate receiving your proposals directed toward that objective."

Chairman McKinney of the Democratic National Committee discussed the proposal in a letter dated April 24, 1952, to Senator Hubert Humphrey. He commented in part as follows: "Obviously, there are administrative and technical problems involved in the holding of more frequent national conventions. One of these is the expense of such an undertaking. Yet the plan undoubtedly has much merit."

Senator Estes Kefauver favored the proposal and discussed it at some length in an article in the *New York Times Magazine* of

Sunday, March 16, 1952. He speculated on what would have happened if national conventions had been held in the summer of 1950, and observed:

"Whatever the specific decisions, several major results would have occurred. The conventions would have dramatized the *national* importance of the Congressional elections of 1950. In the Democratic party, there would have been a salutary opportunity to remind all concerned—President, Senators, Representatives, party workers, voters—that unless the Democratic party retained a majority in both Senate and House, it would be unable to organize those bodies and would be right back where it found itself during the famous—or infamous—Eightieth Congress. . . .

"In the case of the Republican party, there would have been an equally salutary demonstration of the fact that an off-year election is a *national* opportunity for the minority party—and not merely an opportunity for local sniping and head-hunting in individual states and districts. Furthermore, the minority party would have been put on notice that to conduct an effective opposition, it needs a national program of its own—needs it just as much in an off-year campaign as in a Presidential election year. . . . While I have no desire to advise the Republican party on how to solve its problems, I think that it might have been able to make itself a more effective and a more useful opposition party if it had been able to elect a new national committee in 1950 to handle firmly the problems of interim leadership. Moreover, the Presidential and Vice-Presidential aspirants in the minority party would have had an opportunity to display their talents in a forum at which Governors, Senators and university presidents would have equal opportunities to speak their minds on public questions."*

* By way of a bibliographical note, it may be said that President Truman's letter to Congressman Javits was made public by the latter and can be found in the *New York Times*, March 2, 1952; Chairman Gabrielson's letter, only a part of which is quoted above, is available in the files of the Association; Chairman McKinney's letter was made public by Senator Humphrey, and much of it appeared in the *New York Times* of Sunday, May 4, 1952; Senator Kefauver's article was reprinted in the *Congressional Record*, Appendix, March 28, 1952, in addition to appearing in the *New York Times Magazine*.

The full text of the statement adopted by the Committee on Political Parties at San Francisco is as follows:

"The Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association believes that the Democratic and Republican National Conventions should each decide in 1952 to meet again in 1954. The purpose of the meetings in 1954 would be two-fold: (1) *to bring the party platforms up-to-date for the Congressional election campaigns*, and (2) *to consider in each case how the party can be made a more effective national institution*.

"The proposed meetings in 1954 would be a first step in the direction of the Committee's previous proposal in the Report entitled "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System," in which the Committee stated that, in the interest of greater party effectiveness, the conventions should meet at least biennially instead of quadrennially as at present, in order to adopt party platforms and perform other functions as the party governing bodies. The holding of conventions in 1954 would test the idea of off-year conventions and party platforms and would also provide a thoroughgoing opportunity for each of the major parties to consider fundamental problems of its own organization and future.

"*PLATFORMS NEEDED EVERY TWO YEARS*. In recommending national conventions to write party platforms in 1954, it will be apparent that the Committee believes that party platforms are of practical importance. No political process is unimportant that seeks to define and express the principles and program of the major political party. A close reading of political history will demonstrate that many vital decisions have first taken practical form in the evolution of a party platform, even though the execution of the decision was a matter for the future and was necessarily subject to many influences along the way.

"The responsibility of the national conventions for the adoption of party platforms is thus a major responsibility of continuing importance. Platform committees begin their work weeks in advance of the national conventions, public hearings are held on the policies to be incorporated into the platforms, the committees labor for hours over many provisions, and vigorous debate may occur on the floor of the convention itself. The debate and the roll calls at the Democratic National Convention of 1948 on the civil rights question will be long remembered, but many historic battles

have been fought on such issues as prohibition, the gold standard, and the League of Nations.

"Major limitations of the platforms as expressions of party policy and program arise from the fact that they are prepared only in Presidential election years. *The four-year interval between platforms is too long if a platform is to be considered a realistic statement of party position on current issues for the entire period until another platform is adopted.* The fact that the platform is associated primarily with the Presidential campaign tends to leave an impression that it is morally more binding on the Presidential than the Congressional candidates of the party. Conversely, whatever moral effect a platform may have for the Congressional candidates in a Presidential election year is almost wholly dissipated by the time the next Congressional election year rolls around.

