SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, 1923-1998

by Kenton W. Worcester

Foreword by Craig Calhoun

Afterword by Kenneth Prewitt

reprinting

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL: THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS

by Elbridge Sibley

Foreword and Afterword by Eleanor Bernert Sheldon

Social Science Research Council

New York, New York

Copyright © 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL: THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS by Elbridge Sibley

Foreword

Social science was born in 17th and 18th century Europe without disciplinary boundaries. Hobbes and Locke could integrate politics and psychology without need for an interdisciplinary field of political psychology. Vico and Montesquieu informed anthropology, history, sociology and political science in equal measure. Likewise, nascent social science was born in work at once "pure" and "applied"; it included both contemplative pursuit of knowledge and engaged concern for public action. Adam Smith was not one to distinguish theoretical from applied economics, just as he saw the intimate connections of both to the "moral sentiments" and other concerns of what would later be called psychology and sociology. Humboldt's and Herder's inquiries into language and culture aimed to uncover basic truths at the same time as they informed educational policy and debates over national identity.

Social science was born, however, with little in the way of systematic research methods. It was practiced with a tendency to collapse into simple service of the state or particular political projects without critical distance. It was in short undisciplined. But not for very long. Pushed forward partly by epistemological concerns basic to natural and physical science, psychology shook free from philosophy and turned increasingly to experimental research. During the course of the 19th century, economics began to precipitate out of political economy and moral philosophy. Lagging only slightly, political science and sociology gained measures of autonomy from political philosophy and the immediate business of advising rulers, from utopian projects and from efforts to mitigate social problems. Rooted in philosophical concerns for the ultimate nature of humanity, but shaped also by folklore and myths of national origin, anthropology was

transformed by entanglements with colonialism and religious missions. For all these complexities of origin it too gained coherence as an academic discipline, albeit one unusually differentiated by national context and divided by subdisciplinary loyalties. History was perhaps an academic discipline before any of the others, though it was tied to a Whiggish, nationalist and curatorial concern for a usable past. Only gradually did growing attention to method and (often in secret) to theory, and to the lives of ordinary people as well as heroes and great events, bring it into the fold of social science.

The idea of academic disciplines was borrowed from religious orders and did not lose all meaning in the transition. Along with the knowledge-forming discipline of empirical research methods and theoretical rigor came the organization of quotidian life through distinctive disciplinary rituals and practices. The rise of the modern university transformed the novitiate into graduate study and ordination into PhD and habilitation. Nonetheless the disciplines formed with more than a hint of monastic indifference to life outside them, each pursuing its own vision of salvation.

Almost as soon as academic disciplines began to attain solidity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, however, the need was felt to regain lost connections, to create something called interdisciplinary social science. The word first gained currency in the discussions of a remarkable new institution, the Social Science Research Council. The Council was created by visionaries—many of them influenced by another remarkable base for interdisciplinary social science, the University of Chicago—who thought not only that disciplinary particularity could be transcended, but that the resulting research could speak to contemporary social problems and public policy.

Over the course of more than 75 years, the Council has helped to launch a range of new fields of inquiry from comparative politics to human development and the life course. It played a central role in developing quantitative methods in social science and also in developing the area studies

fields as interdisciplinary approaches to international research and scholarship. The Council developed a distinctive style of work, flexibly responding to both the internal development of intellectual agendas and the identification of public needs for social science research. This included carrying out research projects, but also bringing together dispersed researchers for discussions that shaped future inquiry. Not bound by the specific combinations of faculty at any one university or research center, the Council drew researchers from around the country and increasingly around the world to create interdisciplinary teams defined by specific themes and able to push intellectual frontiers.

Council committees studied a variety of issues basic to public policy—and thereby helped to create policy research as a branch of social science. During the 1920s, a committee focused on the impact of prohibition; during the 1930s, Council researchers focused on a variety of consequences of the Depression (though they tried to avoid using that term); one committee examined issues of social security from 1933 to 1943 and provided key input and intellectual background to the development of US government policy. During the 1920s and 30s, committees focused on crime, industrial relations and agriculture among a range of other subjects. At the same time, however, the leaders of the Council were concerned to advance social science on its own terms, committed to the idea that intellectual strength as such would make for useful knowledge. A committee on business research sponsored, along with other work, Adolf Berle's and Gardiner Means' classic study, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*. Bronislaw Malinowksi drew his colleagues' attention to the development of anthropology as a social science; William Fielding Ogburn advanced the systematic study of social change.

In the first years of the Council's existence--to offer a more sustained example of the connections between intellectually driven social science and useful knowledge--the Council president, Wesley Clair Mitchell, initiated an inquiry into economic growth. Mitchell not only did key work on

business cycles himself, but contributed centrally to advancing the field of applied economics—not least by founding the National Bureau of Economic Research. The future Nobel Prize winner Simon Kuznets wrote his first monograph on "Secular Movements in Production and Prices" as a research fellow at the SSRC. From 1949-1968, Kuznets chaired an enormously influential Committee on Economic Growth. This helped to establish the parameters of the field, and also to shape basic theory and quantitative research methods in economics.

Likewise, a series of linked projects used data collected on American soldiers during World War II. Indeed, the US Army initiated surveys of its soldiers on December 8, 1941, the day after Pearl Harbor. A number of social scientists were drawn from the Council to wartime service in the Army Research Administration. After the war, together with colleagues, Samuel Stouffer led a Council committee that produced a pathbreaking series of studies. The research that had provided practical knowledge to the Army in wartime remained important as a basis for future innovations. It also contributed importantly to the development of social science research in ways quite distant from its specific topic. Louis Guttman, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and John A. Clausen were among the research team and made basic advances in research methods and especially measurement. Edward A. Suchman, Robin M. Williams, Jr., Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., and Carl I. Hovland, along with several others, addressed issues of national culture and regional difference, implications of education and psychological patterns, group solidarity and a range of other subjects.

After the war, new themes came to the fore. The Council pioneered in the study of sociolinguistics and transnational social psychology. It contributed to the infrastructure of social science with training efforts including a notable one on mathematical methods for social scientists. It pioneered in the study of the biological bases of social behavior, with a committee focusing on genetic research as early as 1961. The greatest impact of the Council's work in the early postwar period may have been felt in political science. The committees on political behavior

and comparative politics both helped to transform the discipline. Not surprisingly, these events are central to the story that Kenton Worcester offers in the pages that follow. So too is the Council's central role in the development of area studies fields. These, indeed, grew so prominent that they became the single largest component of the Council's work by the 1980s, and Worcester examines not only the innovation that brought them forward but the controversies that attended a shift in the Council's funding and focus in the 1990s.

The Council was generally at its best when it was able to remain flexible and help to support innovation. Its distinctive comparative advantage was the ability to bring together new combinations of social researchers—including sometimes humanists and natural scientists. Its committees sparked the development of new fields and new research agendas. During the 1970s and early 1980s, Council committees played central roles in cognitive research and in the relation of law and social science. That none of these committees still exists is testimony to their very success and to the creation of other institutional supports--from interdisciplinary centers at universities to the restructuring of the divisions of the National Science Foundation that helped to ensure the flow of sustaining resources. More recently, a committee on international peace and security helped to invigorate, transform and broaden research in its domain—and then dissolved to make way for a new, though closely related, effort to focus attention on the institutions of international cooperation, including NGOs and multilateral organizations, and to try to increase international collaboration in security studies.

And so it goes. The Council is defined not by its work on any one topic, nor by any one specific disciplinary combination. It never represented all of social science, even when that was a much smaller enterprise. Rather, its distinctive niche is to innovate and incubate, to identify emergent lines of research that will be enhanced by interdisciplinary ties, to help scattered researchers achieve critical mass in the creation of a self-sustaining new field. For all the Council's success

over the years, the boundaries disciplines impose on scholarship and creativity remain powerful; the need for border-crossings remains basic. Of at least equal importance today is an agenda that was barely articulated in the first years of the Council--the encouragement of truly international, transnational social science. This means researching global issues such as information technology and its regulation, transformations in higher education and—once again—the nature of the modern business corporation. It also means focusing attention on specific cultural and geographic regions since these issues, and others, take on different concrete forms in different settings. Not least of all, the Council seeks to help social researchers in different countries develop stronger collaborative relationships and better communication, on global, regional and sometimes simply bilateral scales.

On the occasion of the Council's 50th anniversary, Elbridge Sibley wrote an informative history of this very unusual organization. It has long been out of print, and we take pleasure in once again making it available here. Presiding over the Council's 75th anniversary, its president, Kenneth Prewitt, commissioned a new history from Kenton Worcester, which is the main focus of this publication. Worcester draws to good effect on the important archives of the Council's early years that have been made available at the Rockefeller Archive Center. He supplements Sibley's essay with new information and especially new analysis, and he brings the story almost to the present day. Much more research could usefully be done, not just on the SSRC but on the institutional history of American social science. Of all scholars, social scientists should be most aware that their ideas do not develop in a vacuum, and most attentive to the value of critical history of the conditions that shaped them. No doubt, such research will be produced, whether as piecemeal efforts of individual scholars or with more institutional organization. New histories may accent the role the Council played in different developments—stressing urban studies or social indicators or cognitive science more than politics and area studies. Meanwhile, though, we

are in Worcester's debt. Thanks to his efforts, we know not only more about the SSRC but a good deal more about social science itself.

Craig Calhoun, President, Social Science Research Council

There is little color or drama about this kind of work. There are no short cuts --no penicillin or sulfa drug that can be discovered to cure the ills of human society. Social maladjustments can be relieved only by the slow accumulation of knowledge and wisdom influencing policies and decisions at myriad points. These influences for the most part work silently, with low visibility. They are seldom spectacular; they are never automatic; the structure has to be built brick by brick. Disciplined minds are needed, and the high integrity of objective scholarship; and the flow of first-class talent into these fields must be continuous and uninterrupted.

And yet, if we use as a measuring rod what has happened in the social sciences over the last fifty years, or even the last twenty five years, there is little occasion for pessimism. Those who look behind the headline can perceive that solid progress has been made. The basis for a better understanding of social and economic issues is being steadily shaped. Today we know far more about our own economy and the economy of other nations than we did a generation ago; investigation has brought within reach fundamental information which is influencing public policy at a dozen points…Along this road, if it is persistently followed, lie the possibilities of ultimate social intelligence, and the goal can be gained by patience, tenacity, and adequate and continuing support.

Raymond Fosdick, *Chronicle of a Generation: An Autobiography* (Harper and Brothers, 1958, pp. 277-278)

Given that extraordinary upsurge in the social sciences, an efflorescence which some writers, perhaps rashly, have likened to the triumphal consolidation of physics in the seventeenth century, the question has naturally arisen: what have we learned from all this? Not in the details, for these have been enormous, but in some synoptic or coherent bodies of new knowledge that constitute an advance on the past; in some sets of verified generalizations about human behavior or social relationships; in some body of techniques or methodologies to apply that knowledge for social design or social purpose; in some synthetic theories to order this knowledge in a comprehensive way and relate these discoveries to previous bodies of knowledge or--dare the thought--to the 'perennial wisdom' embodied in the classic summations of human experience. To put the question grandly: if physics and its allied sciences have given us a greater and more complex understanding of nature so that we have been able to transform nature, what have the social sciences learned about human nature and the social structures that people create, which is more than the generalizations of the great philosophers and which would enable us to achieve the utopian visions of our forebears?

Daniel Bell, *The Social Sciences Since the Second World War* (Transaction Books, 1982, pp. 5-6)

INTRODUCTION

As the Social Science Research Council celebrated its 75th anniversary, Paul Baltes, chair of the Council's board of directors and director of the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin, observed in an essay written for the occasion that "institutions are the primary carriers of the fabric of the human condition and the dynamics of continuity and change." As far as institutions are concerned, he said, "[t]he older the better, since longer tradition makes for prestige, health and influence…In this sense at age 75 the Council is young."[1]

This essay reviews the development of a still-youthful SSRC, both as a source of innovation in scholarly research and network-building, and in relation to the growth and evolution of the modern social sciences. While it is informed by the description and analysis prepared by Elbridge Sibley, whose 50-year history is reprinted in this volume, the essay also takes note of a more recent literature that has opened up new lines of inquiry into the nexus of intellectual history, institutional interests and international linkages in the university sector.

The Council at the end of the 20th century looked very different from the modest organizational shell that emerged after intensive discussion in the 1920s. In its 75th year SSRC committees were involved in over two dozen research and training programs, on topics ranging from higher education and international peace and security to international migration and human sexuality. In the same year the Council organized more than 70 conferences, workshops and training institutes, many of which were held outside the United States; provided nearly 400 fellowships for research

[1] Paul Baltes, "The Social Science Research Council: 75 Years Young," *Social Science Research Council Biennial Report, 1996-1998* (New York: SSRC, 1998), p. 33.

at the predoctoral, doctoral and postdoctoral levels; and maintained an annual budget of approximately $14 million. Aided by a somewhat larger support staff, a 20-person professional staff helped oversee steering committees, research networks, screening panels and working groups.

Books produced under Council auspices testified to the diversity of committee interests as well as a commitment to international research from a plurality of perspectives and languages. These included *Appropriating Gender: Women's Activism and Politicized Religion in South Asia*, edited by Patricia Jeffery and Amrita Basu; *Ciudadania Politica Y Formacion de las Naciones*, edited by Hilda Sabato; *Cuba: La Guerra de 1898*, edited by Manuel Lopez Diaz; *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*, edited by Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard; *Market Cultures: Society and Morality in the New Asian Capitalisms*, edited by Robert W. Hefner; *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects*, edited by Russell Thornton; and *Uncertain Transition: Ethnographies of Change in the Postsocialist World*, edited by Michael Burawoy and Katherine Verdery.[2]

The official theme of the Council at 75 was "a resource for international scholarship." This way of framing the organization's mandate reflected a new, non-nationcentric conception of social science research. As a promotional brochure explained, "Few issues of interest to the social sciences can be investigated within the boundaries of a single nation-state, as the worldwide flow

[2] See Patricia Jeffery and Amrita Basu, eds., *Appropriating Gender: Women's Activism and Politicized Religion in South Asia* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Hilda Sabato, ed., *Ciudadania Politica Y Formacion de las Naciones: Perspectivas Historicas de America Latina* (Mexico City: Fideicomiso Historia de las Americas/Fondo de Cultura Economica/Colegio de Mexico, 1999); Manuel Lopez Diaz, *Cuba: La Guerra de 1898* (San Jose: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, 1999); Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard, eds., *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Robert W. Hefner, ed., *Market Cultures: Society and Morality in the New Asian Capitalisms* (Boulder: Westview, 1998); Russell Thornton, ed., *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999); and Michael Burawoy and Katherine Verdery, eds., *Uncertain Transition: Ethnographies of Change in the Postsocialist World* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999).

of people, ideas, capital, products and images increases in density and velocity. This flow offers new opportunities such as cultural exchange or economic growth, but also new threats, such as the world trade in drugs. The opportunities cannot be fully realized or the threats averted without the aid of the theories and methods of the social sciences. The Council is at work building a program for scholars everywhere in the world, scholars who want to strengthen the social sciences in their respective regions in a manner that links them with colleagues elsewhere who have an international research agenda."[3]

Talk of a multifaceted research agenda, with its emphasis on cross-national and cross-regional exchanges and flows, offers an obvious contrast with the national orientation, and much smaller institutional apparatus, of the early SSRC. And yet, in important respects, the lines of continuity are as significant as more obvious changes in scale and program emphasis. The first generation of Council leaders saw themselves laying the foundation for something that would be around for as long as there was a need for a distinctive branch of knowledge called the social sciences. While there is no reason to suppose that they would have anticipated the specific mix of programs and activities in place at the 75th anniversary, at least some of the research areas would have seemed familiar and the kinds of concrete pursuits–workshops for graduate students, fellowships for research, conferences on cross-disciplinary topics–almost certainly would have reminded them of initiatives undertaken by the Council in its earliest incarnation.

Furthermore, the organizational framework established by the first generation–based on core assumptions about how the Council should promote quality research–has survived over a period of nearly eight decades with few signs of erosion. Even as the Council has continued to foster change and innovation, its underlying form continues to reflect the institutional script that was drafted, debated and refined by the founders of the organization. As I discuss below, such

[3] "Introduction," *Social Science Research Council Biennial Report, 1996-1998*, p. 3.

elementary but critical assumptions as the importance of multidisciplinary collaboration, the value of institutional flexibility and the potential contribution of the social sciences to the public interest have been inscribed into the institutional ethos of the SSRC. Despite their apparent thematic novelty, projects on illicit commodity flows, religion and migration and international scholarly exchange represented the contemporary instantiation of long-established commitments to with bringing scholars and disciplines together, building infrastructure for research and taking note of ways social science might inform public discourse with scientific rigor. The real legacy of the generation that launched the SSRC are the now-axiomatic formulae that underlie the ways the organization promotes research.

Although the present essay is concerned with questions of organizational continuity and discontinuity, it also considers the relationship of the Council to a broader constellation, both in the United States and internationally. While the institutional details may be of interest, the organization's complex intersection with the expansion and consolidation of the modern social sciences is a compelling subject in its own right. Thus, the essay seeks to integrate an awareness of internal dynamics with a broader conception of the Council's impact on and relationship to larger disciplinary, intellectual and political trends.

The essay is divided into two main parts: part one revisits the period covered in the fifty year Council history prepared by Elbridge Sibley in the early 1970s, while part two considers the organization's development from the early 1970s onwards. Considered together, parts one and two provide a narrative of the organization from its early years–when SSRC leaders established an organizational matrix for advancing the cause of research–to more recent decades–when the Council expanded into new program areas, repositioned itself in the research environment and opened toward the international social sciences. It is a story that touches on many diverse aspects of social science inquiry and knowledge production in the 20th century.

PART ONE

The Social Science Research Council was the world's first national organization of all the social sciences, and from the outset its goal has been to improve the quality of, and infrastructure for, research in the social sciences.[4] The idea of a coordinating agency of the social sciences was first proposed by Charles E. Merriam (1874-1953), a professor of political science at the University of Chicago, who identified a need for greater cooperation among researchers interested in empirical and policy-oriented analysis. "Science is a great cooperative enterprise in which many intelligences must labor together," he explained. "There must always be wide scope for the spontaneous and unregimented activity of the individual, but the success of the expedition is conditioned upon some general plan of organization."[5]

Few individuals were as well positioned to promote a new organization of and for the social sciences as Charles Merriam. As chair of one of the country's most prominent political science departments, as president of the American Political Science Association, as an interlocutor with the foundation community and as a former Chicago alderman with impressive verbal gifts, Merriam was ideally placed to bring together scholars, funders and university leaders from across the country in a common venture.[6] He was also, as Dorothy Ross has noted, "in a position to

[4] This section draws on my articles "The Social Science Research Council: Plus Ca Change," *Social Science Research Council Biennial Report, 1996-1998*; and "Introduction to the Social Science Research Council Collection," (Sleepy Hollow, NY: Rockefeller Archive Center, 1999).
[5] Charles E. Merriam, "The Present State of the Study of Politics," in *New Aspects of Politics*, third ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970 [1921]), p. 83.
[6] Robert Crane described "vivid memories of the early days of the SSRC. Perhaps the first to spring to mind will be the robust humor in which he [Charles Merriam] enveloped the driest matters of business. Every session became a verbal sporting event. As a clever boxer he liked to keep his colleagues off balance and, although he scrupulously observed Marquis of Queensbury rules, they learned to stay alert for a quick jab." Robert Crane, unpublished document [1953], Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), SSRC Collection, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 39, Box 187, Folder 2141.

sense and act upon the keen feelings of inferiority that afflicted political scientists and sociologists in the presence of more scientific sister disciplines."[7] Through his influential writings and lectures he called for a more hard-nosed, data-sensitive, hypothesis-driven approach to research that would require a coordination of talent as well as significant institutional support. From Merriam's perspective, the aim of the Council was to help provide for the "closer integration of the social sciences themselves" that he called for in his 1925 presidential address to the political science profession. "The problem of social behavior," he explained, "is essentially one problem, and while the angles of approach may and should be different, the scientific result will be imperfect unless these points of view are at times brought together in some effective way, so that the full benefit of the multiple analysis may be realized."[8]

This way of constructing the social sciences–as the combination and closer integration of perspectives for the purpose of tackling "the problem of social behavior"–reflected Merriam's understanding of the "communal nature of social research."[9] Given the evident complexity and scale of the problems claiming the attention of researchers, some degree of research coordination was not only logical but almost a necessity. Merriam was a persistent critic of older, largely institutionalist traditions which were associated, unfairly or not, with descriptive and piecemeal accounts of governmental and industrial organizations. A more scientific approach would require some form of organization that could coordinate and systematize social research.

Merriam complained that what "political scientists have too often done was to meditate and then elaborate in literary form an idea, without verification or with very inadequate verification."[10] In

[7] Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 401.
[8] Merriam, "Progress in Political Research," in *New Aspects of Politics*, pp. 343-345.
[9] Barry Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 145.
[10] Merriam, "Politics and Numbers," in *New Aspects of Politics*, p. 215.

place of literature Merriam favored a better organized and more consciously scientific and social-psychological approach to the study of human behavior. Statistics and other empirical tools would play a critical role in shifting the political and social sciences closer to the "hard sciences." He emphasized that "the constant recourse to the statistical basis of argument has a restraining effect upon literary or logical exuberance, and tends distinctly toward scientific treatment and demonstrable conclusions. The practice of measurement, comparison, standardization of material–even though sometimes overdone–has the effect of sobering the discussion."[11] As the political scientist David Easton later observed, the "epistemic successes of the natural sciences and of other social sciences, such as psychology and economics, using more rigorous methods of data collection and of analysis" enjoyed a decisive impact on the thinking of Merriam and others of his generational cohort.[12]

Merriam's agenda invoked a "new synthesis of knowledge,"[13] on the basis of what two scholars have recently summarized as "the observation and measurement of actual political behavior by discrete individuals and groups with the objective of generalizing from this basis in order to create a policy relevant branch of scientific knowledge."[14] This approach would become known as behavioralism, and despite the plurality of approaches adopted by its research committees the Council soon became identified as a stronghold of behavioral social science. This may have been unfair to the extent that the discourse and rhetoric of behavioralism was rooted in debates within political science. After all, the best known book to be sponsored by the Council in its first two decades--A.A. Berle's and Gardiner C. Means' *The Modern Corporation and Private Property* (1932)–drew on debates in sociology rather than in political science and operated outside the

[11] Merriam, "The Present State of the Study of Politics," in *New Aspects of Politics*, p. 74.
[12] David Easton, "Political Science in the United States: Past and Present" [1984], in James Farr and Raymond Seidelman, eds., *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), p. 296.
[13] Merriam, "Preface to the First Edition," in *New Aspects of Politics*, p. 58.

behavioral paradigm.[15] But in a larger framework the behavioral agenda outlined by Merriam–emphasizing the application of scientific principles, the development of scientific techniques, the aggregated study of individual behavior, the coordination of research efforts and outreach to the most rigorous social science communities–became part of the Council's operating system. It was not the case that social scientists would have to relinquish their distinctive insights, but the "guess or hunch" would need to be "supplanted by the measurement and the analysis."[16]

Charles Merriam's campaign to forge an organization that would bring together "the full benefit of the multiple analysis" was taken up by strategically placed actors in other fields. Along with Merriam, two individuals were especially vital to early success of the organization. One was Wesley Clair Mitchell, who collaborated closely with Merriam during the 1920s and 1930s and played a critical leadership role inside the new SSRC. The other key personality was Beardsley Ruml, who received a PhD in psychometry from the University of Chicago in 1917 and was appointed director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM) five years later, at the ripe age of 27. The LSRM, with a total endowment of $74 million, initially targeted medical research but actively took up the cause of social research under Ruml's direction. Mitchell's involvement helped ensure the respect and participation of busy economists, and connected the early Council and the National Bureau of Economic Research,[17] while Ruml poured Rockefeller resources into the social sciences in general and the SSRC in particular.[18]

---

[14] Mark M. Blyth and Robin Varghese, "The State of the Discipline of American Political Science: Be Careful What You Wish For?" *British Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, Vol. 1, no. 3 (October 1999), pp. 346-347.

[15] A.A. Berle, Jr. and Gardiner C. Means, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property* (Chicago: Commerce Clearing House, 1932).

[16] Merriam, "Politics and Numbers," in *New Aspects of Politics*, p. 189.

[17] Trained as an economist at the University of Chicago, Wesley Clair Mitchell (1874-1948) was one of the founders of the New School for Social Research, and a leading force behind the emergence of the National Bureau of Economic Research in the 1920s. Like Merriam, he channeled his progressive ideals into the cause of empirical research. His wife, Lucy Sprague Mitchell, was a prominent author and educator who helped establish the Bank Street College. By the 1940s, Mitchell "would enjoy a secure reputation as the father of modern business cycle analysis, as a leader in the professionalization of the social sciences, and as the guiding force behind institutions that had helped through data-gathering to enhance the standing and

All three individuals–Merriam, Mitchell and Ruml–were active participants in what John Judis has described as a Progressive Era movement to establish "domestic-oriented elite organizations" that could support "the development of policy based on fact and knowledge." The founders of these organizations "believed that the way to a disinterested social policy was through the application of social science to national problems. Social science not only provided answers; it also provided the basis for the disinterested temperament." Independent, nongovernmental institutions formed in the aftermath of World War I, such as the American Law Institute (founded in 1923), the Brookings Institution (1927), the Council on Foreign Relations (1921) and the National Bureau of Economic Research (1920) "aspired to be above class, party, and interest" in Judis's words. "They saw their role as conciliatory, as bringing classes and interests together rather than siding with one against the other…They nourished public trust in government by defending and explaining complex decisions that the ordinary voter did not have time to study. And they have carried forward a tradition of disinterested public service against the venality and corruption that interest groups have often encouraged in political life."[19] The distinctive role of the Council, in relation to the many civic and policy-minded organizations formed in the same period, was its exclusive focus on "the advancement of research in the social sciences."[20]

---

legitimacy of the social sciences." See Guy Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning: Capitalism, Social Science, and the State in the 1920s* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), p. 167. See also Joyce Antler, *Lucy Sprague Mitchell: The Making of a Modern Woman* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987); Lucy Sprague Mitchell, *Two Lives: The Story of Wesley Clair Mitchell and Myself* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953); and Smith, *Social Science in the Crucible*, chapter two.

[18] Following his stint at the LSRM, Beardsley Ruml (1894-1960) went on to become an advisor to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, dean of Chicago's Division of the Social Sciences and chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. He has been described as the "father of the modern American state" for his role in expanding the income tax system on the payroll deduction or "pay as you go" basis during World War Two. See Amity Shlaes, *The Greedy Hand: How Taxes Drive Honest Americans Crazy and What to Do About It* (New York: Random House, 1999), chapter one.

[19] John B. Judis, *The Paradox of American Democracy: Elites, Special Interests, and the Betrayal of Public Trust* (New York: Pantheon, 2000), pp. 19-20, 30.

[20] Elbridge Sibley, *Social Science Research Council: The First Fifty Years* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1974), p. 2.

The call for a new organization of the social sciences sparked interest across a number of disciplines, including political science, psychology, sociology and economics. Planning meetings in 1922-23 paved the way for the inaugural meeting of the SSRC in May 1923, which was followed by its legal incorporation in the state of Illinois in December 1924. By the early spring of 1925 the American Historical Association had signed on as the last of seven disciplinary associations to sponsor the new organization.[21] The Council received its first grant funds in 1924, and first offered fellowships, for postdoctoral research, in 1925.[22] Two years later, the organization recruited its first full-time staff member–Robert Lynd, the sociologist[23]–and attracted a $750,000 grant for undesignated core support from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. Within 10 years, the Council "had granted well over $4,000,000 for research in social

[21] In chronological order, the associations that joined the Council between 1923-25 were the American Political Science Association; the American Sociological Society [later renamed the American Sociological Association] the American Economic Association; the American Statistical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Anthropological Association and the American Historical Association. Representatives of these seven associations have sat on governance committees from the mid-1920s onwards and, remarkably, no other disciplinary associations have been added.

[22] Wesley Mitchell later described the process by which the Council used fellowships to "foster the growth of the social sciences." "Should the immediate aim be to promote study of selected problems or to develop the powers of research workers?" he asked. "If the latter aim was preferred, what type of man promised the largest returns?" He then explained that the Council "thinks the chances of success are brightest with candidates in the late twenties or the early thirties. Older men…seldom have as much capacity for intellectual growth as they had when younger. Candidates in the early twenties, on the other hand, have seldom given unequivocal evidence of that marked gift for research…" Wesley Clair Mitchell, "The Research Fellowships of the Social Science Research Council," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XLI, no. 4 (December 1926), pp. 605-606.

[23] Robert Lynd (1892-1970) served as a staff member for two years. With his wife, Helen Lynd, he coauthored *Middletown* (1929) and *Middletown in Transition* (1937), two sociological classics that helped define the field of community studies. Following the publication of *Middletown* he became a professor of sociology at Columbia University. He was the author of *Knowledge for What? The Place of Social Science in American Culture* (1939), which offers a friendly dialogue with the Council's founding generation over the relevance of ethical and social concerns in the development of the social sciences. He was also a critic of larger academic trends. "The national Social Science Research Council," he stated, "represents an important step toward the reorientation of social research. But the large degree of failure to date of its efforts to develop new alignments of research personnel around inter-disciplinary research is directly due to the inability of social scientists, trained to work within the grooves of the present disciplines, to grasp imaginatively the possibilities inherent in working closely with scientists trained in other disciplines." Robert Lynd, *Knowledge for What? The Place of Social Science in American Culture* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1967 [1939]), p. 169. See also Staughton Lynd, "Father and Son: Intellectual Work Outside the University," *Living Inside Our Hope* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997); and Smith, *Social Science in the Crucible*, chapter four.

science and had broadened its sources of funds considerably," notes Barry Karl.[24] This support not only permitted the Council to sponsor new committees but also ensured the survival of the fledgling organization.[25]

The Council opened its first office in 1927, filling 1,500 square feet on the 20th floor of a building at 50 East 42nd Street, for an annual rent of $6,700, or $4.47 per square foot.[26] Prior to that, it relied on volunteer labor. The decision to make Manhattan the base of operations was by no means inevitable. Chicago had both the advantage and disadvantage of being Merriam's home turf. Washington, DC, was another logical option, and in fact the Council intermittently maintained a Washington office from the mid-1930s through the early 1980s. New York City, however, was equidistant between the federal government and Harvard Square. It could be reached by direct train from Chicago, and there was no lack of research-minded social scientists within a 50-mile radius of the city. In addition, New York was the birthplace of the type of

[24] As Karl has pointed out, the Council not only benefited directly from foundation largesse but helped funnel "virtually incalculable sums" into departments, research centers and "local and regional philanthropic research projects of various kinds…Money channeled into the building of new buildings for social research with 'equipped laboratories,' as William F. Ogburn called the new University of Chicago social science building, does not show up in grants to associations or councils, although the Chicago building was built by Rockefeller money provided to Merriam by Ruml…The network which tied universities, the government, the social sciences, philanthropy, and American business together to implement their various programs of social reform remained intact [through the 1930s and 1940s]." Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics*, pp. 136-137.

[25] On the early history of the Council, in addition to works cited, see David L. Featherman, "SSRC, Now and Then: A Commentary on a Recent Historical Analysis," *Items*, Vol. 48, no. 1 (March 1994); Donald Fisher, *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993); Brett Gary, *Nervous Liberals: Propaganda Anxieties from World War I to the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Kenneth Prewitt, *Social Sciences and Private Philanthropy: The Quest for Social Relevance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, 1995); and Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996). An unlikely source is a 1927 talk "prepared at the request of the Alpha Phi Zeta, a social science fraternity at the University of Missouri," in which the speaker concluded that "the invention and founding of the Social Science Research Council will some day go down in history as one of the significant contributions to human progress, on a par with the discovery of the atomic or the germ theories [*sic*]." See A. F. Kuhlman, "The Social Science Research Council," RAC, Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8473, pp. 1 and 16.

[26] RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 2, Folder 16. In 1929 the Council had relocated to the large office building above Pennsylvania Station at 230 Park Avenue, where it remained until 1974, when

private philanthropy that favored the social sciences. Yet the question of where to house the Council would occasionally resurface; a proposal to relocate the headquarters to Washington was intensively debated in the early 70s, with SSRC president Henry Riecken calling for closer ties with research-supporting federal agencies.[27]

The decision to launch the Council proved timely, in at least two respects. First, many academics were receptive to the idea that the cause of empirical social research required an independent home base. Since universities, departments and disciplinary associations were each preoccupied with other matters, none was likely to make the research process its highest priority. An independent organization of professional social scientists could more reliably coordinate efforts and press the case for fellowships, workshops, conferences, publications, networks and other means that would facilitate the acquisition and distribution of social-scientific knowledge. As staff member and future president Donald Young explained in a subsequent memorandum:

> Voluntary professional associations have been created by groups of scientific workers in all fields to serve all varieties of common purposes ever since science has been a recognized calling. So men in the various social disciplines organized themselves as their number and product became too great for more casual interaction and cooperation. Because the boundaries of all disciplines are arbitrary, if convenient, creations of men,

---

the headquarters were moved to 605 Third Avenue. In 1996 the Council assumed occupancy in a mid-town office building at 810 Seventh Avenue.

