

APSR  
V. 37, No. 3 (June 1943)  
pp. 505-514

## INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH WAR-TIME PRIORITIES IN RESEARCH

A STATEMENT BY THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN  
POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION<sup>1</sup>

In the report of the Association's Committee on War-time Services<sup>2</sup> occurs the following passage: "It seems to the Committee that the customary individualism of the profession is a luxury that cannot be unimpaired in war-time; political scientists must not go through the war with a business-as-usual attitude toward research and critical writing. The crises upon the nation and awaiting the nation demand that the profession recognize priorities in its scholarly work . . . . Students, mature and immature, should know what men of affairs consider to be the more crucial issues . . . . The Committee . . . does ask . . . that the profession be given leadership in determining what to do . . . ."

The Research Committee of the Association considered this challenge and sought an answer from those members of the profession who had temporarily left their academic halls and plunged into the war effort in Washington.<sup>3</sup> This group gave generously of their time and thought to the matter.<sup>4</sup> The Committee's own function became merely that of a reporter or synthesizer of the views thus expressed. It is this synthesis which this statement incorporates. The suggestions are deliberately not attributed to any one individual. In the first place, many suggestions were made by more than one person; in the second place, the total pattern is even more intriguing than the individual suggestions.

Insight was uniformly keen and the search for evaluations was noticeable, even among the most preoccupied of the administrators. The Association may be proud of the way its representatives have "kept the faith" in this regard. Interest seemed to be considerably greater in the analysis of power than in the formalities of structure or law. Not many "orthodox" problems were mentioned. One after another declared that the political

<sup>1</sup> Phillips Bradley, Robert Leigh, Karl Loewenstein, Joseph McLean, Walter R. Sharp, Carl B. Swisher, Francis G. Wilson, and Ernest S. Griffith, *chairman*.

<sup>2</sup> See this REVIEW, Vol. 36, pp. 931-945 (Oct., 1942).

<sup>3</sup> Those consulted were: Ethan P. Allen, Alex B. Daspit, Earle DeLong, Marshall Dimock, William Y. Elliott, Merle Fainsod, James W. Fesler, Patterson French, George B. Galloway, Harold Gosnell, E. Pendleton Herring, Arthur N. Holcombe, Harold Lasswell, Karl Loewenstein, Joseph McLean, Harvey Mansfield, Charles E. Martin, Peter Odegard, Harvey Pinney, William Ronan, Wallace Sayre, Walter R. Sharp, George A. Shipman, Carl B. Swisher, Benjamin Wallace, Kenneth Warner, and Francis O. Wilcox.

<sup>4</sup> One only among those consulted dissented. He expressed the opinion that scholars were and should be completely individualist, and that such an effort as that of the Committee was misplaced.

scientist must also be a political economist, or a political psychologist, or a political geographer, or all three. Such emphasis upon the contribution to the understanding of political phenomena made by these and other sister fields of knowledge is undoubtedly the inevitable and wholesome by-product of the fact that administrators are confronted, not by discrete phenomena, but by situations in their totality and complexity. In two or three particulars, it is possible that the account that follows is a bit warped. Most serious is the possible distortion arising from the chronic frustrations of the civil servant. This may account for the relatively large number of administrative problems suggested, including the very difficult problem of public acceptance. Because of the way the question was put by the Committee, the answers laid considerable emphasis upon research tasks capable of being undertaken on college campuses.<sup>5</sup>

The fields and subjects for research and analysis fall roughly into four categories: (1) practical projects designed to help win the war; (2) practical projects important in preparing for peace and reconstruction; (3) phenomena peculiar to the war, and hence necessarily to be studied at this time; and (4) phenomena accelerated or heightened by the war, but probably part of a permanent trend. Each of these will be considered in turn.

1. *Practical Projects Designed to Help Win the War.* In general, it was felt that the government agencies should give the lead as to what research is wanted, and the fact that more agencies do not do so was decried. Very considerable use is being made of political scientists within the government; far less use is made by extending commissions to those remaining on the campuses.