"For all of these reasons, the Committee concluded in its previous report that there is a need for a method of platform-making that is closely related to the Congressional as well as the Presidential campaigns. Such a method should provide sufficient participation on the part of the party members in Congress to give them the feeling that any platform adopted is as much their platform as the Presidential nominee's. The first essential, however, is to provide for the authoritative adoption of national party platforms in each Congressional election year, thereby making clear the continuing importance of such expressions of party policy and their close relationship to the legislative processes of government.

"**SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF '54 CONVENTIONS.** Certain difficulties will arise in convening off-year conventions. The Presidential nominating conventions are such large, cumbersome, and expensive affairs that there will be question as to whether so elaborate a mechanism should be assembled for off-year purposes. The size of the national conventions is an obstacle to effective deliberative activity and it also has many other bad consequences. The delegations from many states are so large that individual delegates have little or no feeling of personal responsibility. Often the delegations are unrepresentative, in part because in many cases the delegates must meet their own expenses of participation.

"The Committee has previously suggested that these deficiencies be cured by convening a convention of not more than 500-600 members, composed mostly of delegates elected directly by the party voters on a more representative basis (300-350 members), a substan-

tial number of ex officio members (the National Committee, state party chairmen, congressional leaders—probably about 150 altogether), and a selected group of prominent party leaders outside the party organizations (probably 25).

"The Committee is aware of the reluctance with which any assembly receives suggestions for the reduction of its own size. Various persons have assured the Committee that under no circumstances will a national convention vote to establish rules for future conventions that would markedly curtail the number of delegates.

"*If special rules are impossible, the Committee would still favor holding the proposed conventions in 1954.* The result of assembling such massive delegate bodies will be to increase the relative importance of the committee work, but not necessarily to prevent the work from being done. Nevertheless, the Committee hopes that it may be possible to adopt special rules for the special national conventions for 1954, without prejudice to any later decisions as to further off-year conventions or to the conventions in 1956, and that in such special rules provision would be made for a delegate body of workable size and representative character to deal with the questions of 1954.

"**POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES TO BIENNIAL CONVENTIONS.** The proposed 1954 conventions, in dealing with the general question of how each party can be made a more effective national institution, should consider the various means by which the party platforms can be kept up to date in authoritative form. If the biennial convening of national conventions appears to present too many difficulties as a permanent policy, various alternatives could be considered.

"In the case of the party in power, *one alternative is to look to the President for such statements of party policy as may be necessary.* This would have obvious disadvantages, and would not be practical unless the President can be given a much more specific mandate to rewrite the party platform from time to time than has ever been accorded him in the past.

"The national committees represent a further alternative. Until very recently the national committees seldom met between Presidential election years, and they have never been considered effective policy-making bodies. *With some changes in size, composition, and procedure, the committees could perhaps be re-constructed as appropriate bodies to act with full power on all party matters, including the revision*

of the party platform, in the interim between conventions held only quadrennially. Without drastic changes, however, many observers would be reluctant to entrust the task of writing the off-year platforms to the national committees.

"The suggestion has been made previously by this Committee and by others that, rather than seeking to reorganize the national committees, a national party council should be created by each major party, of such high quality and representative character that it could carry on platform drafting and interpretation and perform other major policy functions between conventions. If this proposal were to be accepted, the functions of such a council might be expanded to the point where frequent meetings of the conventions would be unnecessary. On the other hand, it might prove no more difficult to secure change in the composition and functioning of either the existing national committees or the conventions themselves than to establish new organizations that might tend to compete with both the conventions and the committees for the privileges and responsibilities of acting as the supreme governing bodies of the parties.

"It has also been proposed as an alternative to the holding of more frequent national conventions that the same purposes can be served by regional meetings of the kind that have become popular in both parties in recent years. This Committee regards the regional conferences as a useful and commendable development. They have apparently had great educational value for all who participated and have increased the ability of the parties to deal effectively with the development of public policy. But the regional conferences hold the potential danger of enhancing the forces of sectionalism, thereby making national policy even more difficult to formulate than would otherwise be the case. And in any case, it is clear that no regional conference or series of them could be put into the position of acting as a supreme governing body with powers comparable to a national convention. It would seem impossible, for example, to adopt new national platforms through any regional conference procedure.