[27] The Executive Committee's decision to keep the headquarters in New York City was one reason behind Riecken's departure in 1972. As long time staff member Paul Webbink commented in a private memo: "[A] New York base for the Council avoids many harassing questions of the relation of the Council to U.S. government agencies. If the Council is to persevere with cross-national research efforts it is worth a good bit of effort to avoid any implication that the Council is somehow an arm of government intelligence…a non-Washington base will avoid at least some of the issues that are tearing apart some of the disciplinary association[s] with which we are most concerned." Paul Webbink, Memo to Executive Committee, December 22, 1970, RAC, Accession 2, Series 4, Sub-series 1, Box 704, Folder 8474.

> associations limited in interest to areas of investigation so defined tend to neglect questions of overall strategy and tactics.[28]

In attending to "questions of overall strategy and tactics" the new organization could complement, rather than compete with, work undertaken within the research universities and academic disciplines.[29] As a medium of scholarly communication, the Council could play a very different role from colleges and universities, disciplines and departments, and public policy think tanks. Located at a remove from campus life and based in New York City rather than Washington, DC, the SSRC could offer its members a respite from entanglements with students, colleagues, deans, trustees and even taxpayers and legislators. Committee members were encouraged to get on with the task at hand without paying attention to disciplinary boundaries, campus controversies or vested interests.[30] Over time, scholars identified with the Council were encouraged to think of themselves as part of an invisible college of researchers and research planners. Membership implied an elevated professional standing; as one of the country's foremost social science institutions, the Council clarified the status of individual social scientists even as it strove to enhance the authority of the social sciences writ large.

---

[28] Donald Young, "Comments on Future Council Policy in Accordance with P&P Instructions," 1944, RAC, Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8465, p. 1.

[29] Pendleton Herring, who served as Council president from 1948-68, described the SSRC as "partner and adjunct to the universities and other research institutions in facilitating communication among specialists and helping to implement research and training ventures that cannot be encompassed within a given institution because of their exploratory or experimental character." E. Pendleton Herring, "Introduction by the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1965-66* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1966), p. 9.

[30] The phrase "vested interests" is taken from a 1945 presentation to the Board of Directors by Board chairman A.T. Poffenberger. "Where does the money come from? The Council has no endowment. Its capital resides primarily in its membership and in its good will built up over the years. For its maintenance and administrative expenses, for surveys and conferences it has enjoyed the generous support of several foundations. For its special projects it has to seek the necessary funds. It accepts no financial support from vested interests; it does not service jobs for pay, so that its findings are free from bias on such account." Board of Director Minutes, February 24-25, 1945. RAC, Accession I, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 324, Folder 1842.

The second timely aspect was that the new organization offered a useful intermediary for foundations and government agencies that wished to lend their support to the burgeoning social sciences, in hopes that a rigorous approach to the study of social conditions and relations could elevate public awareness and shape public policy. Beardsley Ruml ambitiously spoke of "the production of a body of substantiated and widely accepted generalizations as to human capacities and motives." "All who work," he said, "toward the general end of social welfare are embarrassed by the lack of that knowledge that the social sciences provide. It is as though engineers were at work without an adequate development in the sciences of physics or chemistry, or as though physicians were practicing in the absence of the medical sciences. The direction of work in the social fields is largely controlled by tradition, inspiration and expediency, a natural condition in view of our ignorance of individual and social forces."[31]

Program officers at the Carnegie Corporation, the Commonwealth Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, the LSRM and other foundations found satisfaction in working with a new agency that could assess research priorities and disburse research funds. Their support lent institutional credibility and made it possible for the Council to hire staff and develop new programs in the interwar and postwar periods. It also reflected the ascendant doctrine of the New York-based foundation world, that what foundation insider Francis Sutton described as "rational philanthropy, getting at the roots of human ills and deprivations" requires "the kind of specialized knowledge that the social sciences supply." Foundations, Sutton argued, "need some orderly analysis…to proceed in the confidence that they are doing something sensible. Characteristically, in dealing

[31] General Memorandum by the Director, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, October 1922. As quoted and discussed in Fisher, *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences*, p. 33, and Prewitt, *Social Sciences and Private Philanthropy*, p. 19.

with any broad subject, there is a concern for the intellectual and professional resources there are in this country or in the world for dealing with it."[32]

One of the most innovative of the Council's early activities was a series of annual summer meetings held in Hanover, New Hampshire between 1925 and 1930. The Hanover meetings offered a practical expression of the informal leadership role that Charles Merriam and others envisioned for the new organization. They also, as Barry Karl has pointed out, "marked a new phase in the distribution of resources for research in the sciences of society."[33] The two-week meetings allowed board members, committee members, staff and invited guests to contemplate research priorities, allocate training funds and formulate plans for new committee activities. In this rustic setting, scholars could bring their families, and participants came from as far away as California and Europe.[34] Informal decisions taken at a leisurely pace in New Hampshire and subsequent meeting sites would routinely shape the Council's organizing program in any given year.

Transcripts of the Hanover meetings offer an unusually vivid portrait of the scientific aspirations of a prominent subsection of the interwar social sciences.[35] The 1926 meeting featured talks on "Anthropology as a Social Science" (by Bronislaw Malinowski); "Pioneer Belts" (i.e., European settlement in colonial countries); "Labor Policies and Industrial Output"; "The Measurement of Opinion; Problems Involved in Studying the Mechanization of Industry"; and "The Pluralistic

[32] Francis X. Sutton, "American Foundations and the Social Sciences," *Items*, Vol. 39, no. 4 (December 1985), p. 57.
[33] Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics*, p. 135.
[34] Lengthy summer meetings made particular sense at a time when, as David Sills has noted, professors had "far fewer opportunities to leave their campuses than they have today." After 1930 the Council held summer meetings in "such splendid resort communities as Nantucket Island; Franconia, New Hampshire; and Lake George, New York. The entire New York staff of the Council also attended, so in effect the Council itself moved out of town for this period. Eventually, Sky Top in the Poconos turned out to be judged the ideal spot, and the annual meetings were held there for three decades." David L. Sills, "A Requiem for P&P: Notes on the Council's Late Committee on Problems and Policy," *Items*, Vol. 50, no. 4 (December 1996), p. 94.

Measurement of Human Behavior and Attitudes as a Basis of Political Science." Among the participants were Felix Frankfurter, Judge Learned Hand, political scientist Harold B. Lasswell, Arthur H. Schlesinger Sr., Robert S. Lynd, Beardsley P. Ruml and the sociologist W.I. Thomas. The following year brought presentations on "Research and the Law"; "Psychiatry and its Relation to the Social Sciences"; "The Problem of Fuel Power"; "Problems, Methods, and Some Results in Race Testing"; "Biological Methods in Human Problems"; and other subjects. A talk by Robert Yerkes, of Yale University, on "The Relation of Anthropoid Research to Social Science," sparked an exceptionally lively discussion of the study of great ape behavior and its utility for the social sciences.[36] The "Reflections" of historian Charles Beard, who spoke at the 1926 conference, provoked robust sparring over what Beard termed the study of "economic motives in politics."[37] A flavor of the Hanover meetings was conveyed in a series of letters written by a young anthropologist, Robert Redfield, to his wife Margaret Park Redfield. The letters portray the 1930 conference as a networking bonanza for university intellectuals and foundation personnel: "The Social Science Research Council pays their fares, and boards them,

---

[35] RAC, Accession 2, Series 6, Subseries 9, Boxes 329-330.

[36] "[T]he anthropoid apes are available for scientific study in larger degree and in more varied ways than are human infants and children. They may be used more economically. It is not easy, of course, to get or keep the great apes, but it is less expensive from every point of view than it is to keep human subjects…Studies of the functions of the nervous system, for example, which can be carried on only incidentally in the human subject can be carried on outright and under as well-controlled conditions with the anthropoid ape as with any other type of lower organism. We can in them, if you like, induce or produce mental defects, mental diseases, or any other condition which it is desired to study experimentally. In ourselves, of course, it would have to be done secretly." Robert Yerkes, "Relation of Anthropoid Research to Social Science," in Hanover Conference Minutes, August 15-30, 1927. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 329, Folder 1891, pp. 10 & 15.

[37] Beard's main argument–that "[s]ome people think that the economic motive has been overworked in the study of history and sociology and current politics, but I am inclined to think that it not only is not overworked but has never been systematically and thoroughly and intelligently applied as it might be" – was skeptically received by other participants. See Hanover Conference Minutes, August 9-20, 1926, RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 329, Folder 1892, p. 492. Beard subsequently complained that social science, as practiced at the Council, failed to recognize "its limitations and presuppositions," particularly with regard to the ethical dimension of social research. See Charles Beard's letter to Robert Crane (SSRC executive director), September 25, 1934. RAC, Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8465.

and feeds them and washes their clothes, and gives them cards to go to the golf club, and then expects them to produce Significant Results."[38]

Committees launched in the 1920s and 1930s reflected the domestic, policy and empirical priorities of the generation that attended the Hanover meetings. These included committees on Agriculture (1925-42); Crime (1925-32); Industrial Relations (1926-30); Business Research (1928-31); Pressure Groups and Propaganda (1931-34); Government Statistics and Information Services (1933-37); and Social Security (1935-43). One of the first committees to receive research planning funds ($475,000) was the Special Advisory Committee on Eighteenth Amendment Study (1925-28), which examined the controversy over Prohibition.[39] The Committee on the Scientific Aspects of Human Migration (1924-27) allocated $133,800 for projects on the social and economic impact of migration to the United States, and "produced, directly or indirectly, an amazing range of significant books and research articles, including studies of Swedish immigration, Mexican immigration and labor in the United States, statistical compendia of international migrations, and original research on the cityward migration of African Americans."[40] The Committee on International Relations (1926-38; 1940-41) similarly emphasized issues of concern to national policymakers. Its membership roster was unusual in that business leaders and public intellectuals predominated over academics.[41] Committees were

[38] From the same letter: "The place is overrun with pedants and potentates. The potentates are the executive secretaries of the big foundations–collectively they represent huge–staggering–amounts of money that has been set aside for research. The pedants have invited the potentates so that the potentates may see how pedants do their most effective thinking, and how they arrange to spend that money." Quoted in David L. Sills, "50th Anniversary of the 1930 Hanover Conference: The Letters of Robert Redfield to his Wife Keep the Past Alive," *Items*, Vol. 34, no. 2 (June 1980), p. 36.

[39] See *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1926* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1927, p. 9).

[40] Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz and Josh DeWind, eds., *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1999), p. 5. See also Casey Walsh, "The Social Science Research Council and Migration Studies, 1922-30," Department of Anthropology, New School University, 1997.

[41] In 1931-32 the composition of the committee was as follows: Newton D. Baker, Baker, Hostetler, Sidlo and Patterson (law firm); Raymond B. Fosdick, Curtis, Fosdick, and Belknap (law firm); S. Parker Gilbert, J.P. Morgan; Jerone D. Greene, University of Wales; Thomas Nelson Perkins, of Boston; Norman Thomas,

also created to oversee training fellowships, with an emphasis on doctoral and postdoctoral research.

From the outset, Council committees pursued a diverse menu of objectives, from facilitating and upgrading scholarly access to data and archives and sponsoring research guides and monographs, to formulating policy recommendations and awarding fellowships. In its 1933 decennial report the Council described committee work in the following terms: "The objectives are a coherent conception of the area in terms of its central or major problems, the subordination of its minor problems, and a decision as to the most promising point or points of attack…The Council's aim is simply to attain the best picture it can through the agency of the most competent group judgement it can secure. It is recognized also that continuous reworking of any plan of a field is necessary from the very moment of its formulation."[42]

There were indications that top-level government officials were interested in tapping the world of "competent group judgement." The Republican Herbert Hoover and the Democrat Franklin D. Roosevelt were similarly intrigued by the prospect that rigorous analysis could be applied to social concerns. As a sign of his faith in social science, Hoover convened a President's Research Committee on Social Trends, prior to the 1929 stock market collapse, in hopes that "a complete, impartial examination of the facts…should serve to help all of us to see where social stresses are occurring and where major efforts should be undertaken to deal with them constructively."[43] As an indication of their public standing, Wesley Clair Mitchell and Charles Merriam served as chair

---

League for Industrial Democracy; and Owen D. Young, General Electric Company. Norman Thomas, of course, was leader of the Socialist Party and a perennial presidential candidate. The committee spun off a subcommittee on the Export of Capital, whose members included John Foster Dulles, the future US Secretary of State. See *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1931-32* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1932), p. 21.

[42] *The Social Science Research Council Decennial Report, 1923-1933* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1933), p. 13.

[43] Herbert Hoover, "Foreword," *Recent Social Trends in the United States: Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1933), p. iii.

and vice-chair, respectively, of the Research Committee, while their SSRC colleague, the University of Chicago sociologist William Fielding Ogburn, was appointed director of research.

In 1933, the Committee produced a two-volume report, *Recent Social Trends in the United States*, which was published by a commercial house to favorable reviews. The report included "thirteen volumes of appended research papers and data on topics such as population, racial and ethnic groups, women, family, labor, consumption, leisure, crime, health, education, public welfare, economic organization, and public administration and government." In keeping with the scrupulously empirical character of the project, the report advanced few specific recommendations. "The central purpose of the enterprise," observes Mark Smith, "was to make a *factual* study of social trends…The chapters were to be mere records, collections of basic empirical materials which the executive and legislative branches could use to formulate policy."[44] One proposal that passed muster was to have the Council "organize a coalition of leaders in government, industry, and private life, who together with social scientists would continue to gather and interpret data on social problems and their solutions. Such a national advisory council, bridging government and its constituencies on the one hand, and government, science, and the economic and social orders on the other, was recommended amid a sense of growing alarm over social unrest and apparent perils to the democratic process that accompanied the Great Depression."[45]

Although the proposal for a national advisory council, organized by the Council, was not taken up, Merriam and Mitchell were later drafted onto the National Resources Planning Board, a creation *par excellence* of the New Deal. Ties between the Council and the new administration

[44] Smith, *Social Science in the Crucible*, p. 73. Emphasis in the original.
[45] Featherman, "SSRC, Then and Now: A Commentary on a Recent Historical Analysis," pp. 15-16. See also Charles Merriam and William Ogburn, "A Review of the Findings by the President's Research

were in place even before Roosevelt assumed the office of the presidency. FDR had in fact served as a member of the Council's Advisory Committee on Business Research (1928-31), which sought to promote "continuing research in the problems of specific industries" by university research centers, although the future president was not particularly active on the committee.[46] In addition, the page proofs of *Recent Social Trends* were reportedly "the major serious reading that President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt had with him on the cruise that he took on Vincent Astor's yacht during the month before his inauguration."[47] After the inauguration, collaborations between administration officials, the Rockefeller Foundation, Council staff and Council networks led to the committee work that accompanied the formulation and implementation of Social Security.[48]

ORGANIZING ASSUMPTIONS

During the early period the governance committees paid special attention to the means by which the organization would carry out its broad mandate.[49] Charles Merriam, Wesley Clair Mitchell,

---

Committee on Social Trends," *Recent Social Trends in the United States: Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends*, pp. lxx-lxxv.

[46] RAC, Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Box 123, Folder 679.

[47] David L. Sills, "Council Marks the 50th Anniversary of its Committee on Social Security," *Items*, Vol. 39, no. 3 (September 1985), p. 39.

[48] The story of the Council's relationship to the New Deal in general, and Social Security in particular, has yet to be written. See, however, Arthur J. Altmeyer, *The Formative Years of Social Security* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966); Featherman, "SSRC, Then and Now: A Commentary on a Recent Historical Analysis"; Fisher, *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences*, pp. 125-166; Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics*, chapter 12; Charles McKinley and Robert W. Frase, *Launching Social Security: A Capture-and-Record Account, 1935-37* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970); and Sibley, *Social Science Research Council: The First Fifty Years*, chapter seven.

[49] The Council's decision-making apparatus is relatively complex and multilayered, which in part reflected the multiplicity of constituencies and interests served by its various programs. While the Board of Directors is responsible for the overall direction of the organization, it shares authority with the Executive Committee, which is concerned with personnel and budgetary matters. Decision-making powers also resided in the Committee on Problems and Policy (often referred to as P&P), which was created in 1925 for the purpose of overseeing "the intellectual program of the Council between infrequent board meetings." In 1996 P&P was dissolved with its functions transferred to the Board. Other key institutional nodes have included advisory committees established to supervise larger programs (such as committees overseeing the International Program in the 1970s-90s), and the office of the president, as well as strategically placed

William Ogburn, political scientist Robert Crane, historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Sr. and other SSRC actors often returned to the challenge of assessing the work of an organization with an unusually open-ended agenda. They identified seven main tasks: improve research organization; develop personnel; preserve materials; improve research methods; disseminate materials; facilitate research projects; and contribute to "the public appreciation of the significance of the social sciences."[50] This left a number of critical issues unresolved, however, such as establishing a sense of priority among these tasks, determining the extent to which the Council was making strides in these areas and sorting out the appropriate balance between engagement and science. These issues would resurface time and again, often in the context of governance-level discussions about winding down past initiatives or starting new ones.[51]

In establishing guidelines for the organization, Merriam and his colleagues devised several interlocking principles that would play a critical role in the development of the SSRC.

First, the organization was premised on the assumption that social science is a collective enterprise requiring the intersection of multiple perspectives. It was, in other words, an intrinsically interdisciplinary operation, even if the language of interdisciplinarity had yet to be

---

senior staff. See David L. Sills, "A Requiem for P&P: Notes on the Council's late Committee on Problems and Policy," *Items*, Vol. 50, no. 4 (December 1996), p. 94.

[50] "Definition of Council Objectives," n.d. [1930s], RAC, Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8465, p. 1.

[51] The most sustained assessment of the Council's early activities was a 162-page report by the University of Chicago sociologist Louis Wirth, who praised the SSRC's fellowships and its programs on agricultural economics, industry and trade, immigration and scientific methods, but warned that the organization must learn to "distinguish between work that can be fairly objective and scientific and work that proceeds on the basis of pre-suppositions…It is the Council's obligation to restore and accentuate the primacy of its intellectual function." Wirth's report reinforced the view that the Council should "encourage ways of working toward more rigorous induction from data, more rigorous verification of hypotheses, greater coherence and continuity of knowledge." See Louis Wirth, "Report on the History, Activities and Policies of the Social Science Research Council" (1937). RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 5, Folder 29, pp. 150-155; and "Support of Work in the Social Sciences," n.d. [late 1930s], RAC, Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 705, Folder 8476, pp. 1-2.

coined.[52] By concentrating on the analysis of research problems that involved "two or more disciplines," the Council could promote "new insights into social phenomena, new problems, new methods leading to advances in the scientific quality of social investigations."[53] The inclination toward multiple perspectives implied a pluralist stance with regard to questions of method and evidence. Just as no single social science discipline could be expected to furnish all the answers, no one approach or style of scholarship was likely to encompass the diversity and complexity of difficult social problems. The Council, therefore, was constructed as a platform on which scholars from diverse traditions could come together in a spirit of problem-solving cross-fertilization. At the very least, the Council could act as a counter-force to the "excessive overspecialization, too complete departmentalization, and isolation of the special social sciences" that some regarded as endemic in the research universities.[54]

Second, it was decided early on that the small, all-volunteer committees making up the Council would concentrate on "the planning exercise," or what later became known as research planning. While training fellowships would enable researchers to undertake independent projects, committees would guide and stimulate research in a given area rather than carry out an entire research agenda. The research planning mandate enabled committees to evaluate topics, marshal resources, identify obstacles and announce strategies for effective research. They were empowered, in other words, to exercise intellectual and programmatic leadership.

---

[52] The term 'interdisciplinary' "seems to have begun life in the corridors and meeting rooms of the Social Science Research Council [in the late 1920s and early 1930s] as a kind of bureaucratic shorthand for what the Council saw as its chief function, the promotion of research that involved two or more of its seven constituent societies." See Roberta Frank, "'Interdisciplinary': The First Half Century," *Items*, Vol. 42, no. 3 (September 1988), p. 73; and David L. Sills, "A Note on the Origin of 'Interdisciplinary'," *Items*, Vol. 40, no. 1 (March 1986).

[53] "A Decade of Council History," *The Social Science Research Council: Decennial Report, 1923-1933*, p. 10.

[54] This phrase is taken from the 1922 American Political Science Association committee report that led to the founding of the SSRC. Charles Merriam was both chair of the committee and the main author of the report. See Sibley, chapter two.

Third, the Council was an intermediary organization. Part of its function was to form partnerships with disciplinary associations, research centers, government agencies, private foundations, international bodies and other knowledge-based and knowledge-producing organizations.[55] Ties with the research-supporting foundations were of particular significance. The foundations provided money, of course, but their support also made it possible for the Council to act as an intermediary between researchers and research funding in the first place, given that the federal government was not prepared to put its weight behind a central funding agency for the social sciences. Interscience relations were similarly important. Linkages with the humanities, via collaborations with the American Council of Learned Societies, proved especially durable, but the SSRC's founders anticipated that the Council would interact with the physical, medical and biological sciences as well. By the same token, while the Council was never intended to become a lobby for the social sciences at the federal level, it responded from time to time to potentially important matters, such as the establishment of the National Science Foundation in 1950 or legislation affecting exchanges with scholars and universities outside the United States.

Fourth, to take advantage of changing social conditions and methods of investigation, the Council was designed to be as elastic as possible. Even in its early days the Council's research planning committees were expected to carry out their work for a limited span of time–say, five to seven years–and for the same reason fellowship programs were kept going only as long as a persuasive argument could be made for their continued effectiveness. The ethos of flexibility allowed committees to spin-off new committees, sub-committees and working groups, sometimes with

[55] The kinds of organizations with which the Council was expected to develop ties would undergo subtle changes. A 1929 document refers to the "Council's relationship to other organizations–government bureaus, private bureaus, institutes, university and business organizations, agencies for social work, etc." See "Development of Present Council Policy," RAC, Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8465, p. 1. In the intervening years collaborations with social work agencies, for example, has given way to a new emphasis on contacts with international bodies.

overlapping memberships. At least a few social scientists shuttled back and forth among committees, governance bodies and working groups, as circumstances required. No single model of committee development or scholarly involvement was imposed on the organization as a whole. The Council was intended to be open-ended, inclusive not only of the needs and interests of affiliated scholars but also of successive generations. Few decisions about policy could really be considered final; issues of agenda, method and personnel could be reopened at any time by committees and governance bodies. Since the organization sought to provide a framework for innovative research, rather than to advance a specific research agenda, it was up to each generation to make use of this framework or apparatus as they saw fit.

Finally, the Council was conceived as a place where research could provide for a more rational approach to the management of social problems–what Merriam referred to applying "the categories of science to the vastly important forces of social and political control."[56] In part this was a question of "doing policy"–as in the area of social security, committees overlapped with the policymaking process on numerous occasions–but more generally the SSRC insisted on the pragmatic as well as the broadly intellectual value of social science. As a sympathetic foundation officer noted in the early 1920s, "a more complete knowledge of social forms and social processes is bound to be indispensable. Objective, realistic, far-sighted studies of social phenomena are essential if insights are to be gained which social planning requires."[57] From the standpoint of the organization's founding generation, the social sciences could only address real-world concerns by moving in a more data-sensitive, empirical direction–and they could only become more scientific by evaluating their theories and approaches in relation to genuine social problems. "What the SSRC sought to do," explained David Featherman, "was to use contemporary social problems as a research laboratory. The laboratory would provide the testing

[56] Charles Merriam, "Preface to the First Edition," *New Aspects of Politics*, p. 55.

ground for theories and hypotheses and in the course of doing so, generate new knowledge about fundamental features of human behavior and social institutions. The generated scientific knowledge would provide the basis in facts and in legitimacy for informed policymaking."[58]

In seeking to apply empirical knowledge to the public good, the Council's founders assumed that government agencies, most notably at the federal level, offered the most appropriate venue for social and institutional change. Rather than pitching their tent on the terrain of individual values, local communities or civil society, Merriam and others contended that social planning through coordinated government action was central to the task of reforming and modernizing society. Informing public debate and raising public awareness was also critical, but the federal role was deemed essential. This reflected the impact of Progressive Era notions of clean government, informed citizen participation and the importance of objective social analysis for informing policymaking on the generation that established the SSRC. It also, perhaps, sprang from the recognition that informed participation in the policy environment could enhance the legitimacy of the social sciences, which were still in the process of consolidating their position within the research universities.

Taken as a group, these constitutive premises–interdisciplinarity, research planning, foundation and interscience relations, institutional flexibility and scientific advance in the greater interests of society–reflected the cautiously reformist sensibility of a small core of well-placed academics and philanthropists who sought to transcend the limitations of "prescientific" approaches to knowledge-building in the social sciences. Together these organizing principles provided the basis for a new kind of institution, one that derived its legitimacy from the vitality of its networks and programs as much as from any particular intellectual product. If the apparent indirectness of

[57] Quoted in Olivier Zunz, *Why the American Century?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), p. 39.

the enterprise sometimes baffled outsiders, it made perfect sense to a group that saw itself on the cusp of a qualitative transformation in the coherence, relevance and scientificity of social knowledge.

The impact of the 1920s generation went beyond these deceptively simple premises. For one thing, Merriam, Mitchell and several of their peers remained involved long after they ceded executive positions to others. For another, lines of communication that the first generation established with funders and other research organizations, particularly the Rockefeller Foundation (which incorporated the LSRM in 1929), the Carnegie Corporation and the Russell Sage Foundation, provided the organization with a solid footing through the end of World War II. At a more abstract level the founding generation was responsible for placing the Council within an ascendant, geographically-dispersed social science establishment. If it is indeed the case that, as Mark Smith has suggested, the "organizational structure of contemporary American social science and its interrelationships with government, private industries, and foundations owe more to Charles Merriam than to any other individual," then the Council was a principal node within this larger "organizational structure."[59]

The founding generation served as a bridge between the Roosevelt administration and the social sciences during World War II, when thousands of researchers with PhDs migrated into government service.[60] One author estimated that by the summer of 1942 some 5,000 social

---

[58] Featherman, "SSRC, Then and Now: A Commentary on a Recent Historical Analysis," p. 15.
[59] Smith, *Social Science in the Crucible*, p. 85.
[60] In mid-1941, Merriam wrote a memo to P&P in which he argued that "[n]ever has the country been in greater need of the contributions that scholars in the social sciences can make; never have the country and its responsible leaders been so ready to make use of them. The call is for total effort. Defense comes first and foremost, but it is already clear that post-defense adjustment will also demand total effort if the nation is to avoid debacle…Students of politics, economics and fiscal policy must show the way. It is their research that will design the tools of management, of maximizing production, of manipulating consumption through taxation, price controls, and other devices by which alone it may be possible to achieve the goal. The student of political institutions must aid statesmen and political leaders to answer the most serious questions: Which of the people's liberties are basic, and which are merely accidental developments to

scientists were employed as federal workers, and Council leaders worked behind-the-scenes to ensure that qualified scholars were placed with the appropriate agencies.[61] In addition, the Committee on Social Adjustment (1940-47) was concerned with managing societal tensions before, during and immediately after the war.[62] The Committee issued a series of inexpensive pamphlets on the impact of the war on crime, public opinion, migration, Negro-white relations and other pressing topics that were aimed in large part at leaders in government.[63]

Although the war effort "disrupted the Council's normal types of assistance" it was represented a tremendous opportunity–"to see that there is a conscious and more organized attempt after the war to mold the social institutions of the world."[64] While wartime service enhanced the prestige of the social sciences, it also influenced the type of research that was undertaken after the war ended. With reference to political science, Robert Dahl argued that participation in the war effort "stimulated the development of the behavioral approach in the United States, for a great many American political scientists temporarily vacated their ivory towers and came to grips with day-

---

which they have become accustomed? Essential liberties must be preserved; irrelevant modes and customs may have to be modified in the total national effort. How can total effort with its demands for organization and speed be rendered fully responsible to democratic control without sacrifice of efficiency? How can federal unity be preserved and the rights of states and smaller units be protected? What more effective devices are there to implement our constitutional democratic system? What are the bases of morale, the forces that give cohesion to the community, to the state?" See "The Role of the Social Science Research Council in Public Administration," Minutes of the Committee on Problems and Policy, July 26-27, 1941. RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Sub-series 1, Box 315, Folder 1784, p. 214.

[61] Lloyd Short, "Personnel Problems Affecting Social Scientists in the National Civil Service After the War," August 1945, p. 2. RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 316, Folder 1786.

[62] The groundwork for the committee was laid by a three-person group that reported to P&P in early 1940. "The United States," they wrote, "is in a peculiarly detached and advantageous position to undertake the necessary studies upon which a just and permanent peace might be grounded. It is even conceivable that the publication of such studies might hasten the coming of peace, as well as serve as a rallying point for enlightened world opinion…In one sense all social science research in America makes a contribution to this particular objective. On the other hand, we recommend that each committee of the SSRC shall re-survey its contemporary program in order to discover what additional ways and means, if any, offer themselves of emphasizing this orientation. We live in a day of competing ideologies, and the United States as never before carries the hopes and fears of 'the democratic way.'" See Minutes of the Committee on Problems and Policy, January 28, 1940. RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Sub-series 1, Box 314, Folder 1783, pp. 254-255 (Appendix 3).

[63] See RAC, Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Box 208, Folders 1242-1253.

to-day political and administrative realities in Washington and elsewhere: a whole generation of American political science later drew on these experiences. The confrontation of theory and reality provoked, in most of the men who performed their stint in Washington or elsewhere, a strong sense of the inadequacies of the conventional approaches…for describing reality, much less for predicting in any given situation what was likely to happen."[65]

Charles Merriam remained a member of the Council's Board of Directors until his retirement in 1948. That year the Executive Committee appointed a Harvard political scientist, E. Pendleton Herring, as president of SSRC. The inevitable ascension of a new generation of leadership–symbolized by Herring's remarkable 20-year presidency (1948-68)–coincided with the postwar "golden age" of higher education. New fields of inquiry opened up; closer attention was paid to developing ever more sophisticated methods and techniques; and the flow of freshly-minted PhDs meant that researchers were available for almost any task set before them. "Between 1940 and 1990," writes historian Thomas Bender, "federal funds for higher education increased by a factor of twenty-five, enrollment by ten, and average teaching loads were reduced by half…it is difficult to grasp the magnitude of the infusion of new funds into the university, especially the most select research universities, in the quarter-century following World War II." Not unreasonably, a discernable sense of optimism and dynamism swept across the disciplines. Not only did the growth in resources and human capital provide the Council with new opportunities for advancing the status and reach of the social sciences, but the eagerness of government agencies and

[64] This phrase is taken from a presentation on the "Reorientation of Council Program in Light of Postwar Needs" by P&P member (and economist) Edwin G. Nourse. See Minutes of the Committee on Problems and Policy, February 21, 1943. RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Sub-series 1, Box 315, Folder 1785, p. 19.
[65] Robert A. Dahl, "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest" [1961], in James Farr and Raymond Seidelman, eds. *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), p. 251.

foundations to invest in social research also reflected the fact that, as Bender notes, the "social sciences seemed to hold special promise for addressing the challenges of the postwar era."[66] Research agendas changed in ways that reflected these new opportunities. In the immediate postwar period the Council sought to link the social sciences to the needs of the country's military and political leadership. Thus, committees on Techniques for Reducing Group Hostility (1945-47), Utilization of War Records (1945-46), and Military Applications of Social Science (1945-47) each reflected the Council's commitment to deploying social science expertise on behalf of pressing postwar priorities. Reflecting the move beyond a purely domestic focus, a committee on the Social Aspects of Atomic Energy (1945-47) pursued such matters as the "control of the destructive use of atomic energy through inspection," "the economic vulnerability to atomic warfare" and "the economics of atomic energy as a source of industrial heat and power."[67] In the same year, in partnership with the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and the National Research Council, the SSRC launched an Exploratory Committee on World Area Research. As one of the first SSRC committees concerned with research on areas outside the United States, the Exploratory Committee provided a template for the jointly-sponsored area committees that would become the Councils' (SSRC and ACLS) primary means of promoting research on world areas from the 1950s to the mid-1990s.[68]

[66]Thomas Bender, "Politics, Intellect, and the American University, 1945-1995," in Thomas Bender and Carl E. Schorske, eds., *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), pp. 21, 23 and 31. From 1946 to 1958, "foundation support for academic social science amounted to more than $85 million"; between "1959 and 1964, the big three foundations (Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie) bestowed nearly $100 million on political science departments." (pp. 23-24)

[67] "Social Aspects of Atomic Energy," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1945-46* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1946), p. 55-56.

[68] Both the Exploratory Committee on World Area Research (1945-46) and the Committee on World Area Research (1946-53) were chaired by Robert B. Hall, a political scientist at the University of Michigan. The other members of the Exploratory Committee were Mortimer Graves (American Council of Learned Societies), Wendell Bennett (Yale University), Maurice Halperin (Department of State), G. Evelyn Hutchinson (Yale University) and C.W. Thorthwaite (Soil Conservation Service).

By the 1950s, the Council had pulled together a broad portfolio of programs encompassing methodology, area studies, interscience issues, training and domestic problems. Pendleton Herring's orderly, empirical and intellectually serious approach to Council business helped make it possible for the organization to spin off into multiple directions while retaining its cachet within the social sciences.[69] Some of the most impressive work undertaken in this period, with Herring's endorsement, was in the area of methods. While research methods had always been a critical area for the Council, given its bedrock emphasis on fashioning and distributing more sophisticated tools for social analysis, new initiatives in historical statistics, socio-linguistics, survey research, econometrics, mathematical training in the social sciences and scaling theory reflected the breadth of innovation that was characteristic of the period.