The fruitful areas for such immediately practical research are many. The largest number concern local administration and local war-related problems. To be most valuable, many of these projects should be undertaken simultaneously in a number of different localities throughout the country. For example, political scientists could conduct opinion surveys on war problems within their areas and report the results to the agency concerned. The Bureau of Special Services of the Office of War Information would be glad to learn of any research of this sort which is being undertaken. Tension areas brought by race irritations or industrial disputes deserve investigation and diagnosis. Where in pre-Pearl Harbor days there were pro-Nazi or native fascist groups, the behavior of such groups during the war ought to be analyzed.

The local administration of war effort offers many areas for exploration. The origin and personnel of the local draft and rationing boards, relations

<sup>5</sup> The Committee wishes itself to go on record as favoring also the long-range view of values in research, even though there must necessarily be priority at the present time for those projects which contribute to the winning of the war and the postwar settlement.

between the army and municipalities near the army camps, enforcement and violations of rationing and price-control deserve the attention of political scientists; and the results of such study should be of genuine significance in the war effort.

Likewise, under the heading of the practical should lie research into the causes and effects of the various shortages—manpower above all, but also housing. Much light might be shed by such local investigations in discovering the potential supply of labor, in tracing the impact of such shortages on local government, and in correlating the results of local studies with the over-all national picture.

2. *Practical Projects Designed to Prepare for Peace and Reconstruction.* Even more prolific have been the suggested research projects bearing upon the postwar world. Several even went so far as to suggest a conference of representatives of all the social sciences to plan comprehensively and clearly the various fields to be covered. Such a conference would take into account research already in progress inside and outside the government.<sup>6</sup>

Three domestic problems have been mentioned as well worth the attention of our profession. First and foremost is the problem of discovering ways and means of educating our people to accept the type of postwar settlement which our national leaders believe to be essential. There are implications in this suggestion which may cause some members to pause, but surely the techniques of breaking down prejudices and of political education are fertile fields for our students of communication. What attitudes now prevail? By what techniques may those attitudes be changed which stand in the way of acceptance of an enlightened peace settlement? Surely these are urgent subjects for research.

The second problem is not unrelated to the first. This is that of orienting the soldiers' and veterans' groups after demobilization. Those who deplore certain aspects of past Legion activity and those who see the possibility of constructive citizen participation on the part of returning soldiers will at once realize that it is none too soon to institute the necessary studies of political behavior and its control which the situation demands.

The third area of research in the domestic field is reconversion of industry. Chiefly this belongs to the economist, but the political scientist will see implications deserving his attention also. Many of these will be in the field of local government—fiscal problems, voting behavior, dislocation of governmental personnel by return of those on military leave. Others will have wider implications, particularly those centering around

<sup>6</sup> In this connection it should be borne in mind that the Research Committee of the Association is sponsoring a panel on the general subject of "The Rôle of the United States in the Postwar World," and political scientists may look for further leadership from this panel in the course of a year or so.

the political behavior of the displaced and unemployed.

Suggestions for research relating to foreign and international problems were much more numerous. However, more than one person interjected a word of caution as to the availability of relevant material. For example, in the whole vast field of relief and rehabilitation, much if not most of the vital information is confidential, and even that part which is not confidential is probably available in few places, if any, outside of Washington. Something of the same situation prevails in other aspects of the peace settlement, especially where attitudes of enemy peoples, or transfers of populations, or questions of military occupation and government are deeply involved. However, in spite of these cautions, there is general belief that much can still be done by those who remain on the various campuses.

Obviously, many problems relating to the postwar world must be approached in terms of a particular nation or region. It is doubtful whether the political scientist working singly can accomplish much in this regard. Furthermore, in the State Department, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of Strategic Services, the Division of Military Government, are groups of areal specialists who are already at work. Many, perhaps a majority, of the staffs of these agencies have been recruited from college faculties. Hence, the isolated political scientist who may wish to put at the government's disposal his peculiar knowledge of a particular country or region, and who at the same time does not wish to take up residence in Washington, would be well advised to make contact with one of these agencies and ask for some commission, paid or unpaid, to be executed on his own campus.<sup>7</sup> In certain of the universities, there are groups of scholars—geographers, economists, historians, cultural anthropologists, as well as political scientists—who by chance or design are well acquainted with the same foreign region. Under such circumstances, research and a pooling of wisdom would be peculiarly useful—in part as a possible corrective or check upon the official governmental policy, in part because findings and recommendations might properly be made public prior to the peace conference, and hence commence to induce popular support for a given policy.