"The speculative character of the discussion just traversed will make it clear why this Committee does not think that any of these alternatives can be adopted for the drafting and enunciation of national party platforms in 1954, if, indeed, they offer any real pos-

sibility for later years. A national convention, duly assembled, is the only unquestioned, authentic, and legitimate voice of a major political party under the present order of things. If other machinery is to be devised through which the parties can speak with equal authority, careful consideration at a duly constituted convention will be required to produce the necessary plans and take appropriate action. Such consideration would seem difficult if not wholly impossible at the 1952 conventions, and that is why we propose the special conventions in 1954.

"COMMITTEE'S DETAILED STUDY OF CONVENTIONS. If the major political parties are to operate effectively as national institutions, they must each have a supreme governing body that is workable as such and that is responsible to the party as a whole. The existing national conventions undoubtedly leave much to be desired from almost any point of view. In our previous report, we referred to them as "unwieldy, unrepresentative and less than responsible in mandate and action." Yet it would seem that the way forward in American political life must be found to a large extent by attacking the heart of the problem: the constitution of the governing bodies of the major parties that compete for the honor and privilege of governing the nation.

"With this in mind, this Committee expects during the next year to devote intensive attention to the study of all aspects of the conventions and to the completion of a report on convention functioning and procedure. The Committee solicits the assistance of its fellow political scientists, and will welcome suggestions and information from any quarter.

"CONVENTIONS IN '54 ESSENTIAL. Meanwhile, we reiterate the view with which this statement began. We believe that both party conventions should decide in 1952 to meet again in 1954. *With the present pace of world events and the many complexities of the domestic as well as the foreign scene, any platform written in 1952 will require revision in 1954 if it is not to become altogether a dead letter.*

"The parties should meet the need for more effective leadership by undertaking to make clear their own positions as parties with reasonable frequency. In order to do so, the more frequent convening of meetings and conventions will doubtless be necessary; but if such meetings and conventions are to be wholly effective, party organization must be improved, and improved most of all in terms of its

ability to cope with national policy problems. Party organization can be improved only by party action; the parties should therefore give the highest possible priority to putting their own houses in order. *A decision to hold conventions again in 1954 is, we believe, the essential first step.*"

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT ON
CONVENTION DELEGATIONS

On March 10, 1952, the American Political Science Association initiated a new cooperative research project that had been under consideration for some months. The project is concerned with the preconvention political campaigns of 1952, with special emphasis upon the processes by which the delegates are selected in the various states, the organization of the state delegations, and their work at the national conventions in Chicago in July.

This project was made possible by a grant from one of the smaller foundations, and the Brookings Institution is also cooperating by making available the services of Dr. Paul T. David as its director. He will be associated with the headquarters staff of the Association on a full-time basis until November, 1952.

An outgrowth of the work of the Association's Committee on Political Parties, the project also reflects the interest of the Association's Committee for the Advancement of Teaching in the production of improved teaching materials. Much of the work of the project will be associated with the teaching activities of the political scientists who are cooperating in the various states. Eventually, it is hoped, the data provided by the project should be useful in the revision of textbooks in American government and political parties.

A major portion of the project will consist of case studies of eight Republican and seven Democratic delegations to the respective national conventions. The Republican delegations selected for case studies are those of the following states: Connecticut, Louisiana, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin. The Democratic delegations are those of the following states: California, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Texas. In general, the intention was to select an equal number of delegations from states using the primary system and states using the convention system for selecting delegates, with regional diversification and some recognition of known factors of special interest.

The case studies will be supplemented by shorter reports on most of the other delegations. Over 50 political scientists in 40 states have each agreed to prepare a brief report this spring on how one delegation or the other from his state is being selected, covering local party customs and practices as well as the formal requirements of state law. In addition, several other political scientists have agreed to act as project correspondents in their own states, without undertaking formal reporting obligations.

Finally, plans are being laid for work at Chicago during the actual period of the conventions. Dr. David and his assistant, Mr. Robert V. L. Wright, Jr., will be at Chicago throughout the convention period, and the project staff will maintain a roster of all political scientists who will also be there. Any political scientist who expects to attend either convention as a delegate, alternate, or observer is urged to communicate his plans to the national office of the Association at 1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

As of June 10, 1952, the following political scientists were cooperating in the work of the project in the manner indicated:

Alabama: Donald S. Strong, Univ. of Ala., short report on each delegation; Charles E. Cayley, State Teachers Col., Jacksonville, correspondent.