In some cases the emphasis was on applied problems facing the federal government. Committees on Areas for Social and Economic Statistics (1964-67) and Population Census Monographs (1958-68), for example, brought university expertise to bear on problems raised by the administration of the decennial Census. This was neither the first nor last time the Council would devote resources to methodological and intellectual issues raised by the US Census, and the

[69] Edward Pendleton Herring (1903-) specialized in interest group representation, public administration and behavioral forms of political and social research. He received his PhD in political science from Johns Hopkins University in 1928, taught at Harvard's graduate School of Public Administration from 1928-46 and was president of the American Political Science Association in 1953-54. During the war and into the 1950s he served as a consultant to several federal agencies, including the Air Force, the Bureau of the Budget, the Central Statistics Board, the Navy Department, the National Science Foundation and the War Department. During 1946-47 he was the director of the Atomic Energy Group of the United Nations. After serving as SSRC president (1948-68) he chaired the Foreign Area Fellowship Program (1968-73), prior to its merger with the Council and served as president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation (1968-94). On Herring's contribution to military policy-making at the end of World War II, see Jeffery M. Dorwart, *Eberstadt and Forrestal: A National Security Partnership, 1909-1949* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1991). Herring's books include *Group Representation Before Congress* (1929), *Public Administration and the Public Interest* (1936), *The Politics of Democracy* (1940), *Presidential Leadership* (1940) and *The Impact of War* (1941). Among his many accomplishments, Herring is a gifted painter and a published poet with a particular affinity for the sonnet.

longstanding link between the Council and the Census would be further underscored by the 1998 appointment of president Kenneth Prewitt as Director of the Census Bureau.[70]

The Census was by no means the only federal program to inspire program activity. The Committee on Statistical Training (1967-71), which focused on improving the quality of statistics produced by individual states, was one of a number of committees concerned with the health of the country's statistical system. The Committee on Experimentation as a Method for Planning and Evaluating Social Intervention (1971-75) introduced federal officials to the application of experimental methods in planning and evaluating social problems. More generally, committees concerned with introducing graduate students to the latest research techniques helped provide the human capital for social science projects organized by the universities, the federal government and the private sector. Holding out the hope, as Merriam, Mitchell and Ruml had, that the social sciences could be infused with a greater degree of "order, clarity, and rigor," Pendleton Herring and other Council leaders firmly put their weight behind what has been described as "the new rigorism in the human sciences" that was characteristic of the postwar era.[71]

The Council's postwar agenda went beyond questions of method and training. Although Herring was keen on what he described as "the systematic study of political behavior," so that the social sciences could better "serve as a bulwark of democracy and one device for policy making," his tenure was also marked by firm support for an emerging network of area-defined committees that could "advance research on certain foreign areas." "Such area programs," Herring wrote, "gained their original impetus from their demonstrated utility during the war years and the subsequently

[70] The Committee for Research on the 1980 Census (1981-88) sponsored books and monographs on immigration, ethnicity and race, rural life, residential mobility and fertility patterns. See *Social Science Research Council Publications, 1975-1990* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1990), in passim.

obvious need for greater knowledge of many areas and cultures other than our own." As he later noted, area committees were "made up of scholars from a far wider range of disciplines" than non-area programs, and they were "normally concerned first with building the resources for research in this country on their respective areas" rather than pursuing discipline-approved scientific research. While the two major justifications Herring offered for the area approach may not have been entirely complementary–on the one hand, "knowledge about world areas is of vital importance to the government"; on the other, area studies provided a "safeguard against cultural parochialism"–his presidential-level commitment to area studies suggested his stance vis-à-vis the behavioral agenda was pragmatic rather than evangelical and ultimately reflected the familiar assumption that the pursuit of scholarly knowledge was itself a socially productive activity.[72]

The first committee with an exclusively international focus, albeit informed by domestic considerations, the Committee on Latin American Studies (1942-47), was intended to "make substantial contributions to the furtherance of research on Latin American problems."[73] For the duration of the war, the "committee's main emphasis was upon assisting the government as much as possible in carrying on essential activities in the Latin American field."[74] This committee, and other area committees formed after the war, responded to shared concerns about the need for

---

[71] Carl E. Schorske, "The New Rigorism in the Human Sciences, 1940-1960," in Bender and Schorske, eds. *American Academic Culture in Transformation*, p. 309.

[72] See Pendleton Herring, "Political Science in the Next Decade," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. XXXIX, no. 4 (August 1945), p. 766; Herring, "Report of the President, 1958-59," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1958-59* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1959), p. 11; Herring, "Report of the President, 1959-60," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1959-60* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960), p. 15; Herring, "Report of the President, 1949-50," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1949-50* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1950), p. 12; and Herring, "Report of the President, 1961-62," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1961-62* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1962), p. 13.

[73] If area studies is defined as an interdisciplinary enterprise bringing together scholars on the basis of a common interest in research and training on a given geopolitical territory, then the Council's first area committee was the Southern Regional Committee (1929-47), which conceived of the southern states as a cohesive unit where a sustained program of research, inclusive of scholars from the region, could generate in-depth knowledge about the area's distinctive history, politics, economics and culture.

[74] *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1945-46* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1946), p. 37.

developing "foreign area" expertise. Much of the material infrastructure for area and international studies was provided by the Ford Foundation, where Ford officer Francis (Frank) Sutton, who later served as interim SSRC president (1985-86),[75] and others took the lead in drawing "academic boundaries that had the virtue of clarity," as Bruce Cumings has noted.[76] Between 1951 and 1966 the Foundation's International Training and Research Program awarded "more than $270 million in grant funds, which supported the training of over 1,500 graduate students and the building of 'centers of excellence'"; this was in addition to support provided to the area programs of the SSRC and ACLS.[77] The federal government was also a prime mover in area studies, through such programs as the National Defense Education Act (1957) and the Fulbright-Hays Fellowship (1961).

A key moment in the area studies movement arrived with the publication of Robert Hall's *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences* (1947). Sponsored by the Committee on World Area Research, Hall's compact report identified a serious deficit of specialized knowledge on most world areas and the need for an ambitious educational initiative that could help provide intensive graduate training and "individualistic postgraduate refreshment" in unfamiliar languages, histories and cultures. "Here was a possible means," Hall argued, of "bringing about cross-fertilization with the social sciences and of bridging the gaps

[75] Francis X. Sutton (1917-) was one of the primary architects of the Ford Foundation's international program. He served on staff at Ford from 1954-83, and also worked as a consultant for the Rockefeller Foundation, the World Bank and the USAID. His books include *The American Business Creed* (1956) and *Ideology and Social Structure* (1991). After serving in the US Army Air Corps (1941-45) Sutton received a PhD in Social Science from Harvard University in 1950.

[76] For Cumings, the "clarity" of area studies contrasted favorably with the fuzziness of 1990s-style cross-regional scholarship promoted at the SSRC and elsewhere. Bruce Cumings, "Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies during and after the Cold War," *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, Vol. 29, no. 1 (January-March 1997), p. 8.

[77] Susan V. Berresford, "Preface," *Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1999), p. v.

between the social and the natural and humanistic disciplines. Here might be an important way of working toward the fundamental totality of all knowledge."[78]

This push toward the "fundamental totality" via area studies was under way by the late 1940s, when the Council organized committees on Latin American Studies (1947-48), Near and Middle East Studies (1951-59), Slavic and East European Studies (1948-71), and Southern Asia (1949-53). Area committees not only pursued the familiar litany of activities–preparing conferences and academic volumes and awarding fellowships–but also issued research guides, surveyed the state of relevant literatures in different fields, sought to defend the interests of academics engaged in overseas research and gave out book awards. By the end of the 1950s the Council began to collaborate on a systematic basis with the American Council of Learned Societies to establish an active network of area committees, most notably in the fields of Africa (1960-96), Contemporary China (1959-81), Japan (1967-96), Korea (1967-96), Latin America (1959-96), Near and Middle East (1959-96), and the Soviet Union (1971-77; 1983-96). The emphasis was on parts of the developing world and the Communist bloc. It was not until 1975 that the Councils would organize a joint committee on Western Europe; committees on South and Southeast Asia were constituted the following year.

While the area committees achieved prominence in their fields, a couple of non-area, "thematic" research planning committees became, by the standards of academic life, famous. Perhaps the most celebrated was the Committee on Comparative Politics (1954-72), chaired for many years by Gabriel Almond and subsequently by Lucien Pye. This committee became identified with the development and refinement of modernization theory, which enjoyed an undeniable impact on the study of developing areas in the era of decolonialization. It was also an active committee, which

[78] Robert B. Hall, *Area Studies: With Special Reference to their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947), pp. 50 and 2.

generated "over 300 written reports…sponsored 23 conferences, cosponsored 6 others, [and] conducted 5 summer workshops."[79] The conferences served as the springboard for an eight-volume series, "Studies in Political Development," that Princeton University Press issued to considerable acclaim. Prior to its dissolution, committee members recommended that a new committee, on the Comparative Study of Public Policy (1972-76), examine the effectiveness of public policies in Western Europe and North America. The new committee focused on comparative studies of national policies in four areas–affordable housing, control of inflation, industrial organization and access to higher education–but was unsuccessful in raising funds for a sustained program of research planning.

Other prominent research planning committees included the Committee on Economic Growth and Stability (1949-68), chaired by 1971 Nobel Prize-winner Simon Kuznets; the Committee on Economic Stability (1959-74); the Committee on Sociolinguistics (1963-79); and the Committee on Genetics and Behavior (1961-66), which was superceded by the Committee on the Biological Bases of Social Behavior (1966-79). Each was associated with the publication of keynote texts in their respective fields.[80] The Committee on Political Behavior (1949-64), chaired by David Truman, was closely linked to the postwar behavioral revolution that built on the achievements of the generation that founded the SSRC.[81] Several of the most active committees were in fields closest to the original concerns of Merriam, Mitchell and Ruml. Council committees incorporated the perspectives of many disciplines but in this period political science, economics and social psychology were especially vital to the life of the institution.

---

[79] Lucian W. Pye, "Forward," in Charles Tilly, ed. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. ix.

[80] Examples are supplied in the bibliography to Sibley, chapter 4.

[81] See Dahl, "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science," in Farr and Seidelman, eds. *Discipline and History*; James Farr, "Remembering the Revolution: Behavioralism in American Political Science," in James Farr, John S. Dryzek and Stephen T. Leonard, eds. *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Austin Ranney, "The Committee on Political Behavior, 1949-64, and the Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes, 1964-72," *Items*, Vol. 28, no. 3 (September 1974).

A notable aspect of the postwar Council was its ability to draw on the talents of distinguished scholars from a variety of fields. As David Sills has suggested, the membership of governance committees "reads like a 'who's who' of the social sciences," and he cites such visible postwar intellectuals as the anthropologist Clifford Geertz; the economists Frank Knight, Albert Rees, and Joseph J. Spengler; the historian C. Vann Woodward; the political scientists V.O. Key, Jr. and Sidney Verba; the psychologists Gardner Lindzey and Otto Klineberg, the sociologists E.W. Burgess and Neil Smelser; and the statistician Frederick Mosteller; among others.[82] A scan of committee rosters and fellowship lists speaks volumes about the Council's capacity to enlist the support of, and lend support to, successive cohorts of leading social scientists.[83] In 1944-46, for example, to make up for training opportunities lost during the war years, the Council issued 151 Demobilization Awards to such future luminaries as Gabriel A. Almond, James MacGregor Burns, Morris Janowitz, Carl Schorske, Francis Sutton and Paul Sweezy. All but Sweezy were later invited to join Council committees. A decade later, Merle Curti, Robert A. Dahl, John Hope Franklin, Melville Herskovits, Henry Kissinger, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Robert K. Merton, Lucian W. Pye and Thomas Schelling could all be found on SSRC committees. By 1970, some of the more illustrious committee members included Norberto Bobbio, John K. Fairbank, Eugene Genovese, Samuel Huntington, Chalmers Johnson, Arthur Okun and Marshall Shulman.

Institutional growth was anchored by the organizing principles established in the early phase of the Council's development. It was also made possible by the participation of numerous researchers who collaborated on a voluntary basis to design and implement projects through steering committees, research networks, advisory and screening panels and working groups. The

[82] David L. Sills, "Requiem for P&P," p. 95.
[83] In the early 1950s the Council published an annotated biography of past SSRC fellows which revealed, *inter alia*, that out of a total of 1,028 fellowships awarded between 1925 and 1950 slightly under sixty were

growth of the organization also required successive infusions from foundations, and to a far lesser extent, public sources, which in turn depended on a broader confidence in the maturing analytic capacity of the social sciences. As we have seen, even in its early years the Council was able to attract financial backing, although the general situation would never compare to that of the physical and natural sciences. According to Louis Wirth's 1937 report, the SSRC had $20,500 in funds on hand in 1924, $241,454 in 1927, and $925,371 in 1935, at the depth of the Great Depression.[84] While three major foundations–Rockefeller, Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Ford Foundation–were responsible for the lion's share of funds in the Council's first half-century, the funder base diversified from the 1960s onwards. Thus, the number of foundations and government agencies providing support rose from 4 in 1925, to 5 in 1935, 10 in 1965 and 13 in 1975. Whereas in 1925 no funder was based outside the United States, nearly one-third of the 1975 funders were international.

Shifts in the scope and activities of the postwar SSRC were also reflected in the growth in the number of committees (from 6 in 1925, to 21 in 1935, to 32 in 1945 and 1975), as well as the steady rise in the number of committee with an international focus (from 2 to 1925, to 6 in 1945, to 12 in 1955, to 19 in 1965). The number of fellowships offered by committees, for both domestic and international research, also increased, from 19 in 1925, 79 in 1935, 164 in 1945, 299 in 1955, 217 in 1965 and 291 in 1975.[85] Between 1952 and 1970 the Council issued a total of 1,176 dissertation and postdoctoral fellowships.[86] Meanwhile, the size of the professional staff grew from one in 1927, to 6 in 1945 and 1955, 8 in 1965 and 17 in 1975.

---

given to women. See *Fellows of the Social Science Research Council, 1925-51* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951).

[84] Wirth, "Report on the History, Activities and Policies of the Social Science Research Council," p. 55.

[85] These figures were calculated on the basis of information provided in successive annual reports.

[86] "Research Training Fellows of the Social Science Research Council: 1952-1970," unpublished document, March 1972. RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 92, Box 567, Folder 6753.

Another indicator of the Council's evolving role within the social sciences was the publications that resulted from committee projects. The familiar titles of some of the better-known SSRC volumes reflected the broad sweep of its research interests. Council committees in the interwar and postwar periods were responsible for *The Negro Family in Chicago* (1932); *The Modern Corporation and Private Property* (1932); *The Idea of National Interest* (1934); *Cooperation and Competition Among Primitive Peoples* (1937); *More Security for Old Age: A Report and Program* (1937); *The American Soldier* (two volumes, 1949); *The Pre-election Polls of 1948* (1949); *The Social Sciences in Historical Study* (1954); *The Voter Decides* (1954); *Explorations in Social Psychiatry* (1958); *The Politics of Developing Areas* (1960); *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (1963); *Economic Transition in Africa* (1964); *Modern Economic Growth* (1966); *Crises and Sequences in Political Development* (1971); and *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (1975).[87]

SSRC committees sponsored a total of 762 books, reports and other publications from 1929 to 1975, not including books or articles stemming from grants to individual scholars.[88] Sixty-five of

[87] See E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932); Berle and Means, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*; Charles Beard, *The Idea of National Interest* (New York: Macmillan, 1934); Margaret Mead, ed., *Cooperation and Competition Among Primitive Peoples* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937); Margaret Grant Schneider, *More Security for Old Age: A Report and Program* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1937); Samuel A. Stouffer et al., *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life* and *The American Soldier: Combat and its Aftermath* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949); Frederick Mosteller et al., *The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1949); Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin and Warren E. Miller, *The Voter Decides* (Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1954); *The Social Sciences in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1954); Alexander Leighton, John Clausen and Robert Wilson, eds., *Explorations in Social Psychiatry* (New York: Basic Books, 1958); Gabriel Almond and James Coleman, eds., *The Politics of Developing Areas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960); Joseph LaPalombara, ed., *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963); Melville J. Herskovits and Mitchell Harwitz, eds., *Economic Transition in Africa* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964); Simon Kuznets, *Modern Economic Growth: Rate, Structure, and Spread* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966); Leonard Binder et al., *Crises and Sequences in Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971); and Charles Tilly, ed., *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975).

[88] See *Social Science Research Council Publications, 1929-1975* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1975); and *Social Science Research Council Publications, 1975-1990*. In the period from 1929 to

these were book-length research bulletins that the Council published between 1930-54, which emphasized questions of research methodology. From the 1960s onward, most completed projects assumed the form of university press volumes, although from time to time the Council issued reports and other materials under its own banner.

CHANGING POLITICAL TIDES

Lurking behind the dynamism and increased international awareness of the social sciences in the postwar period is the inescapable presence of the cold war. The pursuit of superpower antagonisms played a critical, if sometimes indirect, role in fueling university growth, shaping research priorities, galvanizing research centers, building information and data collection systems and outlining the boundaries of acceptable scholarship. Just as the call for a purposive social science animated Council discussions in the 1920s, the question of national security acquired an entirely new salience in the post-1945 era. In view of the US accession from hemispheric powerhouse to global superpower, the expansion of an American-based international studies was not entirely unexpected, but this period has recently come under closer scrutiny as scholars have investigated the connections among area studies networks, campus research centers, foreign policy imperatives and grantmaking in the social sciences.[89]

In a 1994 review of the impact of the cold war on international and area studies, Stanley Heginbotham, SSRC Vice-President from 1990-95, writing in the pages of *Items*, found that there

---

1990 the Council was responsible for producing a grand total of 1,173 books, reports, and other publications.

[89] While there is as yet no definitive study, readers may wish to consult, *inter alia*, Sigmund Diamond, *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945-1955* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Robert A. McCaughey, *International Studies and Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984); Richard J. Samuels and Myron Weiner, eds., *The Political Culture of Foreign Area and International Studies* (McLean, VA: Brassey's, 1992); Mark Seldon, ed., "Asia, Asian Studies, and the

"is widespread recognition that cold war goals were major incentives for federal programs in support of international scholarship, education, and exchanges. What is less widely recognized is that similar concerns motivated much of the private foundation grant-making in the arena of international scholarship and educational exchange. Even less well understood is the extent to which such concerns shaped the kinds of programs that were developed and are still being sustained."[90] While this assessment struck some observers as a matter of "too little, too late,"[91] others insisted that institutions "operating in a tenser political environment" were able to function without "compromising their academic integrity."[92] Neither side disputed that organizations such as the Council maintained open communication with federal agencies for the purpose of developing area studies infrastructure and assisting national security efforts in the context of the cold war.

A 1951 "preliminary draft" on area training, prepared for the Ford Foundation, is suggestive of the alliances that sprang up in this period. The document opened by noting that "Many more trained men are needed by the government, by industry, and by our universities, with special skills concerning the economic, political, social, and cultural problems of a given area." It went on to call for a major, $4 million area training initiative of fellowship support. The proposed

---

National Security State: A Symposium," *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, Vol. 29, no. 1 (January-March 1997); and Zunz, *Why the American Century?*

[90] Stanley J. Heginbotham, "Rethinking International Scholarship: The Challenge of the Transition from the Cold War Era," *Items*, Vol. 48, nos. 2-3 (June-September 1994), p. 34.

[91] A distinguished historian of the cold war in Asia, Bruce Cumings, complained that it "is a bit much, of course, for the SSRC only to acknowledge this now by way of justifying its new course, when it spent all too much time in the 1960s and 1970s denying that the state had any influence on its research programs." See Bruce Cumings, "Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies During and After the Cold War," in Christopher Simpson, ed. *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences During the Cold War (*New York: New Press, 1998), p. 179.

[92] "The reality is that Slavic and Eurasian area scholars and funders produced results strikingly independent of assumptions driving U.S. political preferences and demonstrated a remarkable ability to integrate new research missions into existing administrative structures…In sum, institutions born partially in response to the cold war found they could operate in a tenser political environment without compromising their academic integrity." Robert T. Huber, Blair A. Ruble and Peter J. Stavrakis, "Post-Cold War 'International' Scholarship: A Brave New World or the Triumph of Form Over Substance?" *Items*, Vol. 49, no. 1 (March 1995), pp. 30-31.

program was organized in two stages. The first stage involved "encouraging the major training centers to enlarge their staffs and to recruit substantially larger numbers of qualified graduate students. This move is of the utmost importance if a beginning is to be made in meeting governmental needs." The second "will begin when governmental funds for sending substantial numbers of men from the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of State become available. Negotiations are currently under way with officials in these and other agencies to work out plans for securing funds from Congress. It seems not unlikely that within the next six to eight months Federal funds may be available to pay for the training of officials and prospective Federal employees who are to be sent to foreign areas. The existing area centers must be greatly strengthened if they are to be able to bear this increased load."[93]

If in-depth knowledge of international areas assumed a special urgency, the reputation of the Council still depended on the perception on the part of funders, scholars and university leaders that its programs were untainted by political favor or bias. As the organization sought to raise money and recruit scholars it continued to stress its autonomy from any single discipline, approach or ideology. One of the strengths that Pendleton Herring brought to the presidency was his ability to make the case for collaborative programs and scholarly research that adhered to the strictest professional standards. The fact that he would be expected to do so at area studies meetings that brought together social scientists, foundation officers and representatives of the intelligence community is redolent of the kinds of academy-state linkages fostered by the cold war.[94] There were, in other words, outer limits to the Council's claim of independence. SSRC

[93] "Area Training Program of the Social Science Research Council: Preliminary Draft," March 5, 1951. RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 39, Box 182, Folder 2071, pp. 1-2.

[94] Bruce Cumings reports that in 1953 "the Ford Foundation sponsored a conference on Soviet and Slavic area studies, to discuss a program of fellowships in that field. Major academic figures in Soviet studies, such as [Columbia University professor Philip] Mosely, Merle Fainsod, Cyril Black, and Frederick Barghoorn, attended; also attending was the China specialist George Taylor. Government figures present included George Kennan, Paul Nitze, Allen Dulles and several CIA officials. Pendleton Herring of the SSRC also attended. Among other things, the conferees fretted about 'loyalty' checks on grantees, and therefore suggested denying fellowships to 'partisans of special Soviet movements and recognized

committees, and the organization's leadership, were invested in America's success in the cold war, and in the spread of liberal democratic values to newly independent nations.[95] A commitment to peer review and canons of empirical inquiry did not rule out the possibility that scholarship that adopted a self-consciously radical stance toward the larger questions of the cold war might find itself excluded from serious consideration. But the existence of implicit ideological boundaries reveals little about the acuity or diversity of scholarship that attracted Council sponsorship in the postwar era.

Furthermore, despite linkages between the foreign policy community and Council networks, the organization also came under fire from cold war partisans as a tool of a disloyal, East Coast establishment. In 1954 the Council, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation and other major foundations were investigated by a Congressional committee looking into allegations of "un-American and subversive activity."

The Special Committee to Investigate Foundations, chaired by Representative B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee, convened hearings between May and June 1954 to investigate the activities of tax-exempt foundations and partner organizations such as the SSRC. The Committee was created by

---

supporters of political parties inimical to the best interests of the United States'." Cumings does not reveal what any of the participants specifically said, or whether any specific recommendations were implemented by SSRC or any other organization. See Cumings, "Boundary Displacement," p. 169.

[95] Further research is needed to back up (or refute) this sweeping claim. One relevant source is the work of the Committee on National Security (1956-64), the successor to the Committee on Civil-Military Relations Research (1952-56). The committee first met in Washington, in June 1956, "with several individuals who had had relevant governmental experience," and among the research topics singled out were "the problems likely to face the United States in the next few years in such places as South Korea, Formosa and Southeast Asia. Dispassionate studies by scholars who were not subject to political pressures might be useful to government officials; such studies of a chronologically middle-range scope, interpreting recent history might appropriately include recommendations to policy-makers…[another] area of inquiry is suggested by the very real concern shown by the President over the maintenance of a sound economy as a vital element in national security…It was perhaps not too much to say that the highest achievement of military statesmanship consisted in finding the right balance between the military establishment and the economy in order to obtain the maximum degree of security over a given time period. Had independent scholars produced analyses that would assist in estimating and maintaining such a balance?" See "Committee on

House Resolution 217 of the 83rd Congress, for the purpose of conducting "a full and complete investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation to determine if any foundations and organizations are using their resources for purposes other than the purposes for which they were established, and especially to determine which such foundations and organizations are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities; for political purposes, propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation."[96] Following its deliberations, the Committee issued a 413-page majority report that voiced strong concerns about the concealed political and social biases of the major foundations.

The Reece hearings were stacked against the foundations and the Council from the outset. Of the 12 witnesses to the hearings, "the eleven first heard were Mr. Reece, three members of his paid staff with extensive reports, two Treasury Department officials on technical tax questions, and five general witnesses unconnected with foundations."[97] The first witness was Norman Dodd, the Committee's director of research. Dodd maintained that the major foundations played a pivotal, behind-the-scenes role in bankrolling collectivist, socialist and world federalist doctrines. The primary means by which the foundations promoted subversive doctrines was through investment in social research.[98] As one foundation insider later noted, "The thesis supported by

---

National Security Policy," RAC, Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Box 183, folder 1085, pp. 1-3. Henry Kissinger was a member of the committee; the chair was William T.R. Fox of Columbia University.

[96] *Tax-Exempt Foundations: Hearings Before the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1954), p. 1.

[97] F. Emerson Andrews, *Foundation Watcher* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 146-147. The Council's attorney, Timothy Pfeiffer, later wrote that most of the witnesses had been "described by a minority member of the Committee as psycho-ceramic crackpots." See Timothy Pfeiffer, *Law Practice in a Turbulent World: An Informal Narrative of Four Decades, 1921-1963* (New York: Milbank, Tweed, Hadley and McCloy, 1965).

[98] Reece himself said the hearings would "confine our attention to the work of foundations in what are called the social sciences. Little criticism has come to us concerning research or other foundation activities in the physical or exact sciences, such as medicine and physics." In a prepared statement, the president of the Rockefeller Foundation, future US Secretary of State Dean Rusk, said "we appreciate the fact that the Chairman has taken note of large fields of foundation activity which have, over the years, become largely noncontroversial in character. With full confidence in the importance and usefulness of our support for

the staff testimony and the general witnesses appeared to be that great changes had occurred in American in the direction of socialism and collectivism, with one of the witnesses holding that even the federal income tax was a socialist plot to destroy the government; these changes were aided, it was alleged, through a 'diabolical conspiracy' of foundations and certain education and research organizations."[99] Only the final witness, Pendleton Herring, testified on behalf of the foundations.

The hearings, and the majority report that followed (there was also a minority report, prepared by the Committee's two Democrats), attracted considerable attention in the national media. Cartoonists and editorialists across the country weighed in both for and against the majority report. In the *Atlantic Monthly*, Sumner Slichter took issue with the Committee's premise that the big foundations or the Council had advanced any overarching political objective, emphasizing that the "research organizations…selected for attack are the ones which have most scrupulously avoided propaganda."[100] Representative Reece was unimpressed by the objections of his critics, however. "Each of the great foundations has gigantic power," he pointed out a year after the hearings. "There has been, and is…a concentration of power. It takes the form of interlocking directorates. It involves the creation and support of various intermediary organizations which act as retailers of the money which the foundations provide as wholesalers. Among these are the Social Science Research Council, American Council of Learned Societies, American Council on Education, Foreign Policy Association and many others…It has resulted in the formation of what

---

work in the social sciences, we urge the Committee to take *all* of our activities into account in any evaluation…In the case of The Rockefeller Foundation, for example, its grants in the social sciences represent 15 cents of the Foundation's dollar expended. We believe that these appropriations have rendered a notable public service. But the broader question of the benefit to the public of any particular foundation necessarily involves a view of its work seen as a whole." Dean Rusk, *Before the Special Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations. Statement of the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1954), pp. 19-20. Emphasis in the original.

[99] F. Emerson Andrews, *Foundation Watcher*, p. 147. A 60 minute video interview with Norman Dodd, entitled *Hidden Agenda: Merging America into World Government*, is available on the world wide web, as are audio tapes of Dodd's speeches warning citizens of the malignant influence of the big foundations.

[100] Sumner H. Slichter, "Undermining the Foundations," *Atlantic Monthly* (September 1954), p. 54.

might really be called an intellectual cartel, having at its command billions of capital and hundreds of millions of income per year to disburse for its selected purposes. This concentration is capable of, and has freely exerted, a form of invisible coercion and of thought control."[101] Pendleton Herring later said he found these charges "bizarre."[102]

Each of these developments–the postwar expansion of higher education, the ratcheting up of pressure to achieve scientific results and cold war agendas that simultaneously rendered the Council complicit and subversive–had a telling impact on the environment in which the SSRC operated from the 1940s through the 1960s.

But by the early 1970s, the era of uninterrupted growth and rising expectations was fast coming to a close. Confidence in the capacity of technically-accomplished social science to develop sound policy diminished as the lofty ideals of the 1950s-1960s dissolved into deepening unease. Surveying the condition of the US social sciences in the mid-1960s, Pendleton Herring discerned "a new period of federal support of social and domestic programs," as well as "increased public attention to social science research."[103] Two decades later, acting SSRC president Francis Sutton lamented "a recent tepidness toward the social sciences, both in government and among private

[101] Unpublished remarks of Carroll Reece to the Commonwealth Club of California, March 11, 1955. RAC, Rockefeller Foundation Collection, 3.2, Series 900, Box 14, Folder 86, p. 7. Reece reported that the "hearings terminated at the end of the long testimony of one of the foremost representatives of the foundations, Mr. Pendleton Herring of the Social Science Research Council, in which he stated just about everything he could think of in defense of the foundations." (p. 2)

[102] Herring told an interviewer that the Committee's "charges were bizarre. The Council, they asserted, was the apex of a pyramid of power. And this power was maintained through interlocking contacts that brought together the overweening influence of private philanthropy and public policy, and the whole thing was, in effect, a conspiracy to take over the control of public affairs. How do you deal with anything as bizarre as that? They expressed their horror at all this by calling attention to 'empirical inquiry' as being very dangerous." E. Pendleton Herring, interviewed in Michael A. Baer, Malcolm E. Jewell, Lee Sigelman, eds. *Political Science in America: Oral Histories of a Discipline* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1991), p. 38.

[103] Pendleton Herring, "Introduction by the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1965-66* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1966), pp. 12 and 9. There is, Herring suggested, "a wider recognition of the relevance of the social disciplines to important contemporary problems. The

funders" which "may arise from a national mood beyond the obvious reach of public policy…We have been in a period when the balance has tipped away from confident recourse to authority and expertise, and in particular from looking to the social sciences for solutions to problems. Indeed, faith in the social sciences as *Wertfrei* objective inquiry has been left badly tattered."[104] The shift in tone is striking. While social scientists were blamed by some for the perceived failures of the domestic programs (and foreign policy) of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the most visible articulation of a backlash against public investment in the research enterprise were the monthly "Golden Fleece" awards, issued by Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisconsin), who found little evidence that the social sciences could offer any scientific or practical accomplishments.[105] Yet Proxmire's selective targeting of bureaucratic excess paled in comparison to the hostility that surfaced during the early months of the first Reagan administration, when Office of Management and Budget director David Stockman sought to trim programs with "social science" in their titles out of the federal budget.[106]

The issue of cold war partisan politics also looked very different from the perspective of the early 1970s. Not only had superpower tensions cooled, but the debacle of the Vietnam War, which had been a cold war project par excellence, gave rise to a generation of scholars who cut their intellectual teeth in opposition to what they saw as foreign policy imperialism. As a result, intelligence experts were less likely to participate in, or be invited to, scholarly discussions on specific world regions. Area studies itself began to look less like an expression of geopolitical

---

public temper now seems to favor direct attack on long-standing inequities, abuses, and inefficiencies in our society." (p. 11)

[104] Francis X. Sutton, "Report of the Acting President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1985-86* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1986), pp. 27-28.

[105] Henry Riecken, who served as SSRC vice president from 1966-68, and as president from 1968-71, told a 1975 meeting of the Committee on Problems and Policy that Proxmire's attacks represented "only the cutting edge" of a much broader assault on federal spending on the social sciences. He also called attention to the decline in Ford Foundation support for social science research, and linked both developments to a deteriorating economic climate. See Henry Riecken, "Recent Challenges to Social Science Research," RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, File 2145.

conflict and more like a forerunner to the interdisciplinary program fields of the 1970s and beyond that neatly straddled the distinction between the social sciences and the humanities.[107] Meanwhile, greater attention was paid to the issue of research funding itself. A small but revealing episode took place in 1973, when the Army Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences approached the Committee on Work and Personality in the Middle Years about the possibility of sponsoring research on careers in the military. While the committee was inclined to apply for funding, several others, including the Joint Committee on Latin America, were critical of the idea. At its September 1973 meeting the Committee on Problems and Policy debated whether such funds were "tainted" and might complicate the Council's relationships with the outside world. Although P&P resolved that Army Institute support would be acceptable, provided that "the acceptance of such funds would involve no special reporting or other special conditions requested by the grantor," the Army Institute quietly rescinded its invitation.[108] A year later, P&P returned to the broader debate over funding sources and resolved that neither "governmental nor any other grants for research that is classified or similarly restricted may be accepted by the Council under any circumstances."[109] While that had been the accepted position of the organization, P&P members felt it useful to reaffirm this commitment in the politicized environment of the early 1970s.

---

[106] See David A. Stockman, *The Triumph of Politics: Why the Reagan Revolution Failed* (New York: Avon, 1986).