Among the many concrete suggestions, a few may be singled out. Techniques to break down Nazi indoctrination would have a high priority on any list. Past experience in transfers of populations, in relief and rehabilitation, and in military occupation, are of really great importance; although in each of these it would be well to make the obvious preliminary governmental contacts before commencing research, in order to avoid possible duplication and lost motion.

<sup>7</sup> See the fuller discussion of this suggestion in the report of the Association's Committee on War-time Services, cited above.

Finally, it is apparent that there will be a wide choice open to us at the end of the war as to orientation of our national policy. Our relations to a possible world organization, to the Western Hemisphere, to the Far East, to policies of international trade—all these will carry with them consequences to our domestic economy and policy and to our power position which deserve the most careful investigation under a number of different hypotheses. Government can and dares do little in illuminating, and even in exploring, the great variations in the consequences of the alternative policies open to us as a people. Private scholarship may do much by way of education as well as research—perhaps by education even more than research.

3. *Phenomena Peculiar to the War.* A most interesting group of suggested research areas and projects comprises those which probably must be studied immediately in order to be studied at all well. The value of such study to political science and social engineering naturally extends beyond the war—perhaps for use in the next war, perhaps to illumine political principles. Yet the difficulties of recapturing, or even understanding, these areas from mere written records after the war is over may be almost insurmountable. Hence the urgency.

As might be expected, a large number of these projects lie in the area of behavior. Political repercussions to the transition from abundance to scarcity furnish a large and fruitful cluster. The squirming of the pressure groups, the political expressions of individual frustrations and resentment, the changed rôle of the minority party—all are facets of the same central core. Non-voting in war-time and shifts in voting furnish spheres for both quantitative and sociological analysis. The effect of the war on the isolationist and communist groups, including rationalization of past conduct, conversions to new attitudes, escape by way of irrelevancies, and downright subversiveness—all are worth examining.

A miscellaneous set of problems concludes this section. Several of the persons interviewed suggested the study of the use of volunteers—the dollar-a-year man federally and the local board in the states and communities. What really has happened to these volunteers—case by case? What changes took place in the courts during the war? What has happened to civil liberties? What changes have taken place in state and local tax revenues? What effect has the war had on the individual, the school, the church, in so far as this effect has political expression? What new meanings, if any, has “treason” acquired? All these questions have been suggested as worthy of study; and for the most part they are urgent, if the phenomena connected with them are not to be blurred or even lost.

4. *Phenomena Accelerated or Heightened by the War, but Which Are Part of Permanent Trends.* To the political theorist, the final group is by far the most significant, for here, if anywhere, is discoverable the “Wave of

the Future." A surprising number of suggestions are "unorthodox," to say the least; a surprising number reveal unexpected insights into new political trends.

Problems in the "new public administration" are the most sharply etched—in part, because of the tremendous growth of this aspect of government; in part, because of the preponderance of administrators among those interviewed. Only occasionally were the problems mentioned which preoccupied the student of public administration of a decade ago. The alternatives of functional and straight-line organization are still the bones of contention they always were. Moreover, sheer size of governmental personnel has brought to a crisis many of the problems traditionally associated with bureaucracy. But here the list ends.

No longer does there seem to be interest in studying the extension of the central controls on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. Rather has interest shifted toward the discovery of ways and means of meeting the problems such central controls create, or toward an examination of the pressures on or from them, or of alternatives to the predominantly negative approach of a control such as job classification.

The frontiers of needed research in personnel have shifted to ways of estimating qualities of personality (a wide open field), and especially to establishing relationships between the personality structure of the individual and the job he is asked to perform. What trainings and aptitudes do various groups bring to government service—political scientists, for example, or business men? How far should the alleged "principles" of public administration—which are probably grounded upon certain assumptions as to the personality of the public administrator—how far should these principles, especially in organization and procedure, be changed when personalities of other types, business men for example, are to do the administering?