Arizona: Paul Kelso, Univ. of Ariz., short report on Democratic delegation.

Arkansas:

California: David G. Farrelly, Univ. of Calif., L.A., case study of Democratic delegation, with assistance of Charles Clapp, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley; Thomas S. Barclay, Stanford Univ., short report on Republican delegation.

Colorado: Curtis W. Martin, Univ. of Colo., short report on Republican delegation.

Connecticut: Mrs. Mary Trackett Reynolds, Hamden, Conn., case study of Republican delegation; Bernard O. J. Linnevold, Univ. of Conn., short report on Democratic delegation.

Delaware: Paul Dolan, Univ. of Del., short report on each delegation.

Florida: Manning J. Dauer, Univ. of Fla., short report on each delegation; Elston R. Roady, Fla. State Univ., correspondent.

Georgia: Lynwood M. Holland, Emory Univ., case study of Democratic delegation; Merritt B. Pound, Univ. of Ga., short report on Republican delegation.

Idaho: Clifford I. Dobler, Univ. of Idaho,

short report on Democratic delegation; Hobart P. Sturm, Idaho State Col., short report on Republican delegation.

Illinois: Clarence A. Berdahl, Univ. of Ill., case study of Democratic delegation; Anthony Birch, Commonwealth Fund Fellow (Univ. of Manchester), Univ. of Chicago, short report on Republican delegation.

Indiana: Paul Willis, Ind. Univ., short report on Democratic delegation; Ferdinand A. Hermens, Univ. of Notre Dame, correspondent.

Iowa: Donald B. Johnson, State Univ. of Iowa, short report on Democratic delegation; John R. Mashek, Iowa State Col., short report on Republican delegation.

Kansas: Walter Butcher, Kans. State Teachers Col., Emporia, short report on Republican delegation; A. D. Miller, Kans. State Col., correspondent; Rhoten A. Smith, Univ. of Kans., correspondent.

Kentucky: J. B. Shannon, Univ. of Ky., short report on each delegation; Louis C. Keselman, Univ. of Louisville, correspondent.

Louisiana: L. V. Howard, Tulane Univ., case study of Republican delegation.

Maryland: Malcolm Moos, Johns Hopkins Univ., short report on delegation; Franklin L. Burdette, Univ. of Md., correspondent.

Massachusetts: Roy Gootenburg, Harvard Univ., short report on Democratic delegation.

Maine: Herbert H. Wood, Univ. of Maine, short report on each delegation.

Michigan: James W. Miller, Mich. State Col., case study of Democratic delegation, short report on Republican delegation; Samuel J. Eldersveld, Univ. of Mich., correspondent.

Minnesota: Arthur E. Naftalin, Univ. of Minn., short report on each delegation.

Mississippi: James H. McLendon, Miss. State Col., short report on each delegation; Leon A. Wilber, Miss. Southern Col., correspondent.

Missouri: Carl A. McCandless, Washington Univ., short report on Democratic delegation; John W. Schwada, Univ. of Mo., short report on Republican delegation.

Montana: Thomas Payne, Montana State Univ., short report on Republican delegation.

Nebraska: Robert J. Morgan, Univ. of Nebr., case study of Republican delegation.

Nevada: C. C. Smith, Univ. of Nev., short report on Democratic delegation.

New Hampshire: Robert Dishman, Univ. of N. H., short report on each delegation.

New Jersey: Harwood L. Childs, Princeton

Univ., correspondent.

New Mexico: Ira G. Clark, N. Mex. Col. of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, short report on Republican delegation; Howard J. McMurray, Univ. of N. Mex., short report on Democratic delegation.

New York: Phillips Bradley, Syracuse Univ., case study of Republican delegation; Mrs. Louise B. Gerrard, Barnard College, case study of Democratic delegation.

North Carolina: William Hays Simpson, Duke Univ., short report on Republican delegation; Preston W. Edsall, N. C. State Col., short report on Democratic delegation.

North Dakota: Melvin P. Straus, N. Dak. Agricultural Col., short report on Democratic delegation; Henry Tomasek, Univ. of N. Dak., short report on Republican delegation.

Ohio: E. Allen Helms, Ohio State Univ., case study of Democratic delegation; J. C. Heinlein, Univ. of Cincinnati, short report on Republican delegation.