[107] "Since World War II, a number of new developments have challenged the conventional organization of academic disciplines. Area studies – of the Soviet Union, China, Latin America, and elsewhere – came first, probably in response to America's intensified presence in world politics. But area studies were soon followed by a host of other program fields driven by very different constituencies – urban studies, black studies, women's studies, cultural studies, gay and lesbian studies." Dan Clawson and Robert Zussman, "Canon and Anti-Canon for a Fragmented Discipline," in Dan Clawson, ed., *Required Reading: Sociology's Most Influential Books* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), p. 14.

[108] Committee on Problems and Policy Minutes, September 9-11, 1973. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, File 2144.

[109] Committee on Problems and Policy Minutes, March 15-16, 1974. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, File 2145.

Another discussion that reflected the changing tenor of the times concerned the demographic make-up of the Council's network and staff. This issue was first broached in 1971, when the board passed a resolution calling on the organization to "increase the participation of younger social scientists, women, and minority group members in the committees' activities." This resolution may have marked a critical turning point, in that staff had previously paid relatively little attention to the social characteristics of committee members and fellowship recipients.

Implementing the new mandate of inclusiveness was not always a smooth process, however. In the minutes of the March 1972 meeting, the board acknowledged that "we have lacked knowledge about persons from these particular categories who have the special competence required for the work of the several committees. Not infrequently, the committees have been of little help in our effort to obtain better balance because they have recommended 'the best possible person' to be added without regard to these categories."[110] At the same meeting the board requested that the president deliver an annual report to P&P concerning the composition of SSRC committees. In the first report, acting president Ralph Tyler noted that, out of a total of 202 committee members, nine were classified as African-American, five were female, six were Asian-Americans, nine were based at non-US institutions, and twelve were under 40.[111] He acknowledged there was likely to be some overlap across these categories. The following year the board further resolved that the Council "develop guidelines for the staffing of committees which take into consideration the range of talent, ingenuity, experience and ability in the social science community, especially with reference to race, sex, age, ethnicity, and foreign status."[112]

---

[110] "Diversification of Council Personnel," Board of Directors Minutes, March 24-25, 1972. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, File 2138.

[111] Committee on Problems and Policy Minutes, March 25, 1972. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, File 2140. An unsigned 1974 staff memo noted that "the majority of the Council's joint-area committees have no foreign scholars as members." See "Some Thoughts on the Future of Area Studies at the Council," January 22, 1974. RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 39, Box 182, Folder 2073.

[112] Board of Directors Minutes, March 23-24, 1973. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, File 2141.

The board would of course return to issues of inclusion and diversity, although by the 1980s the emphasis had shifted somewhat, with greater attention paid to internationalization and less to the participation of younger scholars. Debates over committee composition, and the sources of research funding, were suggestive of larger changes taking place in the academy and in the society at large. They represented a means by which the social agendas of the 1960s and 1970s became inserted into the deliberations of governance bodies and research committees. If the institutional autonomy that was a hallmark of the Council helped ensure that the day-to-day activities of committees and staff were left undisturbed by campus turbulence, the impact of changing public values could be measured in other ways.

The Council took note of concerns about the obstacles facing minorities in higher education by launching two initiatives aimed at minority researchers: the Minority Research Awards (1969-71), and Grants to Minority Scholars for Research on Racism and Other Social Factors in Mental Health (1972-79).[113] The Afro-American Cultures and Societies committee (1968-75) reflected a board-approved effort to pull together a new research program with the involvement of a critical mass of African-American scholars. The goal was, first, to stimulate "comparative research on Afro-American societies and cultures in the New World," and, second, to clarify the "relationship between Afro-American studies and the social science disciplines."[114] Both were worthy ambitions, but committee members were not satisfied with the direction provided by staff and sought greater institutional autonomy. Two years before the committee's dissolution, its chair,

[113] This was by no means the first time that the Council had targeted programs at minority scholars. In 1927 the Council's Advisory Committee on Interracial Relations identified "the prime necessity of training Negro research workers" and urged that the SSRC set aside "a special fund from the fellowship budget to be applied to Junior Fellowships open to promising Negro college graduates." See Interracial Relations Committee Minutes, January 22, 1927, RAC, Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Box 173, Folder 997.
[114] "Afro-American Cultures and Societies," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1971-72* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1972), p. 21.

Ronald Walters, formally requested that the committee operate independently of any staff role. P&P turned down the request, and the committee did not meet in 1974-75.[115]

Board members and staff discussed the possibility of initiating a program in the "neglected area" of gender and society.[116] This led to a series of planning meetings, at which participants discussed "the problems of conceptualizing gender and of formulating research questions and designs to analyze relationships among biological sex, socially defined gender, and society."[117] While funding for a new committee proved scarce, comparative investigation into the economic, social, cultural and psychological status of women were promoted by a number of research planning and area committees in the aftermath of the early 1970s.[118]

From a programmatic point of view changes in the institutional environment were as significant as these broader cultural shifts. In the 1920s, and even in the 1950s, very few institutions were in the same business as the SSRC. By the 1970s this was no longer the case. A proliferation of think tanks, research centers, scholarly associations, ad hoc committees and so on intersected with the Council's areas of interest and in some cases began to seize the turf of research planning. At some of the larger university systems, centers of international studies began to undertake large-scale, comparative research agendas; and some foundations began to manage their own fellowship competitions and in-house research projects. The National Bureau of Economic

[115] Committee on Problems and Policy Minutes, September 26, 1974. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 320, Folder 1813.
[116] Board of Directors Minutes, March 15-16, 1974. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, Folder 2145.
[117] Memorandum on Gender and Society, February 10, 1979. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 321, Folder 1821.
[118] The same intellectual climate that called for research on social identities also pushed the Council in the direction of greater informality. It was in the 1970s that governance committees went from formal lunches with tablecloths, silverware and china plates to paper plates and plastic utensils (and halfway back again). Holdovers from an earlier time, such as the tradition of smoking cigars after executive meetings, were phased out in favor of a more egalitarian, less aristocratic style. Similarly, the unwritten dress code for staff members, which required jackets and ties for men and dresses for women, gave way to a more relaxed

Research expanded, providing economists with an attractive perch for collaborative research. Federal agencies–most notably the National Science Foundation, but also the National Institutes of Health, and Mental Health–began to assume leadership in certain areas of the social and behavioral sciences. It was for this latter reason that Nobel Prize winner Herbert Simon, who served as a member of governance committees, raised the question of whether there was still a compelling *raison d'etre* for the Council when he stepped down from the board of directors.[119] It is at least arguable that the Council's identity as a focal point for scholarly communication and exchange was to some extent eroded as well as complicated by changes in the research environment.

Changes taking place within the Council also underscored the sense that the organization was entering a time of transition. The organization lost four key staff members in the early 1970s: Elbridge Sibley and Paul Webbink both retired in 1970, after joining the staff in 1944 and 1936 respectively; Bryce Wood retired in 1973, after serving as staff associate for 23 years; and Eleanor Isbell retired in 1975 after 37 years, including 27 as the first editor of *Items*.[120] At the

---

approach. Yet the Council retained a somewhat formal, midtown Manhattan mien; what changed was the operative definition of formality.

[119] Letter from Herbert A. Simon to the SSRC Board of Directors, cited in Committee on Problems and Policy Minutes, March 21-22, 1975. RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, Folder 2145. Herbert A. Simon (1916-) served on the board as a member-at-large from 1958 until 1971, chaired the board from 1961-65, and served on several committees, including the Committee on Business Enterprise Research (1953-57) and the Committee on the Simulation of Cognitive Processes (1957-62). While his degree was in political science, Simon is Richard King Mellon University Professor of Computer Science and Psychology at Carnegie Mellon University. His 1978 Nobel Prize was in economics, for "pioneering research into the decision-making process within economic organizations." See "Herbert A. Simon Awarded 1978 Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics," *Items*, Vol. 32, nos. 3-4 (December 1978), p. 41. Herbert Simon's books include *Models of Discovery: And Other Topics in the Methods of Science* (1977); *Reason in Human Affairs* (1991); and *The Sciences of the Artificial* (1996). In his autobiography, Simon emphasized his commitment to the Council's interdisciplinary orientation. "The encouragement of interdisciplinary activity had been a principal motivation for founding the Social Science Research Council. But at the meetings of the council, I was appalled at how often I heard such phrases as, 'as a historian, I…,' 'as an economist, I…,' 'as a sociologist, I…,' and so on. I challenged these phrases each time I heard them, but it was like trying to purge *ainnuh* ('Isn't it so?') from the lexicon of a native of Milwaukee." Herbert A. Simon, *Models of My Life* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 172-173.

[120] See "Elbridge Sibley Dies," *Items*, Vol. 48, no. 4 (December 1994); "Eleanor Isbell to Retire April 1," *Items*, Vol. 29, no. 1 (March 1975); "Paul Webbink and Elbridge Sibley to Retire on December 31, 1970:

same time, several influential research committees, including the Committee on Comparative Politics, which had been staffed by Bryce Wood, were either winding down or dissolved by the early 1970s.

Second, finding a president who could command the respect of committees, funders and staff proved more complicated than expected, and those who maintained the support of these diverse constituencies were not always inclined to settle into the job. The unusual degree of institutional stability represented by Pendleton Herring's long tenure gave way to a more fluid conception of the office of the presidency. After Herring stepped down, Henry Riecken, a psychologist who had served under Herring as vice president, and who had been the program director for the social and behavioral sciences at the National Science Foundation, assumed the presidency. Riecken resigned in 1971 and was followed by acting president Ralph Tyler, the founding director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, California. Eleanor Sheldon, an empirical sociologist at the Russell Sage Foundation with a strong background in the field of social indicators, became president in the fall of 1972, and left seven years later. Her successor was Kenneth Prewitt (1979-85), a University of Chicago political scientist and former director of the National Opinion Research Center. Francis Sutton served as interim president for a little over a year (1985-86), and was followed first by Frederic Wakeman, Jr., a historian of modern China at the University of California, Berkeley (1986-89), and then by David Featherman, a sociologist at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, specializing in status attainment and human development (1989-95). After serving at the Rockefeller Foundation as senior vice president for 10 years, Kenneth Prewitt returned for a second tenure as president in 1995. He resigned in October 1998 to direct the US Census Bureau, and social psychologist Orville G. Brim Jr., a former president of both the Russell Sage Foundation and the Foundation for Child Development,

---

The Council Pays Tribute," *Items*, Vol. 24, no. 4 (December 1970); and "Tribute to Bryce Wood, on His Retirement," *Items*, Vol. 27, no. 4 (December 1973).

stepped in as interim president. Brim's successor, the New York University sociologist and intellectual historian Craig Calhoun, was named in 1999.

Third, in the early 1970s the Councils merged the Foreign Area Fellowship Program (FAFP) into the joint international program. The FAFP had been founded in the early 1950s, with funding provided by the Ford Foundation. Starting in 1962, ACLS and SSRC shared responsibility for appointing committee members, but the fellowships themselves were administered by an independent office with a full-time staff.[121] The merger of FAFP provided the joint international program with greater control over a budget of over $2 million for fellowship support on world areas, and allowed the area committees to link their research planning agencies to regionally-tailored programs of fellowship support. A merger on this scale required that the Council move offices, reinvent staff roles and reassess and reorganize its international program. As a result of the FAFP-Council merger, the area committees acquired a renewed sense of purpose as well as greater weight inside the organization.

Finally, the board was reorganized in 1975, so that the disciplinary associations each designated one representative rather than three, a change that reduced expenses and accorded at-large members a greater voice in Council affairs, but also implied (or confirmed) a loosening of ties between the Council and the associations. This loosening of ties partly reflected larger changes taking place in the research environment within which the Council operated. As the Council developed more intensive linkages with a diverse array of foundations, international organizations and informal, interdisciplinary networks the disciplinary associations no longer represented the major channel through which Council programs shaped scholarly research agendas, as they had done in the 1920s and 1930s. The 1975 board reorganization arguably made the Committee on

Problems and Policy redundant, in that over time a smaller, more activist board would likely seek to combine the tasks of institutional governance (the board's traditional area of emphasis) with that of programmatic and intellectual oversight (the longstanding prerogative of P&P). Thus, the 1975 reorganization ultimately paved the way for the dissolution of P&P, which took place in 1996.[122]

Staff retirements, presidential transitions, the FAFP-SSRC merger and the streamlining of the board may be viewed as aspects of a process of redefinition and reevaluation that came into focus by the early 1970s. In this period the Council faced the familiar challenges of devising innovative research strategies, preparing training agendas, attracting and retaining funder support and mobilizing and replenishing scholarly networks. But it confronted an even larger task, that of reasserting and renewing itself in the context of a transformed intellectual, cultural and institutional environment. The 25-year span between the early 1970s and the late 1990s was, taken as a whole, a period of tremendous dynamism and prosperity from the standpoint of research infrastructure. But it was also a time when the cause of disinterested social science faced adversity on a number of fronts.

PART TWO

Of Some Scholars

[121] Between 1954 and 1966 the Foreign Area Fellowship Program invested $10 million in grant support to 1,214 scholars, mainly advanced graduate students. See Warren Weaver, *U.S. Philanthropic Foundations: Their History, Structure, Management, and Record* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 167.
[122] See Sills, "A Requiem for P&P."

The scholar plays a most demanding part,
Holding the banal in high disdain,
Enfolding a strange loadstone near the heart,
A magnet to attract and to maintain
A steady pulse–in this, the game to win:
A field of learning, bearing one's own mark
And recognized within the discipline.
The course is long, the pathway often dark.
Can rigor rule the flight of art pristine
Or track to earth what genius fain would hide?
Why bottle all that flows from Hippocrene?
Is Pegasus a steed for men to ride?
Some lock their stable door with earnest care
Unknowing that this horse was never there.

Pendleton Herring, "Of Some Scholars," *Caged Thoughts: Sonnets By an Old Bard* (Castle Howard Press, 1995, p. 35)

When Pendleton Herring stepped down as president in 1968 the SSRC appeared to be in good shape. The day-to-day work of the Council was managed by a seasoned professional staff of seven working with an annual budget of approximately $2 million. The focus of their efforts were nearly 40 separate committees, ranging from area and fellowship committees to active programs on comparative politics, economic growth, sociolinguistics, statistical training and biology and the social sciences. The external environment also seemed favorable. Federal and private foundation support for social science research, both basic and applied, continued its upward trajectory. The Council was by no means the only beneficiary of the expansion of investment in the US social sciences in the postwar period, but it certainly benefited from the general trend. For these reasons, Pendleton Herring sounded remarkably sanguine in his farewell report:

> The ranks of social scientists have grown and rewards for the competent have increased with the sharpening competition for talent. Research is marked by greater sophistication

> and methodological elegance (albeit at times embellished with linguistic efforts at refinement more likely to result in rugosities than subtleties of expression). Specialization has brought narrower foci of attention and sometimes unduly abstract theorizing; but the demands for application of social science knowledge exert a healthy counterweight. In short, the situation of the social sciences as of 1968 is improving even though all the support sought may not be forthcoming. The relative affluence of the present can be appreciated by anyone who chooses to recall the not so distant past.[123]

Within a few years, things were very different. While the apparatus underwent a short but decisive burst of growth, the climate of opinion soured. By 1974, with the amalgamation of the Ford Foundation-sponsored Foreign Area Fellowship Program (FAFP) into the international program, an expanded, 16-member professional staff managed an annual budget of just over $4 million. The FAFP-SSRC merger provided an infusion of resources and laid the groundwork for a comprehensive, multi-area program. The Council was in a position to offer more fellowships than previously, while at least initially maintaining a comparable number of research programs.[124] As some of the more ambitious postwar initiatives wound down, new projects on social indicators, mass communications, middle age, gifted children, law and social science and other topics were started up by committees and overseen by staff.

More striking were changes taking place at the federal level, as well as in the foundations and research universities. The robust support for social science in policymaking circles that Herring highlighted in his report[125] was giving way to revived concerns about the cost effectiveness and

[123] Pendleton Herring, "Introduction by the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1967-68* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1968), p. 14.
[124] The overall number of research committees peaked in the late 1980s, as working groups and other informal arrangements became increasingly common.
[125] "Over the last twenty years a marked improvement can be traced in the understanding and acceptance of the social sciences on the part of officials and legislators in Washington. Too often in the past it has been customary there to categorize an issue as 'social science' when it was simply controversial and essentially a

political slant of the social sciences. Foundation leaders were rethinking the appropriate balance between research support and projects with a more practical, hands-on orientation. And the prevailing mood in the research universities was by some accounts disturbingly polarized, with indications of dissension and fragmentation–and considerable intellectual ferment–within and across the major disciplines.[126]

As a consequence of these developments–compounded by a deteriorating macroeconomic climate–the fiscal base for social research gradually eroded. In her first report as SSRC president, in the early 1970s, Eleanor Sheldon noted that "funds available for research seem to be leveling off at a time when the demand for them is rapidly increasing." She added that "a probably helpful humility about the adequacy of present knowledge seems to have set in."[127] By the end of the decade, she described "a time of financial stringency and an almost universal preoccupation with funding…Financial leanness, coupled with the unemployment and underemployment of

---

matter for political decision…Today the social sciences have many active supporters in public life." Herring, "Report of the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1967-68*, pp. 13-14.

[126] This was certainly the view of Gabriel Almond, the former chair of the Council's Committee on Comparative Politics, at least in relation to political science: "in some senses the various schools and sects of political science now sit at separate tables, each with its own conception of proper political science, but each protecting some secret island of vulnerability….The uneasiness in the political science profession is not of the body but of the soul." See Gabriel Almond, "Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science" [1988] in *A Discipline Divided: Schools and Sects in Political Science* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990), pp. 13-14. With regard to sociology, Neil Smelser reported that at "no time in the century has sociology experienced a more dramatic turn than in the 15 years beginning in 1964. To be sure, the vast majority of sociological laborers in the vineyard continued their ongoing work as scientifically-committed professionals. But the audible debates in the discipline revealed all the conflict and convulsion engulfing the larger society in the civil-rights, student, anti-war, counter-cultural, and feminist movements…The fallout from all this turbulence was not a new sociology, but a more complex and divided sociology, heralded by a few but decried by others as crisis and chaos." See Neil J. Smelser, "Sociology: Spanning Two Centuries," unpublished paper, June 1999, pp. 16-17.

[127] Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, "Report of the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1972-73* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1973), p. 21. In March 1973 Sheldon warned that the Council began the year "with a sizable deficit in its budget and a report that the foundations customarily supporting the Council were reasonably uninterested in continuing their support." Minutes of the Board of Directors, March 23-24, 1973, RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 364, Folder 2141. The following year, she announced plans to raise 4 to 5 million to underwrite research planning. Raising these sums proved more difficult than anticipated, and the funding environment deteriorated further when the Ford Foundation announced plans to reduce its support for area and international studies at the end of the decade.

social scientists, is a prominent feature of the future."[128] While the fiercest arguments over the nature and purpose of the social sciences gradually abated, concerns about scholarly fragmentation, institutional drift and declining government support for the social science enterprise continued to gnaw at the organization.

The issue of the federal government's relationship to social science would remain of critical importance throughout the 1970s and 1980s. In 1980, just weeks before the social science establishment would cross swords with the incoming administration in Washington, Eleanor Sheldon's successor, Kenneth Prewitt, testified to the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology on the public value of the social sciences. His opening question–"Are the social and behavioral sciences useful to the nation?"–was intended to assuage the subcommittee's concerns but also went to the core of the mission of the Council. Most of the time the question went unasked, on the assumption that greater sophistication and stronger networks would necessarily enhance the quality, contribution and saliency of the social sciences. But in his testimony, Prewitt offered a more specific response. In the first instance, numerous concepts derived from the social sciences–such as "externalities, reference groups, cost-benefit analysis, socialization, and latent functions"–were in daily use. Government agencies and private companies relied on knowledge derived from fields as diverse as demography, economics, international relations and cognitive psychology. Even the 1969 moon landing, commonly regarded as a triumph of the physical and engineering sciences, drew on "administrative science, and theories of information processing and notions about human stress."

Moreover, while they could not be expected to "solve the nagging, persisting problems of this or any other nation," the social sciences added to a "refinement of debate and a sharpening of the

[128] Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, "Report of the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1977-78* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1978), pp. xvii and xx.

intelligence upon which the collective management of human affairs depends." Good social science refines debate rather than resolves persisting problems because scholars "work with the world as they find it; and the world moves, changes, progresses, reverses direction." Hence, the "complexities of the problems for which the social and behavioral sciences might be helpful are always going to be one step ahead of the problem-solving abilities of those sciences." Yet if the social sciences can "contribute to practical judgement a bit more practicality and a bit more judgement than would, in their absence, be exercised, then the case is made."[129]

Prewitt's testimony came at a time when federal spending on research, the humanities and the arts was subject to increasing scrutiny. Alongside former board members Herbert Simon and Frederick Mosteller, he found himself defending the "social importance"[130] of social science at a time when big government and its attendant vices–such as social planning of the type that might have been identified with Charles Merriam and the early SSRC–was subject to challenge from several points on the political spectrum.

Prewitt was already pondering the Council's relationship to the political process when he assumed the presidency in March 1979.[131] The Council, he told the Committee on Problems and

[129] See "Kenneth Prewitt, Frederick Mosteller, and Herbert A. Simon Testify at National Science Foundation Hearings," *Items*, Vol. 34, no. 1 (March 1980), p. 2.

[130] "Kenneth Prewitt, Frederick Mosteller, and Herbert A. Simon Testify at National Science Foundation Hearings," p. 2. Referring to Pendleton Herring's testimony before the 1954 Reece committee, Prewitt welcomed "the fact that I am here to defend the social importance rather than the political patriotism of the social sciences."

[131] Kenneth Prewitt (1936-) is the only person to have served two non-consecutive SSRC presidencies, in 1979-85 and 1995-98. After receiving an MA from the Harvard Divinity School he switched to political science and earned a PhD from Stanford University in 1963. He served as chair of the department of political science at the University of Chicago in 1975-76 and subsequently directed the National Opinion Research Center (1976-79). Between his SSRC presidencies he served as senior vice president to the Rockefeller Foundation, and in 1998 he became the director of the US Census Bureau. In an article for *Items and Issues* (a 1999 relaunch of *Items*) he described the 2000 census as "one of the largest applied social science projects ever. It is a civic mobilization campaign…" Kenneth Prewitt, "Census Director's Northern Exposure," *Items and Issues*, Vol. 1, no. 2 (summer 2000), p. 2. His books include *Institutional Racism in American Society* (1969), *Education and Political Values: Essays on East Africa* (1970), *Elites and American Democracy* (1973), *Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptations, Linkages, Representation, and*

Policy, was never intended to serve as an all-purpose lobby for the social sciences. Its primary role was to advocate "on behalf of conditions which sustain basic research." The organization "establishes conditions that improve scientific choices," and provides "an institutional context within which these choices have maximum leverage for expanding scientific knowledge." It "only acts 'politically' in the sense that it advocates those social conditions that favor knowledge making."[132]

These careful formulations would soon be tested by events in Washington. Ironically, in the early months of the 1980s there were indications that the social sciences were shaking off their subordinate status vis-à-vis other sciences in the federal science system. Not only had the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology recommended that the budget for social and behavioral science research supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) "be substantially increased," but the NSF was moving to establish a new behavioral and social science directorate that could provide "needed visibility for the social sciences, a visibility that would lead to enhanced status and increased funding."[133] In theory, the directorate would place the social sciences on a level playing field with the natural, physical and medical sciences, representing the long-deferred hope that the NSF could more fully incorporate the social sciences into its mandate and structure.[134]

Policies in Urban Politics (1973), *Political Socialization* (1977), and *Introduction to American Government* (1974; sixth edition 1991). From 1965-66 he was a visiting lecturer at the University of East Africa, Uganda, and from 1970-73 he was a visiting research fellow at the University of Nairobi, Kenya.

[132] Presidential Remarks to the Committee on Problems and Policy, March 23, 1979, RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 321, Folder 1821.

[133] "Kenneth Prewitt, Frederick Mosteller, and Herbert A. Simon Testify at National Science Foundation Hearings," p. 1; and "Proposed Reorganization of the National Science Foundation," *Items*, Vol. 34, nos. 3-4 (December 1980).

[134] As the Harvard sociologist Talcott Parsons noted four years prior to the establishment of NSF, "the question of whether or not to include social science in the scope of the [proposed] Foundation has been one of the most controversial questions…[if] we are moving more and more into a scientific age, and science is to help solve its social problems, it must be social science which does so. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that as rapidly as possible the social sciences be brought as nearly to a level of co-ordinate achievement and prestige with their sister disciplines as can be achieved. Federal financial support by itself cannot achieve this. It can, however, be a major factor in helping to bring it about, and the exclusion of the

Winning the battle for what eventually became the Social and Economic Sciences Directorate was only part of the story, however. In February 1981 the Office of Management and Budget called for draconian reductions in NSF budgets for social research, as well as cuts in federal statistical information,[135] justifying these moves on the grounds that "support of these sciences is considered of relatively lesser importance to the economy than the support of the natural sciences."[136] According to the sociologist Morton Hunt, Congress "wrestled with the administration over many details of the budget, including the allocation for social science research at NSF, but in the end the national upsurge of conservatism triumphed, and social science at NSF, though not savaged to the extent that [Office of Management and Budget Director David] Stockman proposed, suffered a far greater reduction than the other sciences."[137]

Council leaders and others responded to the Reagan administration's proposals by fashioning a united front of scientists and politicians on behalf of public investment in social research. "Although the social science community had no mechanism with which to counterattack," writes Hunt, "it did have a shadowy entity that could be made into one: From the 1960s on, an informal

---

social sciences from such support while it is tendered to the natural sciences would impose a grave handicap on the social sciences which could hardly fail to be detrimental to the larger interests of the nation." Talcott Parsons, "The Science Legislation and the Role of the Social Sciences," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. XI, no. 6 (December 1946), pp. 653, 665-666.

[135] For the financial year (FY) 1982, OMB "requested a 75 per cent reduction in the budget for NSF's Social and Economic Science Division, and within the Behavioral and Neural Sciences Division, a 66 per cent reduction in the anthropology program and a 60 per cent reduction in the cognitive and behavioral science research program." The NSF budget in FY 1980 was $185,661,209; the administration called for a budget of $171,980,000 in FY 1982. The Office of Management and Budget also proposed staff reductions at the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics; a curtailment of several government publications, such as those produced by the Income Survey Development Program; delaying the publication of 1980 Census data; and canceling, reducing the sample size and/or reducing the frequency of observation for proposed health, housing, and consumer surveys. See Kenneth Prewitt and David L. Sills, "Federal Funding for the Social Sciences: Threats and Responses," *Items*, Vol. 35, no. 3 (September 1981), pp. 33 and 35; and Robert Parke, "Responses to Recent Cuts in Federal Budgets for Statistics," *Items*, Vol. 36, nos. 1-2 (June 1982), p. 13.

[136] Prewitt and Sills, "Federal Funding for the Social Sciences: Threats and Responses," p. 33.

[137] Morton Hunt, *The New Know-Nothings: The Political Foes of the Scientific Study of Human Nature* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1999), p. 246. See also John T. Wilson, *Academic Science, Higher Education and the Federal Government, 1950-1983* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

group of ten societies known as the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) had existed for the purpose of holding monthly get-togethers to socialize and talk shop. In the winter of 1981, as the Reagan-Stockman budget proposals were being steamrollered through Congress, Ken Prewitt…asked a handful of social scientists in other organizations belonging to COSSA to meet with him to plan a counterattack; this cadre, after some tug-of-war discussions, agreed to transform COSSA into an active lobbying organization."[138]

These efforts also strengthened ties between social science groups and respected Washington organizations such as the National Academy of Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. To trumpet the accomplishments of the social sciences, the Council collaborated with the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the National Science Foundation to publish a volume on promising research in the social and behavioral sciences.[139] The strategy of determined coalition-building apparently bore fruit, as federal spending on basic social research crept upwards in the second half of the 1980s and into the 1990s.[140] Federal spending on the arts and humanities would remain far more vulnerable to political pressure than expenditure on social science research,[141] although allocations for the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities at the end of the 90s were in fact somewhat higher than those for the social and behavioral sciences within the framework of the NSF.[142]

---

[138] Hunt, *The New Know-Nothings*, p. 246.

[139] *Behavioral and Social Science Research: A National Resource* (Washington, DC: National Research Council, 1982). This volume was followed by *Behavioral and Social Science: Fifty Years of Discovery* (Washington, DC: National Research Council, 1986), and *The Behavioral and Social Sciences: Achievements and Opportunities* (Washington, DC: National Research Council, 1988).

[140] The NSF budget for FY 2000 ($3.95 billion) included $63.6 million for the social and economic sciences and $42.45 million for the behavioral and cognitive sciences.

[141] Certainly no SSRC president would have occasion to write, as American Council of Learned Societies president Stanley Katz did, that "these have not always been easy years. National politics have too often intruded into our work, though of course that is the price of living in a democracy. Civility has not always characterized our relations with the government and its officials. From my point of view, the culture wars were not productive, and they were certainly not fun." Stanley N. Katz, *Report of the President, 1986-1997* (New York: ACLS Occasional Paper, no. 38, 1997), p. 24.

[142] However, since social science research is funded much more broadly across the federal system than the humanities, any direct comparison is misleading.

DIRECTION AND MANDATE

Skirmishes over federal spending constituted one aspect of a larger set of debates over the relationship of the Council, and the social sciences more generally, to questions of public policy, political power and scientific standing. Indeed, the three main phases of the Council's development–the interwar years, the postwar years and the post-60s period–mark specific conceptions of, and specific controversies over, the public and specialist role of the social sciences. In the interwar period we find a strong emphasis on the application of empirical social science to the resolution of domestic problems. Objective knowledge was something to be achieved rather than assumed, but a scientific leap forward was possible in the social arena. In the postwar years the emphasis shifted, with greater investment in area studies and foreign policy, and renewed confidence in the capacity of the social sciences to achieve scientific results (on a widening array of fronts).[143] For the SSRC it was a time of institutional consolidation and expansion, based on principles laid out in the early period.

By the time of the third phase, once-comfortable assumptions about the social utility, scientific status, value orientation and ultimate ambition of the social sciences were cast open for debate. While the research capacity of the social sciences was greater than ever –measured in new PhDs, expanded interdisciplinary centers, availability of research funds and, of increasing importance, a colossal inflation of computational power–any hope of arriving at a broad consensus about the intellectual underpinnings of the social sciences seemed more remote than ever. The relationship of the social sciences to the policymaking process, and to the US foreign policy apparatus, generated furious contestation; the expansion of research infrastructure facilitated scholarly

hyperspecialization, institutional proliferation and programmatic fragmentation; the uneasy gulf between empirical and interpretive forms of social science persisted despite noteworthy efforts to bridge them; the national orientation of the social sciences was subject to increasing scrutiny; and the meaning of science, empirical knowledge and objectivity for the social sciences was rendered problematic, for some, by theories of poststructuralism and deconstruction, and, more broadly, by the turn to culture.[144] From their inception, the social sciences have been a theater of battle for contending approaches, methods, postulates and goals. By the 1970s the camps seemed more numerous, more complexly configured and more thoroughly cleaved than ever.

These larger trends are important, but by no means determinative. The organization's internal layers sequestered committees from most forms of outside entanglements, and, most of the time, even from other components of the SSRC. Given the limited time horizon of most programs, presidents and governance committees could remold the organization's portfolio with a facility that would be difficult for departments or disciplinary associations to emulate. The fact that the Council enjoyed room to improvise meant that committees working on overlapping topics could head off in different directions and divergent perspectives could be comfortably housed within a larger framework. Of course, differences over method, ideology and epistemology surfaced at conferences, workshops and committee meetings. But the view that programs were expected to generate findings rather than merely rehearse debates arguably fostered a pragmatic institutional culture where the question was more often "how can we make headway?" than "on what terms can we make sense of our ultimate differences?"

---

[143] For a helpful overview of the development of the postwar social sciences see Immanuel Wallerstein, et al., *Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), chapter two.

[144] As Thomas Bender writes: "What I have termed a cultural turn encompasses a number of trends–historicism, the linguistic turn, hermeneutics–that are, of course, distinct and even in conflict. Yet the term captures a leading tendency of the intellectual culture of our time, distinguishing it from the broadly analytic emphasis of the immediate postwar years." See Thomas Bender, "Politics, Intellect, and the American University," in Thomas Bender and Carl E. Schorske, eds., *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 41.

If an elastic apparatus and scholarly good will shielded the Council from many of the vicissitudes of political and scientific fashion, they did not obviate the need for periodic renewal and reassessment. Every president was expected to articulate a sense of priorities that reflected the changing conditions facing the Council and the social sciences more generally. What were the germane research questions? How could research planning networks be mobilized to address these questions? What could the Council accomplish in the area of methodology, or in relation to the policy process? Which committees were making headway, and which needed to be reorganized or abandoned? What steps could be taken to ensure that committee projects were effectively promoted and disseminated among the research community and beyond? How would the Council evaluate its own programs, to be sure it was making sound use of finite resources? What was the organization's comparative advantage at a time when think tanks and research centers were proliferating, in higher education, at the federal level and even in the private sector?

Successive presidents were obligated to redefine and assess the organization's direction and mandate even as they sought to inspire staff and funders, maintain quality control, navigate an evolving research environment, respond to developments at the federal level and manage a multimillion dollar apparatus. Presidents relied on familiar tools to advance their agendas–essays in *Items* and annual reports, staff hires and investment in new programs–even as they adopted distinctive styles and approaches. Each was expected to consult with governance bodies, committee chairs, foundation personnel, disciplinary associations, staff and "friends of the Council," i.e., scholars and others with longstanding ties to the institution. No president was a free agent, although some executives enjoyed a smoother ride than others. One factor shaping how much latitude presidents had was their ability to generate support for their vision for the Council. This was not always easy given the contentiousness and segmentation of the social sciences in this period.