Within the broad field of administrative behavior, the struggle for power has apparently played such a major rôle that it deserves most careful and prompt study.

In administrative organization, what is the significance of the "czar" as an institution? Along with this may be put the use of a "general staff," and the proliferation of liaison techniques. These techniques—a reflection of the vast network of interlocking problems in the modern economy—will obviously continue, and will increase their importance and significance, long after the war is over. They are part of the larger problem of inter- and intra-communications in a large-scale administration. Likewise, with the apparent decline in local autonomy, there is interest in evidences of growing autonomy on the part of the field offices, and in central-field relationships generally.

It used to be taken for granted that policy formation belonged to the legislative branch primarily, or perchance to the President. The ordinary administrator, except possibly for the politically appointed cabinet official, was rarely, if ever, thought of as playing a rôle in this regard. Some years elapsed after Lowell's illumination of the administrator's rôle in policy in the British government before the appreciation dawned on us in America that a similar drama was taking place here also. Consequently, the methods, techniques, and procedures for policy formulation in the new administration have been largely neglected as a field of study. They dare not be so neglected any longer. The way is wide open for a profoundly illuminating and significant series of studies with a view to discovering the patterns of such formulation in a large number of fields—price control, taxation, economic warfare, censorship—to mention but a few. Even more illuminating would be a study of the embryonic but enormously important means whereby attempts are made to integrate these patterns and policies toward a common end. If the chief rôle of the government of the future is to be integration—and it appears that it is—then here lies perhaps the most urgent problem of all.

It is a commentary upon the administrative mind that far more of those interviewed spoke of the need for study of ways and means of obtaining popular acceptance of an administrative policy than mentioned the possibility of increasing the amount of intelligent popular participation in its formulation. Controlled experiments in attitude-changing were freely advocated, especially in breaking down popular distrust of officialdom. Leadership studies were likewise suggested, and one man called for a study which related political morality and strategy.

We may conclude our catalogue of studies of administration by mentioning two other suggestions. One of these concerned the methods of assembling and digesting information (including indexing, location of materials, overcoming resistances, etc.); the other concerned the meaning and techniques of organizational and administrative analysis. In both cases, an additional dimension was being added to research in public administration—research into the methods of research.

A second great field for research in probable future trends concerned the relationships between social structure and government agencies. The lesson that government is not a discrete sector of man's interests, something aloof and apart and separable, has been well learned. As an integral part of an enmeshed culture, it reflects, and in turn influences profoundly, the other major sectors of man's activities. Consequently, the accelerated tendency to use special interest groups, to give them a function at times advisory, at times operative in the actual structure of government, is worthy of study—perhaps as a foreshadowing of a democratic corporative state. Advisory committees are used in virtually all the war agencies, and

advisory committees either tacitly or formally tend to be constituted on interest-group lines. These committees themselves constitute a mine of research material. How may they be used effectively—to prevent mistakes, to give information, to convert to a program—without the committees taking over actual responsibility?

How, for example, may business men be used, without their behaving as business men? How use labor leaders? Is it true that labor increasingly is serving as a representative of business, as some have suggested? What techniques are available for group representation? Are there numerous unrepresented groups, as for example the business man who does not belong to a trade association? Do these groups suffer? What have been the affiliation and background of government administrators, especially of those regulating business?

One final question suggested by the cultural setting has to do with the relationship of the military to government in a total war. How deeply does it permeate? What attitudes and problems ensue? What if we should be moving into a long period of militarism which may in the end be scarcely distinguishable from totalitarianism in a kind of military-corporative economy?

A third area of great significance for the future of political science lies in the study of the mainsprings of political behavior, more especially in the field of political communication. Public information in war-time is an unsurpassed laboratory. There are contrasts to be drawn between official programs and agencies and unofficial groups, such as the Foreign Policy Association or the Tax Institute or the Twentieth Century Fund. Similar contrasts between the self-interested and the relatively objective groups merit attention. Should the government, for example, buy advertising? And, in any event, what is the relative strength of the various media open to it? Specific case studies were suggested: the reaction to Roosevelt's Casablanca trip, the public relations policy of the State Department, an analysis of sermon content during the war.