Oklahoma: E. Foster Dowell, Okla. A. and M. Col., short report on Republican delegation.

Oregon: Freeman Holmer, Willamette Univ., case study of Republican delegation; Waldo Schumacker, Univ. of Ore., short report on Democratic delegation.

Pennsylvania: G. Edward Janosik, Univ. of Pa., case study of Republican delegation.

Rhode Island: John O. Stitely, Univ. of R. I., short report on Democratic delegation.

South Carolina: Douglas H. Carlisle, Univ. of S. C., short report on Democratic delegation; Charles E. Cauthen, Wofford Col., correspondent; James K. Coleman, The Citadel, correspondent.

South Dakota: T. C. Geary, Univ. of S. Dak., short report on each delegation.

Tennessee: T. W. Goodman, Univ. of Tenn., short report on Republican delegation.

Texas: O. Douglas Weeks, Univ. of Tex., case study of Democratic delegation, short report on Republican delegation.

Utah: M. R. Merrill, Utah State Agricultural Col., short report on Republican delegation; E. E. Weaver, Univ. of Utah, short report on Democratic delegation.

Vermont: Robert S. Babcock, Univ. of Vt., short report on Republican delegation; Oliver Garceau, Bennington Col., correspondent.

Virginia: Spencer D. Albright, Univ. of Richmond, correspondent.

Washington: Hugh A. Bone, Jr., Univ. of Wash., case study of Republican delegation;

Daniel M. Ogden, State Col. of Wash., short report on Democratic delegation.

West Virginia: William R. Ross, W. Va. Univ., short report on Democratic delegation; Paul D. Stewart, Marshall Col., correspondent.

Wisconsin: William H. Young, Univ. of Wis., case study of Republican delegation; William S. Shepherd, Beloit Col., short report on Democratic delegation.

Wyoming: Charles A. Bloomfield, Univ. of Wyo., correspondent.

Alaska:

District of Columbia: W. Rowland Ludden, George Washington Univ., short report on each delegation.

Hawaii: Daniel W. Tuttle, Univ. of Hawaii, short report on each delegation.

Puerto Rico:

APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF CHANGES

Pedro E. Abelarde, formerly a member of the staff of the Philippines Delegation to the United Nations, has joined the staff of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency as economic affairs officer in charge of foreign trade and commerce for Korea.

Spencer D. Albright of the University of Richmond is a visiting professor of political science at Emory University for the summer session of 1952.

Luther A. Allen of the University of Chicago has recently been serving as instructor in the department of political science at the University of Delaware.

Guthrie S. Birkhead of Syracuse University is serving as visiting assistant professor of political science at the University of Missouri during the summer session of 1952.

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., formerly assistant secretary of the United States Department of Commerce, has been appointed director of the Bureau of International Relations, University of California (Berkeley).

Hugh A. Bone of the University of Washington is a visiting professor at Columbia University for the summer quarter of 1952. He was recently appointed as a member of the executive committee of the Washington Committee on State Government Organization.

William E. Briggs has been appointed to an assistant professorship in political science and public administration at American University. He is serving as academic director of the Washington Semester Program, which is administered by the department of political science and public administration of American University.

D. W. Brogan, professor of political science at the University of Cambridge, has been

appointed to a Walker-Ames professorship at the University of Washington for the autumn quarter, 1952. While at the University of Washington, he will offer courses in political theory and comparative government.

Richard G. Brown is teaching on a part-time basis in the department of political science and public administration of American University.

Manuel García Calderón of the University of San Marcos, Peru, served during the spring quarter of 1952 as visiting professor at the University of North Carolina, where he offered a course in inter-American international law. He came to the University of North Carolina under the auspices of the United States Department of State and the University's Institute of Latin American Studies.

Gwendolen M. Carter, chairman of the department of government at Smith College, has been advanced to a full professorship at that institution.

Harold Chase is expected to return to his position at the University of Delaware in September, after two years of service with the United States Marines.

Asher N. Christensen of the University of Minnesota is a member of the summer session staff of the Salzburg Seminar on American Studies.

O. B. Conaway, Jr., has resigned as acting director of the Bureau of Public Administration of Boston University to become assistant director of the Graduate School of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Hedley V. Cooke, a foreign service officer of the United States from 1928 to 1946, and, more recently, a member of the Middle East Planning Staff of the Economic Cooperation