The diffusion of research planning and the diversification of the research environment were two notable challenges of the post-60s era. In the days when the Council faced few competitors in research planning, efforts to identify new topic areas, highlight training needs and redirect foundation, academic and government resources could be expected to carry some weight--assuming the topics and participants were well chosen and committee members were thoughtful in their deliberations. However, as research centers proliferated and research infrastructure expanded, pulling together nine or twelve talkative scholars to deliberate over a few meetings was not always sufficient. Honing the right topic at the strategic moment with the appropriate people, and actively promoting the results, became both more challenging and more important. And it was not always clear that all committees took full advantage of the leadership platform the research planning model represented.[145]

An additional challenge, emblematic of broader shifts in scholarly emphasis and style, had to do with the waning of the behavioral agenda. From its inception the Council nurtured behavioralism's characteristic focus on the objective study of social and political behavior through the refinement of empirical technique on behalf of a larger scientific agenda. Although Council co-founder Charles Merriam is often viewed as a key figure in the development of a behaviorally oriented social science, it has also been noted that his call for empirically rigorous scholarship was more convincingly taken up by "some of his best students," such as Harold

[145] As board member and Pennsylvania State University geographer Peter Gould complained, "I get the general impression that the work of many committees consists of an awful lot of 'planning projects', 'assessments of the field' and 'identifying areas of research' and so on. In contrast, I also get the impression that there is too little actual *doing*. I do not understand why a committee should constantly be engaged in 'identifying and assessment' if the field is truly important and dynamic. And if an area of research is not important and dynamic, should a committee be scurrying around trying to build it up?…a number of committees never met during the entire year, others could not obtain any funding, and still more could not even bother to get the reports written in time for the [board] meeting. These are not signs of energetic and dynamic areas of intellectual inquiry and research." Letter from Peter Gould to David L. Sills, June 6, 1978. Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Accession 2, Series 2, Subseries 2, Box 633, Folder 9020.

Lasswell, Harold F. Gosnell, V.O. Key, Jr., Gabriel Almond and others.[146] The fact that Lasswell and company played active committee roles in the 1930s-60s helped ensure that Merriam's broad agenda remained part of the organization's developmental matrix for several decades. As the "behavioral mood" passed–"the first victim of its own triumph," as Robert Dahl observed,[147] but also a casualty of increasingly disputatious foundational and ideological arguments rebounding across the social sciences–there was talk of devising a renewed, "postbehavioral" intellectual superstructure around which different activities and programs could be conceived.

Governance committees often chewed over these larger intellectual, programmatic and epistemological issues. Membership on the board and/or P&P empowered scholars to take sides in controversies of the day. Exchanges over new programs, presidential appointments or funding proposals served as surrogates for far-reaching disputes over positivist versus interpretative modes of research; the interface of genetics, human behavior and social science; the rights and wrongs of area studies; the audience(s) for research; the merits of different approaches, fields and disciplines; the emergence of postmodernism; the challenge of internationalization and so on. Louis Wirth once observed that governance committees were "an inner group, detached from and more self-perpetuating than the Council, in control of the destiny of the Council and invested with an aura of superior power, wisdom and inner knowledge."[148] Whether his ironic tone was justified or not, many governance committee members enjoyed airing the big debates with an eye toward redirecting the Council's energies.

---

[146] Barry D. Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 149.

[147] "The behavioral mood will not disappear, then because it has failed. It will disappear rather because it has succeeded. As a separate, somewhat sectarian, slightly factional outlook it will be the first victim of its own triumph." Robert Dahl, "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest" [1961], in James Farr and Raymond Seidelman, eds., *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), p. 261.

[148] Louis Wirth, "Report on the History, Activities and Policies of the Social Science Research Council" (1937), p. 45. RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 5, Folder 29.

A fragmented research environment, campus and disciplinary rifts and an increasingly pluralistic conception of the role and mandate of the social sciences undoubtedly complicated the job of managing the Council. These developments posed unanticipated challenges for a blue-chip nonprofit seeking to promote rigorous and impartial research that might nudge public policy and public thinking in positive directions. The pressure against providing federal funds to social science that mounted in the late 1970s and early 1980s offered an additional complication at a time when traditional funding sources faced shrinking endowments and growing controversy over the appropriate role of large-scale philanthropy in a divided society.

None of these developments precluded institutional growth, however. Just as the range of programs and initiatives expanded in the middle part of the century, indications of growth and innovation accumulated in the wake of the prosperous 60s. In qualitative terms the Council was arguably able to maintain its position as an influential constituent in the broader development of the social sciences, even as the scale of the research infrastructure underwent enormous expansion, and even as the logic, meaning and value of social science was scrutinized more closely than ever before.

Research planning, which had always been critical from the standpoint of shaping scholarly agendas, remained a key feature of Council activities. Projects in the post-60s era canvassed a wealth of scholarly preoccupations–from cognitive reasoning and human development to urban conditions and international relations. Some committees went beyond the university press model by sponsoring bibliographies, new journals, journal special issues, trade books and working paper series. A growing number offered fellowships, which encouraged research interest and promoted new networks and approaches. A significant portion of the Council's growth can be attributed to its success in organizing fellowships and workshops in a variety of thematic and area contexts.

Given the high profile that both area studies and fellowships assumed, these subjects are discussed in separate sections below.

Despite the enhanced scale and visibility of Council fellowship programs, research committees still largely concentrated on producing edited collections and other scholarly monographs. Committee books could potentially crystallize new fields and invigorate existing ones. Noteworthy titles–*The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes* (1978); *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America* (1979); *Bringing the State Back In* (1985); *Life Course Dynamics* (1985); *Law and the Social Sciences* (1986); *The Politics of Numbers* (1987); *Dual City* (1991); *The "Underclass" Debate* (1993); *The Culture of National Security* (1996); *Social Suffering* (1997) among others–circulated among faculty and filtered their way to graduate syllabi as part of the foundation for new scholarship.

RESEARCH PLANNING IN THE 1970s

Committees launched in the contentious 1970s reflected multifaceted agendas. In all, 13 non-area research committees were established during Eleanor Sheldon's presidency (1972-79).[149] One of the best known, the Committee on Law and Social Science (1974-84), made its mark with the landmark volume *Law and the Social Sciences* (1986).[150] In the same period, committees on

[149] These are: Social Indicators (1972-85), Work and Personality in the Middle Years (1972-79), Television and Social Behavior (1973-79), Mass Communications and Political Behavior (1974-80), Law and Social Science (1974-84), Gifted Children (1975-80), Biosocial Science (1976-80), Social and Affective Development During Childhood (1976-85), Methodology of Longitudinal Research (1976-80), Evaluation Research (1977-80), Ethnicity (1977-82), Life-Course Perspectives on Middle and Old Age (1977-87) and Mathematics in the Social Sciences (1977-79).

[150] Russell Sage provided "seed money for the Law and Society Association" and for the publication of a new journal, *Law and Society Review*, in the mid-1960s. The Law and Social Science committee drew on these efforts to demonstrate that "the perspectives, data, and methods of the social sciences are essential to a better understanding of the law." See Stanton Wheeler, "The Commitment to Social Science: A Case Study of Organizational Innovation," in David C. Hammack and Stanton Wheeler, eds., *Social Science in the Making; Essays on the Russell Sage Foundation, 1907-1972* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation,

Television and Social Behavior (1973-79) and Mass Communications and Political Behavior (1974-80) voiced concern about the media's role in simplifying and distorting information, with the latter prescribing measures to strengthen the major political parties.[151] It was uncommon, if not unheard of, for committees to make such broad-gauged policy recommendations, however. The Committee on the Methodology of Longitudinal Research (1976-80), for example, advanced non-controversial guidelines for the use of design, measurement and analysis techniques in longitudinal research,[152] while the Committee on Mathematics in the Social Sciences (1977-79) addressed the substantial variation in the quality and focus of mathematical and statistical training across the major disciplines. The Mathematics committee drew on earlier Council efforts to expose scholars to the use of sophisticated mathematical tools in social research.[153]

The field of human development also flourished with the aid of the Council. The field brought together social psychologists, sociologists, a smattering of anthropologists and specialists in fields such as gerontology and child development. It tracked changes taking place in individuals as they

---

1994), p. 115; and Leon Lipson and Stanton Wheeler, "Introduction," in Leon Lipson and Stanton Wheeler, eds., *Law and the Social Sciences*, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1986), p. 1.

[151] The Mass Communications committee found that the news media reported on issues "which neatly divide the candidates" rather than on nuanced policy matters. "Despite the fact that the 1976 campaign was much longer and more intensely reported than the 1948 campaign, voters actually learned less about the issues." Rather than calling for stricter government regulation, committee members suggested that "party leaders are more adept than the voters themselves at selecting nominees who meet the public's desires for policy and leadership…the time has come to find ways to increase the parties' influence in a nominating system that blends popular participation and party influence." *Social Science Research Annual Report, 1976-77* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1977), pp. 35-36; "Thomas E. Patterson and Ronald P. Abeles, "Mass Communications and the 1976 Presidential Election," *Items*, Vol. 29, no. 2 (June 1975), p. 13. Also see Thomas E. Patterson, ed., *The Mass Media Election: How Americans Choose Their President* (New York: Praeger, 1980); Percy H. Tannenbaum, ed., *The Entertainment Functions of Television* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980); and Stephen B. Withey and Ronald P. Abeles, eds., *Television and Social Behavior: Beyond Violence and Children* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980).

[152] See Robert F. Boruch and Robert W. Pearson, *The Comparative Evaluation of Longitudinal Surveys* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1985); James J. Heckman and Burton Singer, eds., *Longitudinal Analysis of Labor Market Data* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); William M. Mason and Stephen E. Fienberg, eds., *Cohort Analysis in Social Research: Beyond the Identification Problem* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1985); and Robert W. Pearson and Robert F. Boruch, eds., *Survey Research Designs: Towards a Better Understanding of Their Costs and Benefits* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1986).

moved from childhood, to adolescence, to middle age and through retirement, seeking to offer scientific generalizations about specific age segments as well as principles of development that traversed the life span.

The committees on Work and Personality in the Middle Years (1972-79), Life-Course Perspectives on Human Development (1977-87), Social and Affective Development During Childhood (1976-85) and Gifted Children (1975-80) all contributed to the human development paradigm. Over time, many of those active in the field embraced a life-course perspective, with the understanding that "(1) developmental change and aging form a continual process, not limited to any particular stage of life, (2) change occurs in various interrelated social, psychological, and biological domains of human behavior and functioning, and that (3) life-course development is multidetermined. Thus, according to this viewpoint, to understand a particular stage of life–including middle and old age–it is necessary to place it within the context of the preceding and following developmental changes and stabilities and within its historical context."[154]

The human development committees not only generated edited collections but put together workshops, seminars and conferences.[155] The program on Work and Personality served as an

---

[153] See Frederick Mosteller, "The Role of the Social Science Research Council in the Advance of Mathematics in the Social Sciences," *Items*, Vol. 28, no. 2 (June 1974), p. 24.
[154] Ronald P. Abeles and Matilda White Riley, "A Life-Course Perspective on the Later Years of Life: Some Implications for Research," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1976-77*, p. 3.
[155] Relevant publications include Paul B. Baltes and Orville G. Brim, Jr., ed., *Life-Span Development and Behavior*, Vol. 6 (New York: Academic Press, 1984); Orville G. Brim, Jr. and Ronald P. Abeles, "Work and Personality in the Middle Years," *Items*, Vol. 29, no. 3 (September 1975); Glen Elder Jr., ed., *Life-Course Dynamics* (1985); Janet Z. Giele, ed., *Women in the Middle Years: Current Knowledge and Directions for Research and Policy* (New York: John Wiley, 1972); Mavis E. Hetherington, Richard M. Lerner and Marion Perlmutter, eds., *Child Development in Life-Span Perspective* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988); Susan Migdal, Ronald P. Abeles and Lonnie R. Sherrod, *An Inventory of Longitudinal Research on Middle and Old Age* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1981); Peter B. Read and David Jenness, "Some Neglected Aspects of Social Development in Childhood, in *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1974-75* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1975); Aage B. Sorensen, Frank E. Weinert and Lonnie R. Sherrod, eds., *Human Development and the Life Course: Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1986); and Frederick

informational resource, maintaining a mailing list of nearly 900 individuals. Its efforts laid the basis for the MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Midlife Development, which took off in the 1990s.[156] The Gifted Children committee spun off a new program on Development, Giftedness, and the Learning Process (1980-90), which explored "the nature and conditions of extraordinary performance within particular domains such as art, music, and science." For the committee, giftedness offered "a complex set of interacting potentials that vary from person to person and from field to field" rather than a "single or small number of central intellectual traits."[157] In the same period, the Committee on Social and Affective Development during Childhood maintained an active program of publications and seminars.[158]

The Council sponsored research on human behavior that drew heavily on the biological sciences. This reflected the impact of behavioral genetics in general and E.O. Wilson's work on sociobiology in particular, and the need to identify neutral ground on which research inspired by and critical of sociobiology could be discussed and evaluated. As M. Brewster Smith and long-

---

Verdonik and Lonnie R. Sherrod, *An Inventory of Longitudinal Research on Childhood and Adolescence* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1984).

[156] The Research Network, chaired by Orville G. Brim, Jr., embarked on a 10-year study of nearly 8,000 respondents. Its 1999 report offered good news for US citizens reaching their 40s and 50s. "Far from being a time of turmoil, for most people the midlife years appear to be a time of psychic equanimity, good health, productive activity and community involvement," reported the *New York Times*. "The reality of development across the life span…is almost always more complicated, less romantic and far more interesting than any portrayal offered up by the world of advertising." Erica Goode, "New Study Finds Middle Age is Prime of Life," *New York Times*, February 16, 1999, F6.

[157] *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1981-82* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1982), p. 35; *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1984-85* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1985), p. 35. Also see David Henry Feldman, ed., *Developmental Approaches to Giftedness and Creativity* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982); and Robert Sternberg and Janet E. Davidson, eds., *Conceptions of Giftedness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

[158] See John H. Flavell and Lee Ross, *Social Cognitive Development: Frontiers and Possible Futures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Carroll E. Izard, ed., *Measuring Emotion in Infants and Children* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Tory E. Higgins, Diane N. Ruble and Willard W. Hartup, eds., *Social Cognition and Social Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Carroll E. Izard, Jerome Kagan and Robert B. Zajonc, eds., *Emotions, Cognition, and Behavior* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Richard A. Shweder and Robert A LeVine, eds., *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Michael Rutter, Carroll E. Izard and Peter B. Read, eds., *Depression in Young People: Developmental and Clinical Perspectives* (New York: Guilford Press, 1985); Willard W. Hartup and Zick Rubin, eds., *Relationships and Development* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1986).

time SSRC board member Gardner Lindzey pointed out,[159] a Council program could "advance a *Zeitgeist* that sees the interdependent relationship of biological and social factors in more balanced perspective…[and] stimulate research on a difficult and controversial new frontier."[160] These considerations were reflected in the work of committees on the Biological Bases of Social Behavior (1966-79), on Biosocial Science (1976-80) and subsequently on Biosocial Perspectives on Parent Behavior and Offspring Behavior (1980-91).[161] The program on biosocial science, for example, was charged with "clarifying the theoretical and methodological issues raised by the current movement in sociobiology; examining the biological roots of specific human behaviors; stimulating and critically considering the usefulness of new ways of looking at and analyzing human social behavior by the study of the behavior of other species; and, in general, providing a vehicle for cooperation between biological and social scientists."[162]

Probably the most prominent research planning committee to gets its start in the 1970s was Social Indicators (1972-85). Interest in social indicators reflected postwar optimism about the capacity

[159] Gardner Lindzey (1920 -), a distinguished psychologist, first joined P&P in 1962 and served as its chair in the mid-to-late 1960s. He retired from the board of directors in 1992. Few individuals contributed more to the Council's governance over a period of decades. He directed the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Science from 1975-89, and is a member of the Institute of Medicine and the National Academy of Science. For the past several years the American Psychological Association has offered an annual Gardner Lindzey Award for the best dissertation in general psychology. Lindzey is the author, coauthor or coeditor of numerous books, textbooks and encyclopedias, including *Assessment of Human Motives* (1979); *Contributions to Behavioral Genetics Analysis* (1970); *Race Differences in Intelligence* (1975); *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (fourth ed., 1998); *Psychology* (third ed., 1988); and *Theories of Personality* (fourth ed., 1997).

[160] M. Brewster Smith and Gardner Lindzey, "Social Behavior," unpublished essay, December 1973, pp. 6-7. RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 3, Folder 19.

[161] These committees organized conferences and workshops, launched a major new journal, *Human Nature: An Interdisciplinary Biosocial Perspective* (1990-) and sponsored numerous volumes: Jane B. Lancaster and Beatrix A. Hamburg, eds., *School-Age Pregnancy and Parenthood: Biosocial Dimensions* (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1986); Richard J. Gelles and Jane B. Lancaster, eds., *Child Abuse and Neglect: Biosocial Dimensions* (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gryuter, 1987); Jane B. Lancaster, Jeanne Altmann, Alice S. Rossi and Lonnie R. Sherrod, eds., *Parenting Across the Life Span: Biosocial Dimensions* (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter, 1987); Anne Petersen and Kathleen Gibson, eds., *Brain Maturation and Cognitive Development: Comparative and Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1991).

[162] *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1975-76*, p. 26.

of the government to measure and influence the "social state of the nation."[163] The Council became involved in the social indicators movement to an extent that was atypical for the organization, although the same could be said of its role in area studies. As an empirical sociologist, Eleanor Sheldon, was a leading voice in the field of social indicators,[164] and, uniquely, the social indicators program could boast of having its own office, in Washington, DC, for just over a decade.

The cause of social indicators took off in the late 1960s, in large measure through the efforts of the Russell Sage Foundation, whose president, Orville Brim, Jr., would later serve as the Council's interim president.[165] As Brim and others noted, the "notion of constructing and monitoring 'social indicators' was inspired in great measure by the success that economists had had in developing a national income accounting system and economic indicators such as the gross national product and the consumer price index."[166] The social indicators approach was also

[163] Wheeler, "The Commitment to Social Science," in Hammack and Stanton Wheeler, eds., *Social Science in the Making*, p. 111.

[164] Eleanor Sheldon (1920-) received her PhD in sociology from the University of Chicago in 1949 and served as an SSRC staff member in 1950-51 before working as a researcher at Columbia University, the United Nations and the University of California, Los Angeles. From 1961-72 she was an executive associate at the Russell Sage Foundation, and she was the first and so far the only woman to serve as president of the SSRC. From the 1970s through the early 1990s she served on a number of corporate boards, including the Mobil Corporation (1976-92), Citicorp and Citibank (1973-84) and Equitable Life (1972-93). With Wilbert E. Moore she edited *Indicators of Social Change–Concepts and Measurements* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968), which helped launch the social indicators movement, along with Raymond A. Bauer, ed. *Social Indicators* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1966).

[165] Orville Gilbert (Bert) Brim (1923-) served in the US Army Air Force in the Second World War as a B-24 pilot before gaining a PhD in sociology from Yale University. He worked at the Russell Sage Foundation from the mid-1950s onwards and served as its president from 1964-72. His 1960s initiatives on human development, social indicators, law and society and media studies would powerfully inform the Council's program portfolio in the 1970s. From 1974-85 he was president of the Foundation for Child Development, and directed the MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Midlife Development from 1989 onwards. He became interim SSRC president in 1998-99. His books include *Education for Child Rearing* (1959), *American Beliefs and Attitudes About Intelligence* (1969), *Constancy and Change in Human Development* (coedited with Jerome Kagan, 1980) and *Ambition: How We Manage Success and Failure Throughout Our Lives* (1992).

[166] Nicholas Zill II, Heidi Sigal and Orville G. Brim, Jr. "Development of Childhood Social Indicators," in Edward F. Zigler, Sharon Lynn Kagan and Edgar Klugman, eds., *Children, Families, and Government: Perspectives on American Social Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 189.

consistent with the commitment to social planning through federal action that characterized the early years of the Council.[167]

With funding from the National Science Foundation, and under the leadership of staff member Robert Parke, the Council's Center for Coordination of Research on Social Indicators opened in 1972. The Center produced 19 issues of *Social Indicators Newsletter*, and sponsored 13 books and 97 articles and book chapters before shutting its doors in 1983.[168] While sound administrative reasons were advanced for closing the Center, there were larger considerations at stake as well.[169] On the one hand, the program's ability to make an impact at the federal level was sharply curtailed by the changing political climate in Washington, where claims of social scientific neutrality were received with increasing skepticism. On the other hand, the social indicators approach was becoming firmly entrenched within the academy and international organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations. Even as the federal government resisted calls for a social indicators reporting system, academics and nongovernmental organizations continued to develop and refine the measurement of data on the quality of social and cultural life in different parts of the world.

---

[167] This is arguably what Charles Merriam had in mind when he spoke "the evolution of methods and means by which new relations will be discovered, new modes of adaptation contrived, and the processes of social and political control substantially modified." Charles Merriam, "The Present State of the Study of Politics," *New Aspects of Politics*, 3rd edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970 [1921]), p. 76. More than two decades years later, Pendleton Herring found that one of the "greatest needs in the social sciences is for the development of skilled practitioners who can use social data for the cure of social ills as doctors use scientific data to cure bodily ills…Social engineering [is] the application of knowledge of social phenomena to specific problems." Quoted in Terence Ball, "American Political Science in its Postwar Political Context," in Farr and Seidelman, eds., *Discipline and History*, pp. 215-216.

[168] "Publications of the Center for Coordination of Research on Social Indicators," *Items*, Vol. 37, no. 4 (December 1983), pp. 95-99. At its peak the *Social Indicators Newsletter* achieved a circulation of 4,000. The Center also maintained a library, commissioned research papers and organized working groups on science indicators, education indicators and legal indicators, the latter in association with the Law and Social Science program.

[169] The decision to close the Center was made by Kenneth Prewitt, who transferred pieces of the program to the Council's New York office, permitting "closer coordination of social indicators work with the programs of other committees, including standing programs in comparative stratification, life-course perspectives on human development, research on the 1980 Census, and records of government, as well as with exploratory programs in science and technology and in the collection of data for longitudinal research." Kenneth Prewitt, "Council Reorganizes its Work in Social Indicators," *Items*, Vol. 37, no. 4 (December 1983), p. 77.

Council research planning in the 1970s mostly focused on fields that could be sharply distinguished from the humanities-qualitative social science alliance that characterized area studies. Programs on social indicators, human development, research methodology and biosocial science attracted psychologists, linguists, demographers, quantitative sociologists, model-building political scientists, biologists interested in social issues and others who were unlikely to place themselves in an area framework. The specific mix of programs reflected a concern with negotiating an appropriate balance among contending constituencies and approaches. Programs already under way when Sheldon assumed the presidency, such as Economic Stability and Growth,[170] Cognitive Research[171] and Sociolinguistics,[172] leaned in the hard science direction but reflected disparate research agendas.

---

[170] The Committee on Economic Stability and Growth (1959-95) maintained a stunningly consistent agenda over a period of 36 years, and its longevity and membership stability were unique in the annals of the Council. The hallmark of the committee was its interest in generating a fine-grained conception of the global economy that would enable policymakers to tailor public policies to rapidly changing economic conditions. The committee's major achievement was Project LINK, a global system of country models used to determine and predict domestic outputs, price levels and trade balances, as well as corresponding totals for world trade and GNP. One of the committee's founding members, Lawrence Klein, received the Nobel Prize in economics in 1980, "for the creation of economic models and their application to the analysis of economic fluctuations and economic policies." At the behest of the committee, administrative responsibility for Project LINK was transferred in 1990 to the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs at the United Nations. See "Lawrence R. Klein Wins Nobel Prize: Council Board Member and Founder of Project LINK," *Items*, Vol. 34, nos. 3-4 (December 1980), p. 50; Bert G. Hickman and Lawrence R. Klein, "A Decade of Research by Project LINK," *Items*, Vol. 33, nos. 3-4 (December 1979); B.J. Ball, ed., *The International Linkage of National Economic Models: Contributions to Economic Analysis* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1973); Bert G. Hickman, ed., *International Monetary Stabilization and the Foreign Debt Problem* (San Francisco: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, 1985); Bert G. Hickman, ed., *International Productivity and Competitiveness* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). J. Kmenta and J.B. Ramsey, eds., *Large-scale Macro-Econometric Models* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1981); John A. Sawyer, ed., *Modelling the International Transmission Mechanism* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1979); Jean L. Waelbroeck, ed., *The Models of Project LINK* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1976).

[171] The Committee on Cognitive Research (1972-83) was established to "bring fresh stimulation and an interdisciplinary approach to the emerging field of cognitive science" by drawing on the talents of psychologists, neurophysiologists, anthropologists and linguists interested in "the study of cognition in nonexperimental, field settings." In the late 1970s committee members expressed interest in "some of the promising connections between Buddhist thought and cognitive science," and at the end of the decade three members attended a Naropa Institute seminar in Boulder, Colorado that explored Buddhist approaches to the study of mind and knowledge. See *Social Science Council Annual Report, 1981-82*, p. 19; and *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1978-79* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1979), p. 21. Committee titles include Michael Cole and Barbara Means, *Comparative Studies of How People Think* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981); Herbert L. Pick, Jr. and Linda P. Acredolo, eds., *Spatial Orientation: Theory, Research, and Application* (New York: Plenum Press, 1983); Herbert L. Pick, Jr. and

RESEARCH PLANNING IN THE 1980s

The skeptical tone set by the Reagan administration prodded social science organizations to pay greater attention to the presentation of and audience for social research. The administration's faultfinding stance seemed to underline the inherently political and contestable character of even the most carefully-formulated research agendas. In the 1970s and early 1980s, institutions such as the SSRC attracted flak from two directions at once–from conservatives, who used the term "new class" as shorthand for statecentric elites who favored social engineering, and from radicals, who questioned the objectivity and morality of committee-driven social science.[173] Even as radicals made their peace with their departments and their disciplines, conservatives would remain convinced of the value of developing an independent counter-establishment to undermine new class hegemony in the universities, media and foundations.

Elliot Saltzman, eds., *Modes of Perceiving and Processing Information* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978); Eleanor Rosch and Barbara B. Lloyd, eds., *Cognition and Categorization* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978).

[172] The Committee on Sociolinguistics (1963-79), which built on the work of an earlier Committee on Linguistics and Psychology (1952-61), brought together specialists in linguistics, sociology and anthropology to situate language use in community processes. The committee developed cross-cultural and comparative projects to determine how societies and languages interact in different sociocultural and socioeconomic contexts. In the 1960s, the committee launched a new journal, *Language in Society*, and in the 1970s sponsored two research volumes and an influential textbook that helped place the field on the scholarly map. At the close of the 1970s the committee requested it be discharged, "on the grounds that it had accomplished many of the goals for which it had been originally constituted." See Allen D. Grimshaw, "Sociolinguistics at the Council, 1963-1979: Past and Prologue," *Items*, Vol. 35, no. 1 (March 1980), p. 12; Susan Ervin-Tripp, "Two Decades of Council Activity in the Rapprochement of Linguistics and Social Science," *Items*, Vol. 28, no. 1 (March 1974); Catherine E. Snow and Charles A. Ferguson, eds., *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Charles J. Fillmore, Daniel Kempler and William S-Y Wang, eds., *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior* (New York: Academic Press, 1979); and Dell H. Hymes, *Foundations of Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974).

[173] For a sample of the radical critiques of mainstream social science that surfaced in the 1970s, see Benjamin Smith, "Some Notes on the Social Science Research Council and the Governing Class Theory of American Politics," paper delivered at the American Political Science Association annual meeting, September 1970. RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 39, Box 177, Folder 1991.

The terms of three presidents–Kenneth Prewitt (1979-85), interim president Francis Sutton (1985-86) and Frederick Wakeman (1986-89)–overlapped with the Reagan years and the culture wars of the 1980s. All three shuttled to Washington, and spent time in foundation headquarters, making the case for disinterested social science. While the government's commitment to social research remained shaky, certain foundations proved somewhat more forthcoming despite their continued interest in social relevance and practical application in grantmaking. If the Council did not experience explosive growth in the 1980s, neither did it reach a point of institutional crisis. Research initiatives in such fields as global cities, state structures, international security, urban poverty, giftedness, research methodology, mid-life development and area studies enjoyed an impact comparable to postwar Council efforts. Inside the organization a new cohort of senior staff–Martha Gephart, Robert Pearson, Richard Rockwell, David Sills, David Szanton, Toby Volkman among others–came to assume the behind-the-scenes roles once played by Paul Webbink, Bryce Wood, Elbridge Sibley and others who served under Pendleton Herring.

A total of 14 non-area research planning committees were formed in the 1980s.[174] At least a couple, on Biosocial Perspectives on Parent Behavior and Offspring Development (1980-91) and Development, Giftedness and the Learning Process (1980-90), were grafted from existing programs and carried forward the agendas of pre-established fields. Other initiatives, such as Cognition and Survey Research (1985-91),[175] Research Library (1988-90)[176] and Confidentiality and Data Access (1989-94),[177] were in comfortable harmony with the Council's postwar profile.

[174] These are: Biosocial Perspectives on Parent Behavior and Offspring Development (1980-91); Development, Giftedness and the Learning Process (1980-90); Comparative Stratification Research (1981-87); Records of Government (1983-85); States and Social Structures (1983-90); Cognition and Survey Research (1985-91); International Peace and Security (1985-2000); New York City (1985-91); Public Policy Research on Contemporary Hispanic Issues (1985-94); Survey of Income (1985-88); Foreign Policy Studies (1986-93); Research Library (1988-90); Urban Underclass (1988-94); Confidentiality and Data Access (1989-94); Research on Global Environmental Change (1989-98).

[175] The Committee on Cognition and Survey Research sought to link cognition research and survey methods research on the grounds that one of the "weakest links in the design and administration of sample surveys is the construction of questions and questionnaires themselves, frequently described as an art or craft. Only recently have survey methodologists attempted to inform this craft through systematic

Rather more striking is the emergence of committees that, however indirectly, reflected a "ride through and beyond the sixties" that was "sometimes rough."[178] Four programs that invoked the era's contested legacy and its carryover into the culture wars were States and Social Structures (1983-90), which became famous for its advocacy of "bringing the state back in"; New York City (1985-91), which promised to contribute to the "current interest in analyzing the evolution of

---

empirical inquiries into such phenomena as the placement of a question, or the tendency of respondents to recall events as happening more recently or more distantly than they actually occurred." The committee sponsored a major volume, *Questions About Questions*, which drew on contributions presented at committee workshops on survey settings, interview semantics, attitude measurement and retrospective data. See *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1984-85*, p. 22; and Judith M. Tanur, ed., *Questions About Questions: Inquiries into the Cognitive Bases of Surveys* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1982).

[176] The aim of the Research Library committee was "to identify and define the issues that will shape the nature and services of research libraries in the 21st century." A primary focus of the committee was on the impact of new forms of information technology. The project was cosponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies, the Association of American Universities and the Council on Library Resources. See *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1987-88* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1988), pp. 123-125.

[177] Jointly sponsored with the Committee on National Statistics of the National Research Council, the Committee on Confidentiality and Data Access sought to "help better manage the increasingly competing goals of confidentiality and access" to publicly-collected data from censuses, sample surveys, and administrative records. The committee organized several workshops and sponsored *Private Lives and Public Policies* (1993), which offered concrete recommendations "to aid federal statistical agencies in their stewardship of data for policy decisions and research, specifically with respect to three fundamental concerns: (1) protecting the interests of data providers through procedures that insure privacy and confidentiality; (2) enhancing public confidence in the integrity of the data and (3) facilitating the responsible dissemination of data to users." The committee also oversaw the publication of an "Executive Summary and Recommendations" pamphlet based on *Private Lives and Public Policies* that circulated widely in the federal system. Having received funding from the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Internal Revenue Service and the National Science Foundation, the committee offers a solid example of Council-government collaboration in the post-Reagan era. See *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1988-89* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1989), p. 51; Wlodzimierz Okrasa, "Public Lives, Public Policies: Report of the Panel on Confidentiality and Data Access and its Relevance for Designing Information Systems in Central and Eastern Europe," *Items*, Vol. 48, no. 1 (March 1994); and George T. Duncan, Thomas B. Jabine and Virginia A. de Wolf, eds., *Private Lives and Public Policies: Confidentiality and Accessibility of Government Statistics* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1993).

[178] Thomas Bender, "Politics, Intellect, and the American University, 1945-1995," in Thomas Bender and Carl E. Schorske, eds., *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 39. Bender argues that "it mattered…that students and faculty had been politically mobilized; no one can doubt that the moral and political commitments of the sixties brought issues of race, class, and gender (and new models of society, conflict, and stability) into academic work." A heightened environmental awareness could also be discerned. Bender acknowledged that the sixties also left "a legacy…of disillusionment. And there has been a continuing conservative backlash…more generally, it produced a more varied and thus more complicated academic culture that found it difficult to speak with one voice." (p. 40) This is certainly a perspective worth noting in relation to the post-60s history of the SSRC.

state capacity and autonomy";[179] International Peace and Security (1985-2000), for many years the Council's single largest research program, with a field-defining impact comparable with the social indicators or area programs; and Research on the Urban Underclass (1988-94), which revisited scholarly and popular assumptions about poverty, policy and culture.