Two of the traditional areas of concern for political scientists were repeatedly mentioned as needing rethinking. These were international law and representative government. International law was regarded as over-ripe for a systematic audit. Neutrality, in particular, was seen to be approaching sterility as a concept. International administration is crowding in upon the scene.

The present and future status of representative government was mentioned both by those who are concerned with the impact of social structure on government and by those who visualize this impact in terms of behavior. What interests, what capacities, should be represented, and where and how? Congress obviously is changing, but what is to be its new rôle? The attitude of the public toward Congress is relevant in this con-



nection, and that attitude must be carefully studied. Time and again the problem of relating legislators to administrators was mentioned as critical in our national life—to control the latter and to educate the former. Congress's own procedures came in for severe questioning, and the task of adjusting these procedures to realistic opinion and decision-making was put forth as a challenge to our research and ingenuity as a profession. The informal usages, as well as the normal procedures, of our chief legislative body require analysis. Finally, the question was raised—central to an understanding of our government—Why is Congress so critical of the administration at a time like this? Does it argue a basic insecurity arising from the legislative body's own out-moded rituals, or on the other hand is it a most valuable corrective to rampant bureaucracy?<sup>8</sup>

Inevitably the political scientist found himself trespassing upon the territory traditionally reserved for the economist. More than one man expressed the opinion that the political scientist of the future, to survive and to be true to science itself, must become far more of a political economist than a lawyer. With the apparent advent of a planned economy, the political scientist has the insistent and deep responsibility to find ways and means to keep such a controlled economy democratic. The economist and the political scientist must pursue such studies jointly. The economist must contribute the knowledge of price and production, the political scientist must be relied upon for institutional insights. The political scientist can understand why, for example, the Department of Justice met with such obstacles in its anti-trust activity and may be able to suggest techniques of regulation. The political scientist can explore and interpret and institutionalize the concept of "adjustment" as the modern sphere of government in integrating conflicting economic groups in the public interest.

Jointly with the economists, we must seek for principles to delimit the areas of public and private business respectively, and explore the possibilities of mixed forms of corporations and the types and effects of government regulation. In this latter connection, the hypothesis was advanced that regulation makes business men dependent rather than self-reliant, and the question was asked as to why this is so. Another field to explore is the political economy of metropolitan areas—areas whose present government is obviously archaic, but whose problems call for bold adaptations of political structure to economic and social requirements. Functional representation in such metropolitan areas was offered as a possible answer to the present outmoded forms.

To at least two or three among those consulted, the future of federalism seemed to be number one among priorities for study. What actually is happening to the states? Intergovernmental relations, the growth of

<sup>8</sup> See the various reports of the Association's Committee on Congress, *e.g.*, in this *REVIEW*, Vol. 36, pp. 1091-1102 (Dec., 1942).

regional organization with its own peculiar relationship to the national government, the bypassing of the states in direct federal-city relationships—all bear witness to the changing nature of the so-called "United States." The phenomena presented are far-reaching in their effects, and they reveal grave danger of crystallizing usages and laws whereby the old genius of our federal system goes by default.

*Conclusion.* Probably all of the larger universities and a majority of the colleges have at least one member of the department of political science participating in the war administration. Little or no time is available to these men for research other than in line of duty. However, it is obvious beyond any shadow of doubt that these men are having an experience of government in action that will have a profound influence upon their teaching and research when they return to their college or university—as most of them doubtless will return—in the postwar days. A new fertility and a new reality will mark their activity and thought. Hence we may look with hope to our campuses to furnish considerably more leadership than in the past in training and advising statesmen in our postwar America.

The suggestions as to priority in research incorporated in this brief report have necessarily been assembled hastily. Yet it is obvious that the outlines of political science are changing before our eyes. In addition to meeting such priorities, there is for the profession a deep and abiding task collectively to think through the actual structure of our several areas of study, and to work out the frontiers where lie the most fruitful long-range research in each of our areas. With this in mind, the Research Committee of the Association is facilitating the formation of panels in several of these areas. In this task, it invites the coöperation of all who will give it.