While the States and Social Structures and New York City committees grew out of sophisticated debates over the structure of the modern state, the genesis of the International Peace and Security program lay in revived public anxieties about the prospects for superpower conflict as well as a growing awareness that security threats could emerge from forces as diverse as environmental degradation and global resource inequalities. Meanwhile, the Research on the Urban Underclass committee contended with renewed interest in the multiple sources of poverty as well as a growing public backlash against the "undeserving poor" and the popularization of notions of a "culture of poverty."

The Committee on States and Social Structures focused attention on the way the "state has come increasingly to be viewed as an important, relatively autonomous, actor which, while obviously influenced by the social structure which surrounds it, also shapes long term processes of societal change and therefore the surrounding societal structure itself."[180] This agenda allowed for a number of substantive questions: "How are states built and reconstructed? What roles have been played by wars or major economic and political crises; and how do state agencies and activities develop in more normal times? What social, economic, and political factors influence patterns of official recruitment, the acquisition and deployment of state financial resources, and the establishment and use of specific policy instruments to address the given kinds of problems faced

[179] John H. Mollenkopf, "New York City as a Research Site," *Items*, Vol. 42, no. 3 (September 1988), p. 67.
[180] "States and Social Structures: An Agenda for Interdisciplinary Dialogue and Research," unpublished document (1982). RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 322, Folder 1824, p. 1.

by states and societies?"[181] The committee was best known for *Bringing the State Back In* (1985), which became widely assigned at the graduate level, and enjoyed a generative influence on studies of state institutions and political development.[182]

The New York City program similarly announced the arrival of a fresh set of intellectual ambitions, informed by an invigorated neo-institutionalism and political economy. The committee's mandate was to "encourage crossdisciplinary approaches to the 19th and 20th century history of the city," in order to "bring a fresh set of approaches to a number of substantive issues currently before urban studies."[183] A particular concern was the application of the concepts of "space" and "spatial relations" as "a constitutive element of social organization and history," which had been developed by geographers but were "frequently absent from contemporary social science."[184]

---

[181] Theda Skocpol, "Bringing the State Back In: A Report on Current Comparative Research on the Relationship between States and Social Structures," *Items*, Vol. 36, nos. 1-2 (June 1982), p. 7. The committee published a newsletter, organized university seminars on theories of the state and pulled together working groups on industrialization and the state; states and the transnational diffusion of economic knowledge; states, knowledge-bearing occupations, and social policy making and war settlement and state structures. See *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1984-85*, pp. 168-170.

[182] While the book had many fans, one critic, Gabriel Almond, warned that a "generation of young scholars has been encouraged to reject much of its scholarly ancestry with little more than a paradigmatic farewell." Almond's salvo called attention to a paradigmatic gap between those who came of age during the postwar methodological and behavioral revolutions, and graduate students caught up in the passions of the antiwar era who were often inspired by a diverse if heretical mix of thinkers–from Samir Amin, Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci, to Barrington Moore, Karl Polanyi and Max Weber. It seems safe to say that a radically different set of concerns and presuppositions–and theoretical vocabulary–gained favor among many younger scholars as a result of the unfolding legacy of the movements of the 1960s and 1970s.

[183] *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1986-87* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1987), p. 118. The committee spun off working groups on historical and contemporary comparisons, changing patterns of inequality, the restructuring of the built environment and the role of New York in the system of cities; it also sponsored conferences that led to the publication of four pathbreaking titles in urban studies: John H. Mollenkopf, ed., *Power, Culture, and Place: Essays on New York City* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1989); Castells and Mollenkopf, eds., *Dual City: Restructuring New York* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1991); David Ward and Olivier Zunz, eds., *The Landscape of Modernity: Essays on New York City, 1900-1940* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1992); and Martin Shefter, ed., *Capital of the American Century: The National and International Influence of New York City* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1993). The committee also sponsored Jeffrey Kroessler, *A Guide to Historical Map Resources for Greater New York* (Chicago: Speculum Orbis Press, 1988).

The committee's project on global cities was perhaps its most innovative creation. The committee proposed to examine three global cities–New York, Tokyo and Paris–along four dimensions: first, "how globalization has influenced the economic roles that each major city plays in the national and regional system of cities"; second, "how globalization has influenced the internal social structure of the cities, concentrating on the role of immigration and the formation of a new ethnic/racial division of labor"; third, "how each city and the key public and private actors within it have attempted to plan for the city's new global role through a broad range of development policies, including building the required physical environment"; and finally, "how each city's role in cultural production (whether in commerce and mass consumption or in high culture) has influenced its development."[185] The project came at a time when the Council was increasingly invested in the study of the interaction of "global" and "local" forces in the context of an expanding world economy. It was carried forward by an international working group after the formal conclusion of the committee, with London as a fourth case study.

The International Peace and Security (IPS) program grew out of scholarly and policy debates ignited by the "second cold war" of the 1980s. In this period a small circle of academics and foundation officers met to identify ways the field of security studies could be invigorated and better integrated into the social sciences. As Kenneth Prewitt argued, "the current intellectual base of security and arms control studies may be too narrow," and for this reason the concept of 'security' needs "extending and broadening…beyond its current base, in the realization that security in the contemporary world has slipped away from the limited set of concepts we have

[184] "Proposal for an SSRC Research Planning Committee on New York City, November 1984, p. 1. RAC, Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8474.
[185] *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1989-90* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1990), pp. 92-93.

used to study it."[186] One difficulty facing those seeking to reorient security studies was that area specialists appeared indifferent to security-related topics.[187]

To foster new approaches to peace and security, the program offered dissertation and postdoctoral fellowships providing up to two years of support. The fellowships were intended "to broaden the field by recruiting scholars training in a diversity of scientific disciplines who in the absence of the program might never have focused their methodologies and analytical approaches on issues of international peace and security."[188] In a survey of the program's first decade, staff member Robert Latham found it had made awards to many non-US citizens, women, non-whites and scholars from "disciplines such as anthropology, economics, geography and psychology, which had been historically underrepresented in security studies." Latham observed that topics explored by IPS fellows went beyond the field's familiar emphasis on military security and technology to encompass issues of nationalism and ethnic conflict, international ethics, environmental issues and sustainable development.[189]

---

[186] Kenneth Prewitt, "Annual Report of the President: Security Studies and the Social Sciences," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report 1983-84* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1984), pp. xiii-xiv.

[187] Data from Council training programs suggested that few area and disciplinary specialists were interested in security-related research. For example, "of the 724 [fellowship] applications to the African committee [between 1978-83], only seven involved such topics…Of the 340 applications to the Japan committee, only two were even close…Across all the foreign area committees, over a five-year period, fewer than one percent of the applicants proposed research directly pertinent to contemporary issues of peace and security." Prewitt, "Annual Report of the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1983-84*, p. xxi.

[188] Kenneth Prewitt, "Council Initiates New Fellowship Program in International Security," *Items*, Vol. 38, no. 4 (December 1984), p. 65. Remarkably, this program offered the first "major national competition, at the doctoral or postdoctoral level, which awards research and training fellowships in international peace and security studies." See "Research Training Fellowships in International Peace and Security Studies," unpublished Council document, November 1984. RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 323, Folder 1834, p. 1. IPS fellowships not only supported individual research but fostered networks for those interested in rethinking security issues. Fellows and others were linked through an ongoing program of annual conferences, newsletters, research workshops, an online database and other activities.

[189] Robert Latham, "Moments of Transition: The SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Program in International Peace and Security on the Eve of its 10th Anniversary," *Items*, Vol. 48, no. 1 (March 1994), pp. 1-8.

A striking aspect of the program was its ability to rally a diverse coalition of intellectuals. The original committee roster included McGeorge Bundy and John Kenneth Galbraith; cold war historians John L. Gaddis and David Holloway; political scientists Richard Falk and Robert Jervis; the theorist of nonviolent action, Gene Sharp; and former White House security analyst Condoleezza Rice. Prominent scholars who subsequently joined the committee included political philosopher Jean Bethke Elshtain, historian Paul Kennedy and political scientist Peter Katzenstein. The committee culled its members not only from political science, sociology and economics, but also from anthropology, physics and psychology. After a decade of sustained efforts,[190] the IPS committee could take credit for doing "more than could reasonably be expected to help redefine security studies." While suggesting "there is still a long way to go in

[190] Committee workshops surveyed approaches to the study of international security (1986 and 1987); Mexican security (1989); structural adjustment and security (1990); US foreign policy and the developing world (1991); nuclear weapons (1991); Islam in Central Asia (1992); history, security and foreign policy (1992); the state and international security (1993); the European arms trade (1994); transnational social movements (1994); Chinese diplomacy (1995); coercion (1995); human rights in West Africa (1995); Russia's opening to the West (1995); terrorism (1995); winners and losers in neoliberal experiments (1995); Africa in global perspective (1996); minorities and international security (1996); ethnic conflict (1997); failed states (1998); security in Asia (1999); and security and peace-building in Africa (1998 and 1999). Committee sponsored titles included Bruce Michael Bagley and Sergio Aguayo Quezada, eds., *Mexico: In Search of Stability* (Miami: University of Miami North-West Center Press, 1993); Jonathan Boyarin, ed., *Remapping Memory: The Politics of Time and Space* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); Peter Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security: Ideas and Norms in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996); Sam C. Nolutshungu, ed., *Margins of Insecurity: Minorities and International Security* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1996); Philip Tetlock and Aaron Belkin, eds., *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Thomas J. Biersteker and Cynthia Weber, eds., *State Sovereignty as Social Construct* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Sohail H. Hashmi, ed., *State Sovereignty: Change and Persistence in International Relations* (State College: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997); Suzanne Rudoph and James Piscatori, eds., *Transnational Religion and Fading States* (Boulder: Westview, 1997); Lawrence Freedman, ed., *Strategic Coercion: Concepts and Cases* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); and Peter Trubowitz, Emily O. Goldman and Edward Rhodes, eds., *The Politics of Strategic Adjustment: Ideas, Institutions, and Interests* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). Committee fellowships also facilitated book projects, such as Michael N. Barnett, *Dialogues in Arab Politics: Negotiations in Regional Order* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), Radha Kumar, *Divide and Fall? Bosnia in the Annals of Partition* (New York: Verso, 1997), Malik Mufti, *Sovereign Creations: Pan-Arabism and Political Order in Syria and Iraq* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), Robert Powell, *Nuclear Deterrence Theory: The Search for Credibility* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) and Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States: A History of US Policy Toward Latin America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).

transforming the security studies," this outsider reviewer said the program "has been pushing against an extremely strong tide, and, more importantly, considerable institutional interests."[191]

The Committee for Research on the Urban Underclass (1988-94) offers another example of a committee that undertook a comprehensive program of activities on behalf of a politically sensitive research agenda. While aspects of poverty, social stratification and income inequality had been addressed by committees from the 1920s onwards–the issue was certainly germane to the work of the New York City project–the committee was the first in many years to emphasize the condition of the urban poor. Although many participants held reservations about the "underclass" label, there was widespread recognition that no single policy or market prescription was likely to ameliorate conditions overdetermined by neighborhood, familial and macroeconomic factors. The committee examined the "concentration and persistence of urban poverty" by "integrating survey-based research, ethnographic methods, and prospective longitudinal research" to better link "macro- with micro-research perspectives."[192] In developing its agenda, the committee placed particular emphasis on the "role of neighborhoods and communities in the processes that help create, maintain, or ameliorate the conditions of an urban underclass."[193] It also sponsored projects on the origins of the urban underclass, the social ecology of crime and drugs in the inner city and labor markets, as well as a multi-city study of

[191] Steve Smith, "Diplomacy, Foreign Policy and the Changing Role of the State as an International Actor," outside review of the IPS program, September 1994. Another reviewer suggested that the program "is an integral part of the intellectual infrastructure in the field of international security. Over the past decade, it has equaled or exceeded all the other institutions in the field in terms of numbers and quality of fellows." See Steven E. Miller, "MacArthur Foundation/Social Science Research Council International Peace and Security Program: Military Security and Technology," outside review of the IPS program, March 1995.
[192] Martha A. Gephart and Robert W. Pearson, "Contemporary Research on the Urban Underclass: A Selected Review of the Research that Underlies a New Council Program," *Items*, Vol. 42, nos. 1-2 (June 1988), pp. 5, 7-8.
[193] Martha A. Gephart, "Neighborhoods and Communities in Concentrated Poverty," *Items*, Vol. 43, no. 4 (December 1989), p. 84. This led to the formation of a working group on community, neighborhood, family process and individual development that looked at "the relationship between the concentration of poverty and developmental trajectories, and on the role played by household variables, resources of various kinds, and social networks." *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1988-89*, p. 107.

urban inequality. *The "Underclass" Debate* (1993) reflected the committee's interest in applying a greater degree of historical perspective to its own efforts.[194]

The committee sponsored not only doctoral and postdoctoral awards, but also undergraduate research assistantships that connected promising juniors and seniors with academic mentors. In keeping with the push to enhance the fellowship experience, the committee organized conferences for undergraduate researchers, as well as a series of summer dissertation workshops.[195] The committee also collaborated with the Committee on Public Policy Research on Contemporary Hispanic Issues (1985-99) on a project on persistent urban poverty.[196] In the late 1980s and early 1990s the committee organized results-oriented seminars which attracted participants from the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Relations and the House Ways and Means

---

[194] Michael B. Katz, ed., *The "Underclass" Debate: Views from History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993). Contributors to the Katz volume agreed that present conditions represented much more than a continuation of past trends. As Alice O'Connor noted in a review of the book, "the situation of the urban poor has been worsened by the deterioration of public institutions in recent years; and there may be a qualitative difference to life in poor inner-city neighborhoods." See Alice O'Connor, "Review Essay: *The "Underclass" Debate: Views from History*," *Items*, Vol. 47, no. 1 (March 1993), p. 17. Other committee publications included Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson, eds., *The Urban Underclass* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1991); *Persistent Urban Poverty: Integrating Research, Policy and Practice* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1993); and *Urban Underclass Database*, compiled by John D. Kasarda (Chapel Hill: Kenan Institute of Private Enterprise, 1992), a panel study with data over a 30-year period.

[195] Committee-sponsored conferences looked at William Julius Wilson's *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1989); poverty and family life (1991); the urban underclass (1992); persistent urban poverty (1993); new perspectives on urban poverty research (1994), and a 1994 workshop on absent fathers. *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1993-94* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1994), p. 45.

[196] The Committee on Public Policy Research on Contemporary Hispanic Issues was established to promote research on Latino issues and to contribute to policy debates. In partnership with the Inter-University Program for Latino Research at the Center for Puerto Rican Studies, Hunter College, the committee organized a series of workshops and conferences, as well as annual forums where fellows could present their research findings. For several years the committee offered grants for scholarship on significant public policy issues, such as "studies that dealt with persistent poverty, children and youth at risk, culture and economic behavior, political organization and empowerment, and national policy initiatives." Other programs included small grants for predoctoral candidates, advanced research grants and research mentoring grants for Latina junior faculty. The committee also commissioned research on Hispanic families, and on Hispanics and higher education. The committee sponsored Harriett D. Romo, ed., *Latinos and Blacks in the Cities: Policies for the 1990s* (Austin: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, 1990) and Marie E. Enchautegui, *Policy Implications of Latino Poverty* (Washington: The Urban Institute, 1995). See *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1988-89*, p. 98.

Committee. Some form of interaction with the federal system was still possible, even if the climate was not as hospitable as it had been in the halcyon days of the Great Society.

Research planning in the 1980s went in several directions at once. Important work continued to be carried out in the fields of giftedness, mid-life studies, cognition and social indicators (in the early part of the decade). At the same time, new initiatives, such as States and Social Structures, intersected more closely with topics favored by the area programs–*Bringing the State Back In* was in fact cosponsored with the Latin American and Western Europe area committees. The New York City, Hispanic Issues and Urban Underclass programs reflected an interest in linking social research to social problems that was more reminiscent of Merriam's era than Herring's, while the formidable International Peace and Security program confronted thorny policy questions as well as entrenched lines of demarcation inside the disciplines. If one trend stood out, it was the decline of activity inspired by the behavioral/methodological concerns of the 1950s-70s. Over time, the gap between research planning undertaken by the two wings of the Council--"thematic" programs and "area" programs–began to narrow.

RESEARCH PLANNING IN THE 1990s

If controversies in Washington over the role of the social sciences represented a flash point for the Council in the 1980s, the future of area studies became *the* hot-button issue of the 1990s. This was critical because area committees played an increasingly active role not only in fellowship provision and field development but also in research planning. In taking note of this trend, and in the interests of facilitating research that cut across conventional area boundaries, the leadership of the Council began systematically to encourage cross-area collaborations from the mid-80s onwards. These collaborations further underscored the growing importance of the area

programs to the profile and output of the Council as a whole. The area committees, as well as the mid-90s overhaul of the international program, are discussed below.

Four distinguished scholars–David Featherman (1989-95), Kenneth Prewitt (1995-1998), interim president Orville Brim, Jr. (1998-99) and Craig Calhoun (1999-)–served as Council presidents in this decade. A total of nine non-area research committees were established, four of which were launched under Craig Calhoun and therefore fall outside the purview of this essay, which concentrates on the 75 year period from 1923-98.[197] In addition, two of the larger Reagan-era programs, International Peace and Security and Urban Underclass, conducted significant research efforts in the 1990s. The program on Global Environmental Change (1989-99) was particularly active during David Featherman's tenure, reflecting a new level of awareness surrounding the social and political aspects of climatic change. The work of the Foreign Policy Studies committee (1985-94) also bore fruit in the 90s and provided a fresh perspective on a topic in which the Council had a longstanding interest.[198]

One feature of research planning in this period was the increasing use of research groups that pursued a more limited agenda than full-fledged committees. Working groups and other *ad hoc* and short-term arrangements gave the Council greater flexibility to develop projects on a variety

[197] These are: Culture, Health and Human Development (1991-); International Migration (1994-); Urban Initiatives (1994-97); Higher Education (1997-); Human Capital (1997-); Program on the Arts (1998-); Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector (1998-); Global Security and Cooperation (2000-); the Corporation as a Social Institution (2000-).

[198] The committee was animated by the belief that whereas students of US foreign policy most often concentrated on the actions of a "relatively small circle of government officials," in many instances foreign policy decisions "reflect a complex interplay of broader political, economic, and social forces." To stimulate interest in the broader sources of foreign policy making, the committee sponsored postdoctoral fellowships, grants for scholars from the developing world, a minority research assistantship program promoting foreign policy careers and workshops and conferences. See Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane, eds., *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993); W. Lance Bennett and David L. Paletz, eds., *Taken by Storm: The Media, Public Opinion, and US Foreign Policy in the Gulf War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); and Miles Kahler, ed., *Liberalization and Foreign Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

of worthy topics.[199] A project in the late 1990s on Pledges of Aid, for example, which prepared a comparative study on international aid to countries recovering from violent conflict, resulted in two publications and was cosponsored with New York University's Center on International Cooperation.[200] Additional examples include the Social Science and Immunization Project, which grew out of a 1993 workshop on immunization and culture,[201] and working groups on Ethnic Customs, Assimilation and American Law,[202] and Bio-Behavioral-Social Perspectives on

[199] Other features of the institutional environment changed as well. As a result of revenue growth and far more intensive reporting requirements, a greater burden was placed on the finance office to manage and oversee a complex budget. In addition, the rapid development of desktop computing transformed everyday labor processes for finance and program staff, with email and the web playing an increasingly central role by the late 1990s. Inevitably, capital investment in computer hardware and software absorbed an ever larger portion of the budget. It may also be worth noting that computers were introduced into the life of the Council in the early 1980s. The minutes to the spring 1981 Executive Committee meeting reported that "Mr. Peleck [the Council's chief financial officer] recommended that the Council consider the purchase of a word processor which would expedite the typing and editing of proposals and other correspondence. Also, the record keeping aspects of the fellowship program would be performed by the word processor." RAC, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 327, Folder 1852. As far back as 1956, P&P discussed the possibility of launching a committee on Electronic Computers and the Social Sciences. A draft statement noted that "the eventual influence of high-speed computers on the social sciences" might include "memory, classification, and information retrieval; language translation; computers as problem solving machines with partial success characteristics built into them; automata capable of concept formulation." See Minutes of the Committee on Problems and Policy, June 15, 1956. RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Sub-series 1, Box 317, Folder 1789, pp. 61-62

[200] See Shepard Forman and Stewart Patrick, eds., *Good Intentions: Pledges of Aid for Postconflict Recovery* (Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers, 2000); Shepard Forman, Stewart Patrick and Dirk Salomons, *Recovering from Conflict: Strategy for an International Response* (New York: Center on International Cooperation, 2000).

[201] Project members tackled such issues as how countries with different formal characteristics and political systems have "nearly everywhere embedded immunization as a sovereign and constitutive function of the state"; how demand for vaccination is related to the coverage, quality, and sustainability of public health interventions; and how international politics and institutional dynamics shape the testing and introduction of new vaccines. The project "assumes that sustained social science research can elicit practical insights into the success and failure of immunization programs" and toward that end has sponsored meetings with "global, national and local public health officials and policymakers. See Paul Greenough and Pieter Streefland, "Social Science and Immunization: New Possibilities and Projects," *Items*, Vol. 52, no. 1 (March 1998), pp. 2, 4, and 6.

[202] This working group drew on a 1997 committee workshop on the free exercise of culture and sought to investigate the "tension between ethnic minority customs and the customs of the American cultural mainstream" to explore "some of the limits of pluralistic tolerance" and the dilemmas of policymaking in a multicultural framework. See Richard A. Shweder, Hazel R. Markus, Martha L. Minow and Frank Kessel, "The Free Exercise of Culture: Ethnic Customs, Assimilation and American Law," *Items*, Vol. 51, no. 4 (December 1997), p. 63. A reporter for the *New York Times* summarized a subsequent working group meeting in terms of how "democratic, pluralistic societies like the United States, based on religious and cultural tolerance, respond to customs and rituals that may be repellent to the majority." The reporter also quoted from the group's statement of purpose, which noted that "despite our pluralistic ideals, something very much like a cultural un-American activities list seems to have begun circulating among powerful representatives and enforcers of mainstream culture." See Barbara Crossette, "Testing the Limits of

Health, that emerged out of the Culture, Health and Human Development committee.[203] The working group model was taken up by the area programs, which spun off "regional research" working groups, on East Asia and pan-Europe, in the mid-1990s.

Three of the decade's more ambitious research planning efforts addressed the themes of environmental change, culture and human development and the international impact of migration.

The Research on Global Environment Change program sought to promote research on the "long-term, large-scale interfaces of humanity, technology, and the global environment."[204] As staff member Richard Rockwell noted, global environmental change "occurs over periods of decades to centuries, and each occurs on a scale of continents or broader." Environmental change on this scale, Rockwell suggested, invited a rethinking of the "society-bound studies that have long characterized our research" in the social sciences.[205] The committee targeted four areas for investigation: landed property rights, land use changes, the national implementation of international accords and social learning in the management of global environmental risks. The resulting research consortia sponsored nearly two dozen workshops and conferences,[206] and the group on international accords was responsible for the publication of *Engaging Countries*

Tolerance as Cultures Mix: Does Freedom Mean Accepting Rituals that Repel the West?" *New York Times*, March 6, 1999, B9.

[203] This brought together representatives from SSRC, the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research at the National Institutes of Health and the National Opinion Research Center, aiming to foster research on health through systematic and comparative studies.

[204] *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1988-89*, p. 103.

[205] Richard C. Rockwell, "Puzzles of Global Environmental Change: The Council's Collaborative Research Program," *Items*, Vol. 44, no. 1 (March 1990), pp. 1-2. See also John F. Richards and David C. Major, "Landed Property Rights and Global Environmental Change," *Items*, Vol. 47, no. 1 (March 1993); and David C. Major, "First Open Meeting: Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change Community," *Items*, Vol. 48, nos. 2-3 (June-September 1994).

[206] These included meetings on area studies and global environmental change (1990), international conflicts in global environmental change (1990), changes in land use patterns (1990), regional observatories for research on the human dimensions of environmental changes (1990), landed property rights (1991, 1993, 1994, 1995), population and the environment (1991), social learning (1991 and 1992), human dimensions of global environmental change (1992), the national implementation of international environmental accords (1990, 1992 and two in 1994), global land use and cover change research (1993); social learning in the

(1998).[207] In 1995 and again in 1997, the committee sponsored "open meetings" on the human dimensions of global environmental change which attracted graduate students and more senior researchers from the social and natural sciences and helped put the "human dimensions" problematic on the map. In collaboration with the International Social Science Council and a nonprofit group, Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN), the committee sponsored *Population and Environment: Rethinking the Debate* (1994), which sought to shift the population debate by showing that "population trends must be analyzed in relation to other processes, whether these processes be environmental or political, economic or social."[208]

The Committee on Culture, Health and Human Development drew on human development approaches but also emphasized the roles of cultural and social practices, beliefs and institutions in shaping the forms and functions of human health and development. The inspiration for the committee arose out of the recognition that anthropological and "other comparative cross-cultural studies…offer a potentially productive perspective on assumptions in biomedicine, public health, psychiatry, and psychology about what are, and are not, universal aspects of human experiences and conditions over the life course." The committee identified three goals: first, to "combine health with human development in an integrated framework to explore in detail how models and processes drawn from one domain can yield a new understanding in the other"; second, to "strengthen the theoretical foundations of research in these domains by bringing to bear a deep and detailed conception of culture that can be explicitly integrated with existing biosocial points of view"; and finally, to "strengthen the methodological foundations of research at the boundary

---

context of environmental risks (1993) and the role of social groups in shaping policy on global environmental issues (1995).

[207] Edith Brown Weiss and Harold K. Jacobson, eds., *Engaging Countries: Strengthening Compliance with International Environmental Accords* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998).

[208] Lourdes Arizpe, M. Priscilla Stone and David C. Major, "Rethinking the Environmental-Population Debate," in Lourdes Arizpe, M. Priscilla Stone and David C. Major, eds., *Population and Environment: Rethinking the Debate* (Boulder: Westview, 1994), pp. 8-9.

of the health and social sciences by exploring creative ways of combining qualitative and quantitative methods."[209]

The committee organized a series of workshops and conferences,[210] and was responsible for *Social Suffering* (1997), based on a special issue of *Daedalus*.[211] The committee's working group on ethnopediatrics could take credit for inspiring *Our Babies, Our Selves* (1998), aimed at a popular audience; another publication, on "The Cultural Psychology of Development," appeared in a major reader in developmental psychology.[212]

Another large-scale program launched in the 1990s, International Migration, defined its mission as "shaping migration studies as a field of scholarship that can contribute to an understanding of how this phenomenon is altering the United States."[213] The program organized conferences and workshops, offered doctoral and postdoctoral fellowships and hosted Minority Summer Dissertation Workshops on an annual basis starting in 1995. Between 1996 and 1999 the program provided 23 postdoctoral fellowships and 33 dissertation fellowships, while 58 scholars took part in the Minority Summer Dissertation Workshops. In 1997 the committee produced a special issue of *International Migration Review* based on papers presented at an earlier

[209] Frank Kessel, "On Culture, Health, and Human Development: Emerging Perspectives," *Items*, Vol. 46, no. 4 (December 1992), p. 66. See also Frank Kessel, "On Culture, Health, and Human Development: Emerging Perspectives II," *Items*, Vol. 49, no. 1 (March 1995).
[210] Workshops were held on numbers and narratives (1993), pluralism (1993), acquisition of culture (1993), local biology (1993), culture and human development (1994), social suffering (1994), ethnopediatrics (1994), culture, identity and conflict (1994), violence, political agency and the self (1995), community responses to social change (1995), child development (1995), social science, biomedicine and international health (1996), perspectives on human development (1996) and biomedical technologies (1996).
[211] Untitled report, *Items*, Vol. 50, no. 1 (March 1995), p. 21.
[212] Arthur Kleinman, Veena Das and Margaret Lock, eds., *Social Suffering* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Meredith Small, *Our Babies, Our Selves: How Biology and Culture Shape the Way We Parent* (New York: Anchor, 1998); Richard Shweder, Jacqueline Goodnow, Giyoo Hatano, Robert LeVine, Hazel Markus and Peggy Miller, "The Cultural Psychology of Development: One Mind, Many Mentalities," in Richard Lerner, ed., *Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 1: Theoretical Models of Human Development* (New York: John Wiley, 1998).
[213] *Social Science Research Council Biennial Report, 1996-98* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1998), p. 63.

conference titled "Becoming American/America Becoming." The committee also sponsored *International Migration and the Remaking of America*, a special issue of the *American Behavioral Scientist* on immigration research in the United States, and *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, which won the American Sociological Association's Thomas and Znaiecki award in 2000.[214]

In a review of the Council's work in immigration studies, program director Josh DeWind highlighted significant areas of continuity between the committee of the 1920s on Scientific Aspects of Human Migration and the program of the 1990s. "When each of the Committees were created," he noted, "large numbers of immigrants had been entering the country for two or more decades and, in the midst of extensive public debates, the Congress had passed comprehensive legislation to manage their entry and impact on American life." In keeping with the Council's primary focus on research, both committees shied away from attempting to "resolve policy disputes" but rather sought "to 'clarify the nature of central issues, explain their origins and outcomes, and identify their wider social contexts and ramifications' with the expectation of informing the public's ability to 'assess the goals, consistency, and long-term implications of policy options being debated.'"[215] DeWind also identified significant discontinuities between the two periods, particularly in terms of a more recent emphasis on ethnic pluralism and multiculturalism and their implications from the standpoint of public policy.[216]

---

[214] Josh DeWind, Charles Hirshman and Philip Kasnitz, eds., "Immigrant Adaptation and Native-Born Responses in the Making of Americans," *International Migration Review*, Vol. 31 (winter 1997); Charles Hirschman, Josh DeWind and Philip Kasinitz, eds., *International Migration and the Remaking of America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1999); Ruben G. Rumbaut, Nancy Foner and Steven J. Gold, eds., "Transformations: Immigration and Immigration Research in the United States," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 42, no. 9 (1999); and Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz and Josh DeWind, eds., *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1999). Other committee conferences focused on the political incorporation of immigrants (1997 and 1998) and immigration research (1998).

[215] Josh DeWind, "Immigration Studies and the Social Science Research Council," unpublished paper, 1998.

[216] In 1999 the committee launched a project on Religion, Immigration and Civic Life, in partnership with the Committee on Culture, Health and Human Development. Funding was provided by the Pew Charitable

For many years the Council drew a firm distinction between thematic and area programs, on the assumption that thematic programs were largely US-focused and tied to US disciplines while area programs concentrated on discrete world regions and nurtured ties with non-US institutions and scholars. Research planning in the 1990s complicated this long-standing demarcation. The programs on Global Environment Change and Culture, Health and Human Development were cosmopolitan in conception, while the International Migration project placed US trends in a transnational framework. More recent projects, on Higher Education (1997-) and Human Capital (1997-), were not only international in scope but were positioned to draw on contributions from area specialists. The international program reorganization of the mid-1990s flowed in part from the obsolescence of the area/thematic divide, by establishing committees that could readily move across conventional area boundaries and by fostering collaborations with scholars who did not view themselves as area specialists.

Raising funds for research, field development and training became somewhat easier in the 1990s than it had been in the 1970s-80s. In part this reflected the prosperity of the Clinton era and the greater wealth of the foundation sector. The preponderance of revenue raised in the 90s was directed toward the international program. While the Council continued to solicit funds from its major postwar donors–such as the Ford Foundation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and, from the late 1970s onwards, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation–a growing number of smaller and non-US foundations were added to the list.

Trusts. The project started from the observation that "consideration of the role of religion in immigrant incorporation has been strikingly limited in contemporary scholarship." Despite this pattern of relative neglect, "religion and immigration are topics of general interest," and the project promised to "share its

Institutional growth was also reflected in stronger ties to international research centers and networks. The trend toward greater non-US support was made possible by, and also facilitated, an ongoing internationalization of committees and networks.[217] Measures taken to internationalize the work of the Council–to recruit non-US scholars onto committees, promote research on world areas, promote comparative research on the US, situate the organization in international networks and recognize the growing vitality of social research from various areas and regions of the world–represented a *de facto* strategic response to an increasingly complex (and crowded) research environment. If committees and staff could no longer assume that the SSRC alone could undertake the leadership role associated with research planning, they could take steps to nurture ties with the outside world that flowed from the Council's reputation and status as a peak organization of the social sciences. The shift toward internationalization was informed by the foreign area studies movement and the Council's experience in bringing together humanists and social scientists onto region and country-specific committees. But it also reflected a more generalized flowering of cross-national intellectual exchange that rendered a geographically compartmentalized conception of social science increasingly unsustainable.[218]

---

results with a wider public." See "Council Announces New Working Group on Religion, Immigration and Civic Life," *Items and Issues*, Vol. 1, no. 1 (winter 2000).

[217] Two funders that made substantial commitments were the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership, which underwrote the Abe Fellowship Program, and the German-American Academic Council (GAAC), which provided support for the Young Scholars Summer Institute program (1994-) and the German-American Research Networking program (1998-). As a GAAC member organization, the SSRC shared responsibility for these programs with the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin. The Summer Institutes program hosted two-week workshops for advanced graduate students and recent PhDs from Germany and the United States working on topics in the social and natural sciences. Each institute consisted of two workshops held during consecutive summers. Topics covered include immigration and citizenship, longevity, mating systems and European integration. The program enrolled approximately 200 fellows between 1994 and 1999. The Research Networking program supported collaborations of participants in GAAC activities. The Council also administered a fellowship competition, the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies, which funded 117 fellowships between in 1986 and 1998. Other non-US funders included the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, the Volkswagen Foundation, the Bank of Japan and the Swedish Agency for Research Cooperation with Developing Countries. International funding helped alleviate financial concerns, but the targeted nature of much of this support did not address the nagging problem of raising funds for a general program of research planning.

[218] Whereas nearly half of all SSRC committees touched on international themes in the mid-1960s, by 1985 three-quarters (24 of 32) were fashioned around international themes. By the mid-1990s the overall number of committees had fallen (there were 25 committees in 1995), but most were associated with international research. The number of funders also rose, from 13 in 1975 to 23 in both 1985 and 1995.

Inspired in large measure by the new mandate of internationalization, research planning at the end of the century reflected an exciting surge of intellectual and programmatic entrepreneurialism, with a cluster of new programs on business institutions, higher education, international education, philanthropy and nonprofits, the social impact of the arts and information technology and the social sciences. Collaborative projects on collective memory of repression, rethinking development, youth culture and other topics were also underway in the context of the reorganized international program. If training occupied the center stage for much of the 1990s, research programs promised to recapture their dominant position in the early years of the 21st century.

AREA AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Area programs, such as those on Africa, China, Latin America, the Near and Middle East and the Soviet Union rode the crest of the area studies wave and acquired greater weight inside the organization through the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s.[219] As an indication of the scale of area activities, a 1983 board document tallied nearly 200 area-based meetings, conferences, seminars and workshops held between August 1980 and January 1983, on topics ranging from film in Eastern Europe, capitalism in Ivory Coast and Kenya, religion in Latin America and legal reform in Indonesia and Malaysia.[220] Area-defined programs spun off working groups, conferences, grants, research volumes and language institutes. The most active became vital reference points in multidimensional research fields. From their inception the area committees were seen as

[219] In 1979-80 staff floated the idea of establishing a "Tocqueville Committee" to "encourage and support empirical research on the society and culture of North America by non-American, and particularly non-Western scholars," as part of the international program. Although raising funds for such a committee proved difficult, the underlying conception indicated that innovative programmatic thinking within an area studies context was possible. Committee on Problems and Policy minutes, February 1-2, 1980, RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 321, Folder 1822.

[220] "Meetings of the Joint Committees, 1980-83" [unsigned document], RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 322, Folder 1826.

integral to a wider area studies agenda. For some the identity of the post-60s Council would substantially overlap with area studies itself.

The framework within which the area committees functioned was fairly complex. Committees were typically cosponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies, which ensured the involvement of humanist disciplines.[221] As a group these committees constituted the two Councils' international program, and to a certain extent the international program committees inhabited a different SSRC from other committees organized along methodological or topical lines. The sense of belonging to a family of committees made a clear difference when it came to fundraising and program evaluation, for example. As we have seen, however, the lines between area and thematic were increasingly blurry around the edges. Area committees often sponsored "thematic" projects that traversed area boundaries, while some thematic programs were regional or international in scope. Complicating matters was the fact that ACLS bore responsibility for supervising committees on China (1982-96) and Eastern Europe (1971-96), while the others were staffed at SSRC. From 1984-96 the committees were overseen by the Committee on International Programs (JACIP), with input also provided by P&P, the board and ACLS governing bodies.

Committees were often enmeshed in a particular area studies community, which added to the complexity of their organizational ecology. It was not unknown, for example, for partner institutions to feel a sense of responsibility for given area committees. Few non-area committees were as long-lived as the area committees, and they rarely developed the durable, cross-institutional links that flourished under the area studies rubric. By definition area committees represented a different model of research planning from that proposed in 1921 by Charles Merriam, who spoke of "the practical urgent necessity for better organization of our own

[221] One exception is the Committee on Social Science in Italy (1965-73), which was cosponsored by SSRC and the Adriano Olivetti Foundation.

professional research" but warned that organizations "may become ends in themselves rather than means to an end."[222] Area committees enjoyed the flexibility and autonomy of the research planning group, able to gestate ideas and special projects. But the committees were invested to an unusual extent in maintaining wider networks, which followed from their prior commitment to field development, and they presented an ambiguous fit with the Council's imperfectly observed ethos of committee impermanence. Rather than merely exploring promising avenues for interdisciplinary inquiry, these committees carried the burden of symbolizing a grand postwar alliance of the humanities and the social sciences on behalf of greater area knowledge capacity.

Area studies, and the humanities-social sciences alliance on which area studies was premised, had long been subject to scrutiny and debate inside the SSRC. Some board and P&P members mistrusted the "soft science" bias of area studies, believing that "the Council was devoting too much of its time and resources to support language and area studies, and too little to advancement of the behavioral sciences."[223] Another familiar complaint was that area committees spent too much time "thinking up ways to ensure their own perpetuation."[224] Area committees assumed a gatekeeping function that sometimes seemed to favor some departments and programs over others. A 1978 letter criticizing a committee for passing out awards to applicants from universities represented on the committee is indicative of the sensitive interinstitutional tensions that the gatekeeping role sometimes provoked.[225]

---

[222] Charles Merriam, "The Present State of the Study of Politics" [1921] and "Preface to the First Edition" in Charles E. Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics*, pp. 81 and 55.

[223] Bryce Wood, "The SSRC As a Political System." May 1972. RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 5, Folder 31. Wood ascribed this view to "some of the SSRC staff and some members of the Board."

[224] From the same letter: "Rightly or wrongly, most of the research seems much 'softer' and much less methodologically sound [than the thematic committees]…Am I entirely wrong when I read that a committee 'continued to develop a series of projects intended to explore the analytical utility and limits of concepts and conceptual systems indigenous to…' or another tells me that it 'has been considering several projects that might form the basis for future activities?" Letter from Peter Gould to David L. Sills, June 6, 1978. RAC, Accession 2, Series 2, Subseries 2, Box 633, Folder 9020.

[225] In his letter, Edward Friedman, chair of East Asian Studies at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, complained that the China committee, comprising "three Michigan-related people, two Stanford people and one other person," issued awards to applicants at "Harvard, Michigan and Stanford." "Such coincidences

There were also concerns that area studies promised more than it could deliver. The often-expressed skepticism of Herbert Simon, who chaired the board from 1961-65, was reflected in his observation that "anything that can be learned by travel, can be learned faster, cheaper, and better in a good library. The accumulation of evidence supporting the travel theorem is now overwhelming."[226] Harvard political scientist Robert Bates, who served on the Council's board of directors from 1992-98, reported that researchers are seeking "ways to move from the in-depth study of cases typical of Area Studies to more sophisticated research designs required for scientific testing."[227] Elsewhere, Bates stated that "I have long regarded area programs as a problem for political science…Within the academy, the consensus has formed that area studies has failed to generate scientific knowledge."[228] SSRC president Eleanor Sheldon argued that "the concept of area studies itself has little theoretical or intellectual value for the social sciences and humanities, and in general discourse frequently creates only serious misconceptions, ill-informed caricature and hard feelings."[229]

---

might be less frequent or less upsetting," he wrote, "if the Committee were more broadly based." In response, staff member Anne Thurston indicated that "the distribution of awards in China studies has tended to reflect the nature of the field. With only a relatively small number of universities currently offering the array of coursework, language training, library facilities and faculty support necessary to train a China specialist, the most outstanding students have also tended to be concentrated in those schools." Friedman responded by insisting "You are absolutely wrong in your assertion that 'most top-ranked scholars' are at the few universities re warded with scholarships," noting the "practice of justice requires, at a bare minimum, the appearance of justice." See RAC, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 707, folder 8504.

[226] Herbert A. Simon, "Mao's China in 1972," *Items*, Vol. 27, no. 1 (March 1973), p. 1. Simon would later express second thoughts on the area studies movement. "Too often, they [the area committees] seemed to aim at training disciplinary specialization within area specialization: experts on the Russian economy, the Chinese government, the Indonesian family. And because of the necessary emphasis on language skills, combined with a frequent attraction to current events, they seemed often to degenerate into high-grade journalism…As I look at the scene today, however, I see more comparative analysis among cultures, much of it sponsored by SSRC, and I am correspondingly more positive about the long-run effects of the area studies programs. I don't think I can claim any personal credit for these newer developments." Herbert A. Simon, *Models of My Life* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 173-174.

[227] Robert H. Bates, "Area Studies and Political Science: Rupture and Possible Synthesis," *Africa Today*, Vol. 44, no. 2 (1997), p. 126.

[228] Quoted in Christopher Shea, "Political Scientists Clash Over Value of Area Studies," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 10, 1997, p. A13.

[229] But she acknowledged that "American studies of foreign areas are extraordinarily diverse and reflect the same conceptual richness and wide range of theoretical concerns found in the social sciences more generally." It was the term area studies itself that "deserves to be expunged." See Eleanor Sheldon,

Meanwhile, Francis Sutton, an early supporter of area-based research, warned in the early 1980s that "specialists on most world areas, with the notable exception of the Soviet Union and its neighbors, become sympathizers, advocates, or even apologists for their areas."[230] Another longstanding advocate of area studies, the sociologist Richard Lambert, urged that US scholars avoid "interfering in the internal politics of the host country, and refraining from playing out American political dramas within the host country."[231] Their anxieties implied a fault line between postwar area studies and the political culture of area studies in the wake of the 60s. Even as an evolving area studies movement derived inspiration from notions of scholarly relevance and international solidarity, its origins in strategic geopolitics continued to be reflected in its own constitutive boundaries.

The fact that the "celebrated whole-culture approach"[232] favored disciplines and subdisciplines that comfortably spoke to or for the humanities did not endear it to all parties. Over time, the area committees became lightning rods for concerns about the postbehavioral, postpositivist drift of some branches of the social sciences, and the status and prospects for quantitative research at the SSRC.

Any sense of stability that the area committees might have enjoyed was further vitiated by periodic financial emergencies, most notably in the early 1970s, late 1970s and late 1980s. Incoming presidents often found themselves scrambling to defend or restore field-based

---

untitled and undated memorandum written in the mid-1970s. See RAC, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 39, Box 182, Folder 2073, p. 1.

[230] Francis X. Sutton, "Rationality, Development, and Scholarship," *Items*, Vol. 36, no. 4 (December 1982), p. 53.

[231] Richard D. Lambert, *Language and Area Studies Review* (Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1973), p. 398. See also Richard D. Lambert, *Points of Leverage: An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1986).

[232] Kenneth Prewitt, "Annual Report of the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1981-82*, p. xvi.

fellowships and programs. The effort to sustain a multimillion dollar, multi-committee program with multiple stakeholders and a relatively narrow base of funders over a period of decades was not to be taken lightly. Financial emergencies and shortfalls not only complicated the job of building stable fellowship programs but also served as a reminder of area studies' underlying vulnerability in a discipline-based system of graduate training.

These intellectual, disciplinary and budgetary tensions help explain the sometimes defensive tone adopted by those who argued on behalf of area programs. On the one hand, the Council could take credit for providing leadership in area studies. As political scientist Robert Ward and staff member Bryce Wood observed in 1974, "insofar as there has been overall planning, coordination, or evaluation on a national scale it has been supplied in larger part by the committees and staff of the Social Science Research Council." On the other hand, writers identified with the Council sought to reassure critics of the potential scientific contribution of the area studies enterprise, and to point the way to more satisfactory forms of area-based research.

As far back as 1947, Robert Hall noted that "the most persistent opposition" to area studies "is built around the very sound question 'Where is the hard core?'…Every proposed venture into area studies must be analyzed in this light."[233] Ward and Wood themselves stressed that the "orderly descriptions, analyses, and interpretations of economic, political and social systems other than our own…are valid and valuable contributions, but they are not in the long run sufficient." If area studies was to remain useful, efforts "must be made to transcend the limits of particular cultures and to formulate and synthesize these expanded and enriched data in cross-cultural and comparative terms." Only by recasting area studies as a net plus for "the professional interests

[233] Robert Hall, *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947), pp. 29-30.

and activities of the more American-oriented members of the social science community" could area committees hope to contribute to the mainstream of the disciplines.[234]

A similar concern with the divide between disciplines and area studies surfaced in the report of the committee that brokered the 1973 SSRC-Foreign Area Fellowship Program merger. The committee, chaired by John M. Thompson, a historian at Indiana University, was decidedly more enthusiastic about the direction in which area studies was headed than where it had been. Area research, the committee reported, "is developing in new ways. It is becoming far more concerned than in the past with…comparative study (across countries and regions), problem-oriented and applied research, and the study of modernization and development." Appropriate leadership "would help the field move in new directions and establish the most beneficial relationships with the disciplines." The key to revitalizing area studies lay in maintaining "scholarly integrity" and in advancing "the research interests of their fields as a whole."[235]

Ten years later, Kenneth Prewitt observed that "few difficulties have nagged at area studies so persistently as their uneasy relationship to the traditional disciplines in the humanities and social sciences." He suggested bringing together "area scholars with those whose disciplines are international economics, international politics, and international security. Some of this is happening; but it is a forced marriage and not likely to achieve the larger goal of constructing a scholarship which is as vertically and horizontally interdependent as is the world it seeks to understand."[236]

---

[234] Robert E. Ward and Bryce Wood, "Foreign Area Studies and the Social Science Research Council," *Items*, Vol. 28, no. 4 (December 1974), pp. 57-58.
[235] John M. Thompson, "Foreign Area Fellowship Program to Merge with Other Area Programs of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council," *Items*, Vol. 26, no. 4 (December 1972), pp. 42-43.

David Featherman, in his capacity as president in the early 1990s, sought to reconcile area with discipline by assigning area programs a "dual mandate"–"responsibility for area-specific field development and joint collaboration with other Council groups in interregional, comparative and transnational scholarship."[237] The concept of the dual mandate represented an effort to extend and redefine intellectual boundaries based on world areas and regions. It was also interpreted in some quarters as an attempt to reconcile the area approach with (or subsume the area approach into) the "mainstream" of such disciplines as sociology, political science, psychology and economics.

A searching analysis of area-based research was offered by a project on "International Interactions-Area Studies." Undertaken in the late 1980s, this project led to the publication of "Transnational and Comparative Research" by Frederic Wakeman, who served as president in the same period.[238] Wakeman's widely disseminated article represented a breakthrough in thinking about the "dramatic globalization of networks of all kinds that has taken place during the last decade" and their implications for the "ways in which 'national' and 'international' studies are currently conceptualized."

---

[236] Kenneth Prewitt, "Annual Report of the President," *Social Science Research Council Annual Report*, 1981-82, pp. vx and vxiii. The reference to a "horizontally and vertically interdependent" form of research planning foreshadowed the international program reorganization of the mid-1990s (see below).

[237] David L. Featherman, "Presidential Items," *Items*, Vol. 44, nos. 2-3 (June/September 1990), p. 33. Dr. Featherman (1943-) received his PhD from the University of Michigan in the field of social psychology, and taught at the University of Wisconsin at Madison from 1970 until assuming the presidency of the Council in 1989. He currently directs the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. His books include *Socioeconomic Background and Achievement* (1971), *The Process of Stratification* (1977, with R.M. Hauser), *Opportunity and Change* (1978, with R.M. Hauser) and *Life-Span Development and Behavior* (1991, coedited with R.M. Lerner and M. Perlmutter).

[238] Frederic E. Wakeman, Jr. (1938-) received his PhD in Far Eastern history and Oriental languages from the University of California, Berkeley in 1965. Before becoming president of the Council, Wakeman served as chair of two committees, the Committee on Studies of Chinese Civilization and the Joint Committee on Chinese Studies. He is one of the nation's foremost historians of modern China, and his books include *The Fall of Imperial China* (1976), *The Great Enterprise: The Manchu Reconstruction of Imperial Order in Seventeenth-Century China* (two volumes, 1985); *Policing Shanghai, 1927-1937* (1995); and *The Shanghai Badlands: Wartime Terrorism and Urban Crime, 1937-1941* (1996). He is currently Walter and Elise Haas Professor of Asian Studies and Director of the Institute of East Asian Studies at the University of California at Berkeley. Wakeman, the first historian to serve as president of the SSRC, is arguably the only president to have been schooled in an area studies context.

Wakeman noted that "our research strategies in international and area studies are ordered in such a way as to permit important problem-oriented issues to slip through our analytical nets. Such issues as the global emergence of an underclass, the spread of English and the access to power associated with speaking English, and differences among nations in how they use the same technologies, do not accord with ordinary discipline- or area-oriented committee agendas." He also identified other glaring issues that evaded standard categories of analysis–the transnational implications of labor flows, global religious fundamentalism, sectoral analysis of capital development, cultural Americanization, media studies and the relationship of "national character studies" to the study of political culture. "Paradigms are fuzzy," observed Wakeman, "and although the most positivistically inclined among us might express a certain tough-minded impatience with such irresolve, many of our most thoughtful social scientists express considerable unease about the categories with which they work."[239]

The smoldering debate over area studies cast a shadow over the activities of the area committees, which were required to defend their competence and scholarly contribution to a sometimes unforgiving audience. Long before the international program reorganization of the mid-1990s the area committees hoped to show they could avoid the pitfalls of insularity and intellectual self-preoccupation. All but a couple of committees were in tune with the comparative and transnational agenda highlighted by Wakeman. Indeed, some of the most audacious and far-reaching work undertaken within an area framework was sponsored by one or more of the joint committees, which suggests that in practical terms the strongest case for area-based programs was made at the committee rather than governance level.

[239] Frederic E. Wakeman, Jr., "Transnational and Comparative Research," *Items*, Vol. 42, no. 4 (December 1988), pp. 85-89.

The most conspicuous accomplishments of the area programs were the books and research monographs that flowed from conferences and workshops. In total, nearly three-quarters of all Council sponsored publications in the post-1973 period were connected to the area committees. Landmark titles–from *Organizing Interests in Western Europe* (1981) and *Order and Conflict in Contemporary Capitalism* (1984) to *Karma: An Anthropological Inquiry* (1983) and *Market Cultures* (1998)–attested to a close connection between the area programs and such important research fields as political culture, democratic theory, political economy and non-Western systems of thought.

An overview of some of the major initiatives undertaken by the area committees, from their postwar origins to the reorganization, underscores the productivity and range of the area-based international program.

The Joint Committee on African Studies (1960-96) was established at a time when many African nations were gaining independence from colonial rule. In its early years the committee focused on research planning, generating programs on health and disease, the crisis in African agriculture, state-society relations, the "class bases" of nationalism, race and class in South Africa, material culture, African philosophy, the African diaspora and numerous other projects. By the 1980s the committee was also placing heavy emphasis on fellowships and training, and by 1991 it sponsored no fewer than seven fellowship programs: doctoral, predissertation, fellowships for dissertation research (to expose graduate students studying health or agriculture to work in the natural or engineering sciences), postdoctoral, humanities fellowships, agricultural fellowships and the African Archives and Museums Project (AAMP), launched in 1991.[240] In the early to

[240] This project issued 55 grants to African institutions to support efforts to conserve, catalogue and exhibit the continent's cultural and historical resources, and to develop linkages with other museums. A 1995 conference held in Harare, Zimbabwe, brought together many of the project directors of the recipient institutions.

mid-1990s the committee also sponsored projects on fertility and African families, popular arts and culture, political transitions, biodiversity, development and the social sciences, African literature and economic risk and investment in Africa. In addition, a series of commissioned papers with an interdisciplinary focus, entitled "New Directions," was launched. The committee collaborated whenever possible with African cultural institutions and in particular with the Council for the Development of Economic and Social Research in Africa (CODESRIA) and the African Academy of Sciences. Over a period of 36 years the committee provided hundreds of fellowships and helped develop the careers of many of prominent African studies scholars.[241]

The Joint Committee on Chinese Studies (1981-1996) promoted research and represented the interests of China research specialists within institutions concerned with public education, library resources and language training. This committee was a successor to two committees, the Joint Committee on Contemporary China (1959-81) and the Committee on Studies of Chinese Civilization (1964-81). The division between the two reflected the longstanding bifurcation of Chinese studies into historical research and contemporary analysis. While the divide "served the field well when it was young…it is discouraging humanistic studies of both the Republican and PRC periods and has retarded the development of social science history (and historical social science) within the field of Chinese studies," observed the chairs of the two committees.[242] The field as a whole was transformed in the wake of improved US-China relations, which allowed normal access for scholars from the United States. Scholarly exchanges came about in substantial measure as a result of efforts undertaken by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with

[241] Committee titles include William A. Shack and Elliot P. Skinner, eds., *Strangers in African Societies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979); Jane I. Guyer and Pauline E. Peters, eds., *Conceptualizing the Household: Issues of Theory, Method and Application* (Charlottesville: Teleprint Publishing, 1986); Michael J. Watts, ed., *State, Oil, and Agriculture in Nigeria* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1987); Mary Jo Arnoldi, Christraud M. Geary and Kris L. Hardin, eds., *African Material Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996); Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard, eds., *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

China (1966-), which is administered by ACLS and continues to oversee research projects. The committee also sponsored a book series with the University of California Press, which resulted in 21 volumes over a period of 14 years.[243]

The Joint Committee on Eastern Europe (1971-96) sponsored two major fellowship competitions, for doctoral and postdoctoral research, and also emphasized language training. Although the committee was disbanded in the mid-1990s, a number of its projects continue to be developed under the auspices of the ACLS Committee on East European Studies, which is part of the reformulated international program. With funding largely provided by the US State Department, through its Soviet-Eastern European Research and Training Act of 1983 (Title VIII), the committee organized a series of programs designed to promote scholarship on the area and encourage wider non-specialist interest. The committee was also concerned with developing scholarly infrastructure in the region and in promoting collaborative ties with East Europeans. The committee organized its first meeting in the region in 1986, and the collapse of Communist systems at the end of the decade created new opportunities for scholarly exchange. From 1985-96 the committee provided 238 full-year fellowships and nearly 1000 summer research grants. The committee also sponsored a major journal, *East European Politics and Societies* (1987-), published by the University of California Press.[244]

---

[242] Letter to Kenneth Prewitt and [ACLS president] Robert Lumiansky, from Donald Munro and Bob Dernberger, August 24, 1981. RAC, Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 2, Box 322, Folder 1825.
[243] Committee titles include Margery Wolf and Roxanne Witke, eds., *Women in Chinese Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975); Hok-Lam Chan and Wm. Theodore de Bary, eds., *Yuan Thought: Chinese Thought and Religion under the Mongols* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); David N. Keightley, ed., *The Origins of Chinese Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982); James L. Watson, ed., *Class and Social Stratification in Post-Revolution China* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Edwin A. Winkler and Susan Greenhalgh, eds., *Contending Approaches to the Political Economy of Taiwan* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1989); Thomas G. Rawski and Lillian M. Li, eds., *Chinese History in Economic Perspective* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Andrew G. Walder, ed., *The Waning of the Communist State: Economic Origins of Political Decline in China and Hungary* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).
[244] Committee titles include Charles Gati, ed., *The International Politics of Eastern Europe* (New York: Praeger, 1976); Egon Neuberger and Laura D'Andrea Tyson, eds., *The Impact of International Economic Disturbances on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: Transmission and Response* (New York: Pergamon

The Joint Committee on Japanese Studies (1967-96) promoted scholarship and training on Japan through doctoral and postdoctoral fellowship competitions, dissertation workshops, research planning activities and several projects that were designed to build scholarly infrastructure. In addition, the committee also produced reports on the state of Japanese studies, and facilitated research collaborations among Japanese and US scholars. Many of its research planning activities were undertaken in partnership with the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. In the 1960s and 1970s, much of the committee's work was devoted to developing a baseline understanding of Japanese society and politics. Over time, more of the committee's projects placed Japan in an explicitly comparative context, which reflected the fact that the country was no longer considered exotic and was of growing interest to the policy, academic and business worlds as well as the general US public.

As interest in Japan grew, the committee became concerned that many doctoral candidates were choosing to remain in Japan rather than returning to the United States to complete their projects. To counter this evacuation of talent, the committee provided write-up fellowships to entice students back to their home campuses, which resulted in a shorter time period for completion of the PhD and the timely dissemination of research findings. Japan-US Friendship Commission funding provided support for researchers interested in contemporary, policy-relevant topics in the social sciences. Over the course of three decades, the committee sponsored over 50 volumes and nearly 120 conferences, workshops and collaborative research projects. In the same period it

---

Press, 1980); Jane Leftwich Curry, ed., *Dissent in Eastern Europe* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983); J.F. Brown, *Eastern Europe and Communist Rule* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1988); Joseph Rothschild, *Return to Diversity: A Political History of East Central Europe since World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Daniel Chirot, ed., *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe: Economics and Politics from the Middle Ages until the Early Twentieth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Michael Burawoy and Katherine Verdery, eds., *Uncertain Transition: Ethnographies of Change in the Post-socialist World* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999).

awarded 303 postdocs and 131 dissertation grants.[245] In the 1970s, the committee focused its research on pre-Tokugawa Japan, as well as religion and development. By the 1980s, greater attention was paid to the themes of religion and politics, Japanese power in East Asia and the evolving US-Japan relationship. In the 1990s, the focus shifted to the Japanese experience in comparative perspective, with projects on domestic political transitions, gender and work, regionalism and subregionalism, deindustrialization, the urban environment and the cross-national flow of ideas.[246]

For nearly three decades, the Joint Committee on Korean Studies (1967-96) served as one of the main support systems for Korean studies in the United States, sponsoring some 59 meetings, including conferences, workshops, seminars and research planning projects. In the same period the committee sponsored 32 books and articles, as well as *The Journal of Korean Studies* (1979-). Between 1991-96 the program awarded 65 dissertation fellowships and 128 postdoctoral grants. Initially the committee focused on developing tools for research and teaching on Korea, in part by sponsoring the publication of bibliographic works and assessments of the state of Korean studies. The committee also sponsored workshops on topics such as religion, colonialism, the relationship among the early peoples of Japan and Korea, modern Korean poetry and population and development. In the 1990s the committee organized research projects on "Korea's Place Within the East Asian Buddhist Tradition," "Tradition and Modernity in East Asia" and a comprehensive survey of regional social statistics. The committee also encouraged links between scholars in the Korean peninsula and in the United States, which led to a symposium on "Scholarly

[245] These figures are taken from Rudolph Janssens and Andrew Gordon, "A Short History of the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies" (1997), available on the internet at www.ssrc.org/jcjs.htm.
[246] Committee titles include Iriye Akira, ed., *Mutual Images: Essays in American-Japanese Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); Albert M. Craig, ed., *Japan: A Comparative View* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie, eds., *The Japanese Colonial Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); Edward Norbeck and Margaret Lock, eds., *Health and Illness in Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987); T.J. Pempel, ed., *Uncommon Democracies: The One-Party Dominant Regimes* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990); Andrew Gordon, ed., *Postwar Japan as History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

Communication with North Korea," held in 1994 at the Woodrow Wilson Center at the Smithsonian Institution.[247]

For more than four decades (1942-47 and 1959-96) the Joint Committee on Latin America "served as the point of intersection between the US social science community and the social scientists" of the region.[248] Committee grants enabled nearly 600 doctoral candidates to conduct field research in Latin America and the Caribbean, and training workshops held during the 1960s, the early 1970s and again in the early 1990s allowed more than 100 junior scholars, mostly from Latin America, to work with senior scholars to advance their research skills and engage with intellectual networks that cut across national and disciplinary boundaries. Between the early 1960s and the mid-1990s the committee provided research funds for some 832 scholars from Latin America, the United States and Western Europe, and more than 2,000 researchers participated in a total of nearly 100 committee conferences and seminars (resulting in the publication of approximately 50 volumes).[249] Over 200 scholars served at one time or another as committee members, and a greater number donated their time and expertise to subcommittees, selection groups and working panels.

The focus of committee activities shifted over time, reflecting its evolving sense of critical gaps in training, empirical and theoretical understanding and scholarly infrastructure. At its inception, the committee constituted one of a handful of organizations devoted to the support of research in Latin America, and in part through the committee's efforts, the infrastructure for area research

[247] Committee titles include Dae-Sook Suh and Chae-Jin Lee, eds., *Political Leadership in Korea* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976); Peter H. Lee, ed., *The Silence of Love: Twentieth-Century Korean Poetry* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1980); Laurel Kendall and Griffin Dix, eds., *Religion and Ritual in Korean Society* (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1987); Hagen Koo, ed., *State and Society in Contemporary Korea* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).
[248] John Coatsworth, "International Collaboration in the Social Sciences: The ACLS/SSRC Joint Committee on Latin American Studies," unpublished paper (1989), p. 11.
[249] A fair percentage of committee-sponsored titles were published in Spanish, and a few were translated into Portuguese; roughly one-fifth appeared in Spanish language editions only.

expanded considerably in the postwar era.[250] From the early 1960s onward, the committee's roster included scholars from Latin America as well as Europe, which enhanced its capacity to foster innovative, cross-disciplinary research.[251] In the mid-1990s the committee organized meetings on political economy, democratization, social movements, ecological conflicts and conflicts over collective memories of political repression. Several initiatives were incorporated into the reorganized international program.[252]

The Joint Committee on the Near and Middle East (1959-96) focused on consolidating the standing of the Middle East in the social sciences and the humanities as an area for the development and testing of theory, and to move Middle East studies beyond its emphasis on the raw accumulation of knowledge about the region. During the 1980s-90s committee projects converged around the contingent nature of the Middle East as a region, and the extent to which the Middle East was embedded within cultural, economic and political flows that transcend regional boundaries. These projects challenged the notion of the Middle East as a "container"–a

[250] "[B]etween 1961 and 1964, the JCLAS co-sponsored and helped to finance three meetings of Latin American and US sociologists in Latin American capitals, leading to the formation of the Latin American Council of the Social Sciences (CLASCO). In addition, the Committee sponsored several meetings devoted to assessing the state of Latin American studies in the US and spearheaded the establishment of the Latin American Studies Association in 1964 and the field's most respected journal, the *Latin American Research Review*, in 1965." Paul Drake and Lisa Hilbink, "The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies: A Model of International Research Collaboration," unpublished paper (1999), p. 5.

[251] A Colombian sociologist, Orlando Fals Borda, "was the first Latin American to serve on the Committee, beginning in 1964…The JCLAS was the first area studies committee to incorporate scholars from its region and the only one where they came to constitute half of the Committee's members as a matter of policy." Drake and Hilbink, "The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies: A Model of International Research Collaboration," p. 6.

[252] Committee titles include Juan J. Linz and Alfred C. Stepan, eds., *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978); David Collier, ed., *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Peter Evans, *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Rosemary Thorp, ed., *Latin America in the 1930s: The Role of the Periphery in the World Crisis* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1984); Richard R. Fagen, Carmen Diana Deere and Jose Luis Coraggio, eds., *Transition and Development: Problems of Third World Socialism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1986); Friedrich Katz, ed., *Riot, Rebellion and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989); Abraham F. Lowenthal, ed., *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Barbara Stallings, ed., *Global Change, Regional Response: The New International Context of Development* (New York: Cambridge

metaphor long used by geographers to describe bounded spaces–rather than something more porous and fluid. Projects undertaken in the 1990s included war and the state, the family, economic regionalism, nationalism after colonialism, moving borders, port cities in the Mediterranean and Indian oceans and gender and visual representation. In the mid-1990s the committee's field development efforts benefited from US Information Agency funding through the Near and Middle East Research and Training Act (NMERTA). Following the reorganization of the international program, a Middle East program continued to provide grants and fellowships in Middle Eastern studies.[253]

The Joint Committee on South Asia (1976-96), established in 1976, initially concentrated on what it referred to as South Asian conceptual systems, i.e., "the tools or frames of thought, or the structures of ideas which define, order, and create meaning in individual and social perceptions in South Asia."[254] This approach emphasized using concepts drawn from and articulated within South Asian contexts as possible sources or tools for innovative social and cultural analyses. Under this framework, several multiyear projects were launched, focusing in the first instance on indigenous concepts of authority and personhood, which led to conferences and edited volumes on folklore and oral epics, conceptions of authority and moral order, karma and rebirth and Hindu ethno-sociology. The committee's agenda subsequently expanded through a political economy initiative, which led to projects on agrarian productivity, risk and uncertainty in agriculture, industrial growth and the political economy of water. Another project explored the commons in South Asia, which sought to expand scholarship on the natural environment to include the

---

University Press, 1995); Elizabeth Jelin and Eric Hershberg, eds., *Constructing Democracy: Human Rights, Citizenship, and Society in Latin America* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996).

[253] Committee titles include Ann Elizabeth Mayer, ed., *Property, Social Structure, and Law in the Modern Middle East* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985); Ali Banuazizi and Myron Weiner, eds., *The State, Religion, and Ethnic Politics: Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986); Eric Davis and Nicolas Gavrielides, eds., *Statecraft in the Middle East: Oil, Historical Memory, and Popular Culture* (Miami: Florida University Press, 1993).

[254] David L. Szanton, "South and Southeast Asia: New Concerns of the Council," *Items*, Vol. 30, no. 2 (June 1976), p. 17.

historical and social aspects of peoples' relationship to and utilization of forests, seas, land and other common domains.

A project that attracted wide attention addressed the topic of public culture, which focused on such phenomena as commercial cinema, tourism, sports and museums, to determine the ways in which these cultural forms go beyond local boundaries and shaped identities, in relation to both the material constraints of the nation-state and an accelerating flow of meanings, images and technologies. This project helped introduce the concept of the production and consumption of transnational cultural forms and representations and became the basis for the journal *Public Culture* (1991-). Other committee projects focused on environmental discourses and human welfare, nationalizing the past, plantation economies and enforced labor, political violence and religious transformations and new media. Finally, in the early 1990s the program established a Bangladesh studies initiative to help develop the field.[255]

A committee project on Islamic categories of person and authority paved the way for the Committee on the Comparative Study of Muslim Societies (1985-93). This program was established to explore the "appropriate roles of nationalism, the state, and civic and religious authorities" in societies shaped by Islamic religious traditions.[256] The Muslim Societies committee represented an innovative effort to develop area studies research along thematic rather than regional lines. The committee generated a series of workshops and research volumes that

[255] Committee titles include Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, ed., *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980); Charles F. Keyes and E. Valentine Daniel, eds., *Karma: An Anthropological Inquiry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); Pranab Bardhan, *The Political Economy of Development in India* (New York: Blackwell, 1984); Marriott McKim, ed., *India Through Hindu Categories* (New Dehli: Sage Publications, 1990); Barbara Stoler Miller, ed., *The Powers of Art: Patronage in Indian Culture* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1992); Patricia Jeffery and Amrita Basu, eds., *Appropriating Gender: Women's Activism and Politicized Religion in South Asia* (New York: Routledge, 1998).

[256] David L. Szanton, "Sacred and Secular in Muslim Societies: Some Key Issues Before the Joint Committee on the Comparative Study of Muslim Societies," *Items*, Vol. 43, no. 1 (March 1989), p. 2.

examined such critical issues as intellectuals and Islam, Islamic legal theory, and the emergence of social movements in the advanced industrial countries inspired by Muslim principles.[257]

The Joint Committee on Southeast Asia (1976-96) was established to counter the relative weakness of US scholarship on Southeast Asia. As staff member David Szanton commented, "Western fascination with Asian philosophies, religions, languages, arts and history, had rarely included Southeast Asia…Southeast Asian studies in the United States is thus a rather recent phenomenon, and without a long-established internal dynamic of its own, it has been perhaps understandably susceptible to external or contextual influences."[258] The committee placed particular emphasis on the development of research on indigenous systems of thought, which led to conferences on aesthetics, expressive and artistic practices, concepts of power and authority, religion and society, law and the state, oral and literate traditions and regional development in different historical periods. An early 1980s initiative on post-peasant societies led to a series of workshops and conferences on everyday forms of resistance, education and social change, rural differentiation and processes of state formation. In 1983 the committee launched an Indochina studies program, which offered grants for research and which paid special attention to the research value of the knowledge and memory of refugees and migrants to the US. Partly as a result of the heterogeneous nature of the region, the committee often emphasized comparisons with other world regions, through collaborations with committees on Africa, Eastern Europe,

[257] See William R. Roff, ed., *Islam and the Political Economy of Meaning: Comparative Studies of Muslim Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); Dale F. Eickelman and James Piscatori, eds., *Muslim Travellers: Pilgrimage, Migration, and the Religious Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Gilles Kepel and Yann Richard, eds., *Intellectuels et Militants de I'Islam Contemporain* (Paris: Seuil, 1990); Muhammad Khalid Masud, Brinkley Messick and David S. Powers, eds., *Islamic Legal Interpretation: Muftis and their Fatwas* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996); Barbara Daly Metcalf, ed., *Making Muslim Space in North America and Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); Muhammad Khalid Masud, ed., *Travellers in Faith: Studies of Tablighi Jama'at as a Movement in International Islam* (in press).

[258] David L. Szanton, "Southeast Asian Studies in the United States: Toward an Intellectual History," unpublished paper, 1984, pp. 6-7.

Japan and Korea.[259] The committee helped produce *Southeast Asian Studies in the Balance* (1990), one of several efforts to assess the state of the field of given world areas.[260]

The Joint Committee on Soviet Studies (1983-96) was the successor to the Joint Committee on Slavic and East European Studies (1971-77) and the Slavic and East European Studies Committee (1948-71). From the period 1968-91 the two Councils administered the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), which continues to organize exchange programs and other activities as an independent agency. The central concerns of the committee included the retirement of specialists trained during or just after World War II, the decline in the numbers of new recruits to the field and uncertain career prospects for area specialists.[261]

To respond to these needs, the committee focused on field development through a range of fellowship programs, including graduate training, dissertation write-up, postdoctoral awards, and fellowships for disciplines underrepresented in the field of Soviet studies. From 1984 to 1996, the committee issued over 90 awards for graduate training, 120 awards for dissertation write-up and more than 70 for postdoctoral research, as well as numerous language training grants. Supported in large measure by the US Department of State, through the Title VIII program, the

[259] Committee titles include David K. Wyatt and Alexander Woodside, eds., *Moral Order and the Question of Change: Essays on Southeast Asian Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, 1983); David P. Chandler and Ben Kiernan, eds., *Revolution and its Aftermath in Kampuchea: Eight Essays* (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies, 1984); David Marr and Anthony Milner, eds., *Southeast Asia in the 9th-14th Centuries* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1987); David Marr and Christine P. White, eds., *Postwar Vietnam: Dilemmas in Socialist Development* (Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program, 1988); Gillian Hart, Andrew Turton and Benjamin White, eds., *Agrarian Transformations: Local Processes and the State in Southeast Asia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Charles F. Keyes, ed., *Reshaping Local Worlds: Formal Education and Cultural Change in Rural Southeast Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies, 1991); Robert W. Hefner, ed., *Market Cultures: Society and Morality in the New Asian Capitalisms* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998).

[260] See Charles Hirschman, ed., *Southeast Asian Studies in the Balance: Reflections from America* (Ann Arbor: Association of Asian Studies, 1990); see also Robert H. Bates, V.Y. Mudimbe and Jean O'Barr, eds., *Africa and the Disciplines: The Contribution of Research in Africa to the Social Sciences and Humanities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), and Peter A. Hall, *The State of European Studies* (New York: Social Science Research Council and the Council for European Studies, 1996).

committee also established subcommittees in economics, foreign policy, history, literature and popular culture, political science and sociology. To address problems of library and archival resources, a subcommittee on Bibliography, Information Retrieval, and Documentation was formed, which sponsored an annual publication, the *American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies*, currently housed at the University of Illinois. In 1991, the committee changed its name to the Joint Committee on the Soviet Union and Its Successor States, and promoted international network building through exchange programs and workshops. Major research projects focused on imperial Russian history, foreign policy institutions, the economics of the transition and population, family and gender in Central Asia and the Middle East. Several of the committee's research and training programs continued through a new Title VIII Program Committee.[262]

Founded in 1975, the Joint Committee on Western Europe was establish to stimulate systematic reflection and research on the origin and evolution of contemporary European societies. The founding rationale for the committee was laid out in a report entitled "New Perspectives for the Study of Europe."[263] By the early 1990s, many observers were asking whether the collapse of the Soviet bloc and the movement toward an integrated European Community required an even more thoroughgoing reexamination of past approaches. Sidney Tarrow's report, *Rebirth or*

---

[261] This list is drawn from Leon Lipson, "On a Proposal to Form a Joint Committee on Soviet Studies," unpublished memorandum, April 1982. RAC, Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 322, Folder 1826.
[262] Committee titles include *A Guide to University-based Graduate Training Programs in Soviet International Behavior* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1985); *International Directory of Librarians and Library Specialists in the Slavic and East European Field* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1990); Harley D. Balzar, ed., *Five Years that Shook the World: Gorbachev's Unfinished Revolution* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991); Susan Gross Solomon, ed., *Beyond Sovietology: Essays in Politics and History* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1993); Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel, eds., *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998).
[263] The report found that the "old maps of state, society, and economy no longer work, and Western industrial societies feel themselves embarked without guideposts or compasses on journeys whose way stations and destinations are no longer familiar. The program is a double one. The terrain has changed, and the maps, which had only a very rough and perhaps spurious fit with the old state of affairs, have not been redrawn to take account of the new landscape of the industrial world." Suzanne D. Berger, Gerald D.

Stagnation? (1993) highlighted four areas for interdisciplinary collaborations: European integration, ethnic and regional fragmentation, democracy and civil society and the dynamics of privatization and economic reform.[264] The committee also sponsored a Subcommittee on Southern Europe (1989-97) which held a series of international conferences on the bases of democratic change in Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain. In addition, the committee developed research projects on consumer cultures, the intellectual origins of European identity, the politics of flexible production, democracy and civil society in 19th-century Europe and a broad project on the contours of the New Europe. In a period of two decades the committee provided over 200 dissertation research grants.[265]

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM REORGANIZATION

Given the identification of the Council with the area programs, the decision in the mid-1990s to close down the area committees in favor of a reorganized international program with stronger thematic, cross-regional and cross-cultural elements came for some as a bolt from the blue. The reorganization added fuel to a lively controversy over the future of area studies that was already well underway.[266]

Feldman, Gudmund Hernes, Joseph LaPalombara, Philippe C. Schmitter and Allan Silver, "New Perspectives for the Study of Europe," *Items*, Vol. 29, no. 3 (September 1975), p. 34.

[264] Sidney Tarrow, *Rebirth or Stagnation? European Studies after 1989* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1993), p. 26.

[265] Committee titles include Suzanne D. Berger, ed., *Organizing Interests in Western Europe: Pluralism, Corporatism, and the Transformation of Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981); John H. Goldthorpe, ed., *Order and Conflict in Contemporary Capitalism: Studies in Western European Nations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984); Charles S. Maier, ed., *Changing Boundaries of the Political: Essays on the Evolving Balance Between the State and Society, Public and Private in Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Peter A. Hall, ed., *The Political Power of Economic Ideas: Keynesianism across Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989); J. Rogers Hollingsworth, Philippe C. Schmitter and Wolfgang Streeck, eds., *Governing Capitalist Economies: Performance and Control of Economic Sectors* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Richard Gunther, Nikiforos Diamandouros and Hans-Jurgen Puhle, eds., *The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).

[266] In addition to articles cited elsewhere, contributions to the debate include Itty Abraham, "Ambivalence about Globalization: Divergent Moments in the Academy" (paper delivered at the 1998 Association of

Despite its apparent suddenness, the program's overhaul was prefigured by developments within the Council and beyond. One of the signposts of this discussion was the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc, which not only reopened the issue of political and geographic boundaries but also served as a reminder that area studies had been essentially constructed along cold war lines. Taking the collapse of Soviet communism as its starting point, Stanley Heginbotham's 1994 article on "Rethinking International Scholarship" called for a "shift in focus" from country and area studies to "international scholarship that is context-sensitive…while the need for local knowledge, the province of area studies specialists, is likely to increase…the character of area studies programs will need to be significantly modified."[267] A piece that Heginbotham published two years earlier, on the National Security Education Program, similarly highlighted the need for revisiting area training and research at a time when US political and military leaders faced a dramatically altered geopolitical landscape.[268]

Asian Studies annual meeting); Gabriel Almond, "The Future of Comparative and Area Studies in the United States" (paper delivered at the 1997 International Political Science Association annual meeting); Peter A. Hall and Sidney Tarrow, "Globalization and Area Studies: When is Too Wide Too Narrow?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 23, 1998; Michael Holquist, "A New Tour of Babel: Recent Trends Linking Comparative Literature Departments, Foreign Language Departments, and Area Studies Programs," *Profession* (1996); Chalmers Johnson and E.B. Keehn, "A Disaster in the Making: Rational Choice and Asian Studies," *The National Interest*, Summer 1994; Ivan Karp, "Does Theory Travel? Area Studies and Cultural Studies," *Africa Today*, Vol. 44, no. 3 (1997); David Ludden, "Area Studies in the Age of Globalization," www.sas.upenn.edu/~dludden/areast2.html; and Vincente L. Rafael, "The Cultures of Area Studies in the United States," *Social Text*, no. 41 (1994). In a scathing critique of area studies and the Council the intellectual historian Harry Harootunian argued that "organizations like the SSRC" have "made sure that the national committee structure directing their respective activities (distributing funds and controlling research) serve as the sole custodians of and vigilant guard dogs against particularly the kinds of theoretical and methodological innovations they purport to promote. Instead of encouraging greater integration of differing knowledges and intellectual agendas, they have only partitioned and dispersed them, supported by the national committee structure with its received views of region." See Harry Harootunian, *History's Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice, and the Question of Everyday Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 35.

[267] Stanley J. Heginbotham, "Rethinking International Scholarship: The Challenge of Transition from the Cold War Era," *Items*, Vol. 48, nos. 2/3 (June-September 1994), p. 37.

[268] Stanley J. Heginbotham, "The National Security Education Program: A Review and Analysis," *Items*, Vol. 46, nos. 2/3 (June-September 1992). Heginbotham, and by extension the Council, was criticized for offering "procedural" objections to a program that would house resources in the Defense Intelligence College under the control of a "shadow board" with "indirect links to US national security agencies." See Cumings, "Boundary Displacement," pp. 20-21; and Stanley J. Heginbotham, "Round Up the Usual Suspects: Cumings's Misdirected Search for Post-Cold War Enemies of Academic Independence," in Mark

Responding to the continued controversy over the status of area scholarship, president Featherman convened a seven-person task force in 1994 to review the work of the international program. Although the task force failed to arrive at a consensus on the merits of the area committee model, its members agreed on the need to strengthen problem-driven research agendas and the contribution that the Council could make in "bringing together a variety of scholars on behalf of research development who otherwise would be unlikely to work together."[269] One concern was whether area committees would "fail to attract and engage a range of younger scholars who are sensitive to the importance of language, culture, and history as tools for effective scholarship but do not identify themselves primarily as scholars of particular countries or regions."[270]

In the same period, a pivotal staff memo affirmed that "some committees have not consistently been attentive to how the results of their research development efforts will feed back into the core social science disciplines," noting that despite the introduction of the dual mandate few committees "generate adequate cross-regional or thematic research development initiatives on a regular and sustained basis."[271] The authors called for reducing the number of committees and creating a centralized fellowship program that would disconnect research planning from fellowship provision, but neither staff nor task force members went as far as to call for closing down the area committees.

Seldon, ed. "Asia, Asian Studies, and the National Security State: A Symposium," *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, Vol. 29, no. 1 (January-March 1997), pp. 50-51.

[269] Stanley J. Heginbotham, "Status Report on the Task Force on the Future of the Council's International Program: A Preliminary Staff Overview of Major Themes and Suggestions," May 18, 1994, p. 3.

[270] Stanley J. Heginbotham, "Background Information for Discussion on the Future of the International Programs," December 2, 1994. The members of the task force were Arjun Appadurai (anthropology, University of Chicago), Craig Calhoun (sociology, University of North Carolina), John Coatsworth (history, Harvard University), Rhonda Cobham-Sander (literature, Amherst College), Crauford Goodwin (economics, Duke University), Margaret Levi (political science, University of Washington), and David Soskice (economics, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin).

The conversation about the state of area studies in relation to disciplines and transnational research agendas was further stimulated by a September 1994 meeting of the chairs of the 11 area committees that was convened by David Featherman. In his opening comments, Featherman argued that the existing configuration of committees no longer reflected "geopolitical and research community realities."[272] A lively but testy discussion ensued. The "chairs meeting," as it was known, became the centerpiece of Jacob Heilbrunn's widely-circulated survey of area studies and the SSRC in the popular academic magazine *Lingua Franca*, which painted a dramatic scenario of embattled committee chairs and distraught staff members. Heilbrunn, who described the international program as providing "nothing less than the intellectual scaffolding for American scholarship on the outside world" warned that the "underwriters" of area studies "would do well to recognize that not every quest for knowledge can be justified at the bar of utility, and that not every insight is of worldwide relevance."[273] But this understated both the complexity of individual funder reflections on area studies and the diversity of opinion within the foundation community.[274]

---

[271] Eric Hershberg, Steven Heydemann and Priscilla Stone, "Restructuring the International Program," June 16, 1994. Staff generated over 100 memoranda on the proposed reorganization in 1993-94.

[272] "Discussion Summary: Meeting of Joint Area Committee Chairs and Representatives," September 30, 1994.

[273] Jacob Heilbrunn, "The News From Everywhere: Does Global Thinking Threaten Local Knowledge? The Social Science Research Council Debates the Future of Area Studies," *Lingua Franca*, May/June 1996, p. 56.

[274] The most public expression of foundation rethinking on area studies emerged from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, which initiated a review of area studies in 1992. The following year, the president of the Foundation, William Bowen, identified a number of instances in which the conventional area studies framework was proving incomplete or ineffective: "If geography is to be the major defining variable, it is by no means clear how 'areas' should be identified. Nor do area studies offer a satisfactory approach to understanding some of the most striking phenomena of recent years, such as the diffusion of values associated with contemporary Western culture and the spread of worldwide markets – or the profound implications of conflicting developments such as the increasing power of fundamentalism, desecularization, and traditionalism in many parts of the world." See William Bowen, "1993 President's Report," *Report of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation 1993* (New York: Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 1993), p. 5. Five years later, another area studies funder, the Ford Foundation, announced a new, six-year, $25 million program on "Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies." This new program was intended to "stimulate a revitalized area studies while preserving its intellectual core–the study and analysis of language, history and culture." See Toby Alice Volkman, "Crossing Borders: The Case for Area Studies," *Ford Foundation Report*, Winter 1998, p. 28.

The dissolution of the 11 jointly-sponsored area committees, and the creation of a new international program, was announced in March 1996.[275] "Most readers of *Items* will know that area studies as commonly understood is being freshly examined, even questioned, on a number of campuses, among funders, and, not surprisingly, by the ACLS and the SSRC," wrote Kenneth Prewitt. "In this self-examination the academic community is hardly alone. From United Nations agencies to international corporations, from nongovernmental organizations to the state department, the traditional region-by-region organization is found to be poorly aligned with the tasks and opportunities of the contemporary world."

Prewitt identified two considerations at work in the "reexamination of area studies." The first was "a world shaken loose from its familiar moorings" by global economics and new information technologies. World areas, he reasoned, "are more porous, less bounded, less fixed than we previously assumed...Area studies traditionally had a fairly clear grasp of what was meant by 'here' and what was meant by 'there'. But when areas, from remote villages to entire continents, are caught up in processes which link them to events that, though geographically distant, are culturally, economically, politically, strategically, and ecologically quite near, the distinction between 'here' and 'there' breaks down."

The second consideration was that "scholarship of the kind practiced by American area studies is now internationally produced." This meant that "one's colleague in the study of Uganda, Chile, India or China is as likely to be a scholar from that country–or from Europe or from elsewhere in Africa, Latin America, Asia–as to be an American. Moreover, those colleagues will not view

[275] In the process of soliciting comments on an early version of the reorganization proposal the Council received correspondence from nearly 200 individuals. While many letter writers staunchly defended the existing structure, others suggested that the reorganization represented a rare opportunity to rethink the

themselves as 'area specialists'." The "de-parochialization" of US disciplines, while "certainly not completed," raised an "array of fresh research questions that draw their theoretical excitement or methodological challenges from the variations presented by examining them in non-American settings." Both trends challenged the familiar understanding of area studies as a US-dominated study of self-contained geopolitical units. "Name your topic–child-parent bonding, identity politics, transitions to market economies, energy consumption–and chances are high that the comparisons that will most matter cross area and cultural boundaries," Prewitt wrote. The implication was that the Councils would need to "take into account and be responsive to the changes in world conditions and in world scholarship."[276]

In a follow-up piece Prewitt insisted that the "repositioning herein recommended is an effort by the Councils to insure a durable place in intellectual life for area studies."[277] Or as outgoing ACLS president Stanley Katz wrote, the "new international program does not abandon area studies, but rather builds on the strong foundation built over the past forty years in order to bring place-based knowledge into engagement with a new range of issues."[278]

How would the new program accomplish these goals? The Councils envisaged an apparatus with three major components.[279] The first was the Collaborative Research Networks, or CRNs. These

---

study of world areas. The publication of the two announcements in *Items* generated additional responses to the reorganization proposals.

[276] Kenneth Prewitt, "Presidential Items," *Items*, Vol. 50, no. 1 (March 1996), pp. 15-18.

[277] Kenneth Prewitt, "Presidential Items," *Items*, Vol. 50, nos. 2-3 (June-September 1996), pp. 31-32.

[278] Stanley N. Katz, *Report of the President, 1986-1997* (New York: American Council of Learned Societies, Occasional Paper no. 38, 1997), pp. 7-8.

[279] In addition to the Collaborative Research Networks, Regional Advisory Panels and Human Capital program described here, two additional initiatives–a Committee on Engagement and Field Development Working Groups–were envisioned. The idea of creating an engagement committee was scrapped when it was decided that demonstrating "the multiple ways in which contemporary societies will benefit from international knowledge grounded in an understanding of local conditions" was critical for the entire program. Meanwhile, several Field Development Working Groups have focused on training issues in relatively under-studied world regions and have allowed the Councils to maintain and build on longstanding area-based commitments. Following the reorganization a number of committees and working groups were established, including the Committee on Scholarly Communication with China, the ACLS

were research planning committees devoted to themes with broad comparative significance that would coalesce diverse groups of scholars; assess the state of research on a given topic; identify training needs; prepare conferences, workshops and research volumes; spin off working groups and more generally assume leadership on problems cutting across conventional academic boundaries. "It is not expected that there will be a large number of CRNs," Prewitt said. "The goal is not topical coverage so much as quality and impact."

The second component was the Regional Advisory Panels or RAPs. The RAPs were expected to look, act and feel quite different from the old area committees. Their main function was to "bring perspectives of their respective world regions on the research, training, and related components of the new international program." The term "advisory" was there for a reason. The RAPs were to provide feedback on research and training initiatives, so that "a research-agenda setting enterprise is informed by perspectives rooted in a serious understanding of what is going on in and between the various parts of the world." The RAPs were comprised of small groups of international scholars, not only from a given region, but from all over the world, and they were organized so as to strengthen linkages between the SSRC and international social science institutions.

The third component was the Committee on Human Capital, which analyzed the needs and constraints associated with research capacity-building on an international scale. The initiative began "from the premise that there is a global need for new kinds of research professionals who are capable and comfortable understanding local situations in relation to global, transnational and international trends and impacts."[280] The committee was entrusted with the task of assessing the institutional context within which scholarship is shaped in different parts of the world, and to

---

Committee on East European Studies and the ACLS-SSRC Working Group on Cuba. The International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship (IDRF) program should also be considered part of the reorganized international program.

consider how these contexts are evolving as a result of greater economic integration and changes in information technology. The committee, chaired by Lisa Anderson, Dean of the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, consisted of scholars and foundation officers from around the world. The committee focused initially on four sets of issues: connectivity and communications; human capital needs and conditions on a global scale; research and training networks; and new allies and alternative sites, which involved a series of focus group bringing together multiple actors in producing and consuming social science knowledge. Before the end of the decade it launched a handsome working paper series.

To conceptualize and implement the mission of the new program the Councils convened a meeting of 70 scholars from all parts of the globe in April 1997. Three major themes surfaced at the meeting. First, many participants proved critical of the term "globalization," which had been part of the rationale for the program reorganization. The term was "challenged as too all-encompassing and under-specified: a prime candidate for 'empty-signifier' status…Definitional fuzziness was compounded by uncertainty about when scholars meant globalization as something to be explained or when they were attempting to account for its consequences." As a result of these concerns, the SSRC backed away from the language of globalization to describe the new program.[281]

---

[280] Mary Byrne McDonnell, "Introducing the Human Capital Initiative," *Items*, Vol. 52, nos. 2-3 (June-September 1998), p. 30.

[281] Some critics warned that the rhetoric of globalization was a "mantra" for "maneuvering to find ways to meet the needs of our global corporations." "If the current US administration has one 'doctrine'," argued Bruce Cumings, "it is a Clinton doctrine of promoting US-based global corporations and US exports through the most activist foreign economic policy of any president in history. Clinton's achievements in this respect–the North American Free Trade Association (NAFTA), the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the new World Trade Organization, and many other alphabet-soup organizations, and the routine daily use of the state apparatus to further the export goals of US multinationals–are all justified by buzzwords that crop up in the new SSRC [international program reorganization] plans." See Cumings, "Boundary Displacement," pp. 24. A similar argument was advanced by French social theorists Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Wacquant, who linked the Council and other elite academic institutions to the emergence of a "new global vulgate" that is the product of "a novel kind of academically based imperialism whose effects are all the more pernicious for being promoted by cultural producers who more often than not

A second theme was the issue of language itself, as a communication tool and training agenda. Participants noted the existence of "a hierarchy of networks, where scholars with access to vernacular and international languages are more easily a part of international networks than others." A related issue was that of language acquisition. While many participants agreed that area studies represented an imperfect basis on which to address research problems, they insisted that the focus of area studies programs on language training was to be applauded. "Languages," as staff members Itty Abraham and Ronald Kassimir observed, "offer modes of insight peculiar to the culture and society in question, insights which cannot be gleaned in other ways and which are partly lost in translation."

The third theme concerned audiences for research. Participants argued that in many areas the divide between "the academy and the worlds of ideas and policy was much less marked when compared to North America and Western Europe." Scholars "working outside the West automatically thought of their work as speaking to wider audiences. This did not necessarily make their work less basic, or more applied, which was more a function of the autonomy they were able to maintain from 'interested' donors." At the same time, participants resisted the notion that there was a clear division between North and South in this context. Differences between "non-Western scholars were also aired, most notably the complex and diverse political conditions within which they work."[282]

Each of these themes–controversies surrounding the term globalization, the complexity of framing issues in terms of global-local linkages, access to language from the standpoint of

---

think of themselves as progressives." See Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Wacquant, "The New Global Vulgate," *The Baffler*, no. 12 (March 1999), p. 69.

[282] Itty Abraham and Ronald Kassimir, "Internationalization of the Social Sciences and Humanities," *Items*, Vol. 51, nos. 2-3 (June-September 1997), p. 24.

network-building and scholarly training, rethinking scholarly audiences–could only be broached, rather than resolved, at the meeting. In one guise or another the Regional Advisory Panels would return to the issues flagged at the April meeting.

The closing down of the area committees and the reorganization of the international program attracted more attention and controversy than anticipated, and in some instances relatively minor aspects of the reorganization process (such as the concept of globalization) generated a disproportionate amount of heat. Given the largely unfavorable reaction of many area specialists, who regarded the international program as an organizational resource as well as a source of institutional legitimation, it seemed likely that the controversy would continue to simmer long after a new portfolio of international research activities was in place. And yet one of the notable features of the new international program was the degree to which it encompassed not only cross-regional projects but also field development programs of the type that had been identified with the postwar international program. While the reorganized program offered a more flexible approach to area-based research it did not–appearances to the contrary–represent the definitive break with area studies that its critics seemed to assume. The international program reorganization is best described as an act of radical reform rather than as a revolution in the academy.

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

Fellowships of various shapes and sizes represented an increasingly important part of the Council's output in the post-60s period. Fellowships did not simply underwrite promising research, but shaped the context within which social science was formulated, evaluated and disseminated.

Fellowship programs enabled successful applicants to acquire the skills and experience to conduct quality research in diverse cultural, economic and political settings. At the more junior levels, this entailed grants to supplement disciplinary knowledge with exposure to particular research sites. Dissertation fellowships supported PhD candidates prepared to carry out rigorous studies of particular social, cultural, economic and/or political processes in one or more given setting. Postdoctoral awards, in turn, often favored scholars moving beyond their previous work by mastering new skills and approaches.

By the 1970s the Council was awarding more fellowships than ever before, with some observers asking whether the organization was in danger of becoming a fellowship house –or travel agency–as opposed to a place that made good research happen. Raising funds for new fellowship programs often seemed easier than securing support for research meetings, and these programs represented a crucial means by which many graduate students and faculty were introduced to the SSRC. At the same time, staff and governance committees recognized that the organization's interests were best served through a rich mix of programs that included both fellowship and research planning components. Fellowships could further the aims of research planning, by providing incentives for work in a promising new field. But even the most well-conceived fellowship program would never attain the field-defining impact that a thoughtful research planning initiative might hope to provoke.

A close connection between fellowships and the Council label had been established from the outset. By 1975 the organization was awarding upwards of 300 fellowships per year–for postdoctoral research, doctoral research and predissertation exploration. Two decades later, Council awards reached a total of 365. The bulk of these were for international research, and the cumulative total of awards for field research outside the United States was staggering. Between

1950 and 1996 the SSRC and the Foreign Area Fellowship Program combined handed out 6,817 area fellowships; over half were awarded between the mid-70s and the mid-90s.[283]

The character of fellowship support changed over time. Most notably, a greater emphasis on supplemental activities such as fellows' conferences, mentoring arrangements and follow-up collaborations came into play. By the 1990s fellowships that merely offered stipends became the exception rather than the rule. During the 1998 calendar year, for example, "some 14 different fellowship competitions" provided fellowship support at the pre-dissertation, doctoral, and/or postdoctoral levels, and sponsored "an associated 35 fellows' events," such as workshops and other training initiatives.[284] These bells and whistles represented a value-added approach to fellowship provision that promised to more effectively link fellow, project and Council.

A cluster of ambitious training programs were launched in the 1990s. While some provided field research fellowships, others were organized along thematic lines. Each combined fellowship provision with other, value-added components that promoted networking-building and enhanced the grant experience. A number of staff members–including David Szanton, in connection with the Committee on the Comparative Study of Muslim Societies–contributed to this revaluation of network-building, human capital development and fellowship support. As president, David Featherman was also identified with the challenge of revitalizing the Council's fellowship programs, as well as strengthening ties to research and training organizations in Asia and Europe.

[283] Untitled document prepared by David Szanton (1998). Additional area fellowships data may be found in David L. Szanton, "Shaping the Course of Area Studies: The Dissertation Research Awards," *Items*, Vol. 45, nos. 2-3 (June-September 1991), and Kenton W. Worcester, "Survey of International Field Research Fellowships, 1990-1995," *Items*, Vol. 50, no. 1 (March 1996).
[284] Sheri Ranis, Beverlee Bruce, Ellen Perecman and Diane di Mauro, "Good Fellowship: Fellows' Conferences at the Council," *Items*, Vol. 53, no. 1 (March 1999), p. 16.

The Abe Fellowship Program (1991-) provided postdoctoral fellowships for academics and non-academics (such as journalists, lawyers and scientists) for research on problems common to advanced industrial societies and US-Japan relations. The program sought "a new level of intellectual cooperation between the Japanese and American academic and professional research communities concerned with and trained for advancing global understanding and problem solving."[285] A distinctive aspect of the program is that it was jointly staffed in New York and by an SSRC representative based in Tokyo. The Tokyo office produced a regular newsletter and the program generated numerous reports and publications arising out of these activities.[286] Between 1991-99 the program provided 146 postdoctoral fellowships.[287]

The Sexuality Research Fellowship Program (1995-) was established to "contribute to a more thorough understanding of human sexuality, encourage new researchers to this field, and promote a research agenda that allows for both a wider range of topics and new approaches to current social and health issues."[288] The program provided dissertation and postdoctoral fellowships for applicants from an unusually wide range of disciplines, from literature and linguistics to psychology, sociomedical sciences and nursing. The fellowships included research workshops and, in the case of graduate fellowships, mentoring arrangements. The program emerged out of a Sexuality Research Assessment Project that surveyed research needs and funding priorities in social and behavioral research in sexuality. The project sponsored *Sexuality Research in the United States* (1995) as well as an "executive summary," which circulated widely among

---

[285] *Social Science Research Council Biennial Report, 1996-98*, (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1998), p. 72.

[286] See, for example, Theresa M. Greaney, *US-Japan Bilateral Trade Disputes: End of an Era? The Cases of Film and Aviation* (New York: Social Science Research Council and Center for Global Partnership, 1997); Sheri Ranis, ed., *Requirements of a Transnational World* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1995); Leonard J. Schoppa, *A Fragile Enterprise: Multilateral Liberalization of Trade in Services and the Asian Financial Crisis* (New York: Social Science Research Council and Center for Global Partnership, 1997).

[287] The program also sponsored workshops on such themes as international trade (1994, 1997, 1998), Asia-Pacific security (1996) and health care and aging in the US and Japan (1997, 1998), as well as fellows' workshops and a Tokyo-based seminar series.

researchers. The report identified three primary concerns: "a need for fundamental research to expand the information base on sexuality and a need for adequate dissemination of research findings to policy makers, practitioners, educators, and groups working at the community level; a need for comprehensive training for sexuality researchers, incorporating sexuality content material and research methodology skills; and a need for the overall strengthening of the sexuality research fields in order to encourage greater academic respectability and public acceptance of research in this area."[289]

The SSRC-Mellon Minority Fellowship Program (1995-) was intended to help increase the flow of African American, Latino and Native American scholars into core fields in the arts and sciences. The initiative organized summer conferences and a predissertation research grant program. The first fellows' conference, held in 1996 at Stanford University, brought together over 120 minority fellows in the humanities, social sciences and physical sciences. Titled "Making Our Ways in a Changing Academy," the conference was "designed to provide a forum where fellows could present their work, share their experiences in the academy, and initiate and expand professional networks with others who shared similar conceptual, methodological, or policy concerns."[290] Subsequent fellows' conferences attracted upwards of 160 participants each.

The Applied Economics Program was launched at the end of the decade (1998-) but fits comfortably in the value-added fellowship framework. It was established to encourage graduate students in economics, business and/or public policy to "undertake innovative empirical and theoretical research that addresses vital and complex, wide-ranging economic and policy

---

[288] Sexuality Research Fellowship Program Announcement, 1999.
[289] Diane di Mauro, *Sexuality Research in the United States: An Assessment of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1995), p. 3. See also Diane di Mauro, "Researching Sexuality: A New Fellowship Program," *Items*, Vol. 50, no. 4 (December 1996).
[290] *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1995-96* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1996), p. 105.

issues."[291] The program attracted the participation of some of the discipline's most prominent scholars[292] and received coverage in the *New York Times*, which described it as part of an effort "to improve understanding of the relationships among people rather than among mathematical symbols," in order to motivate graduate students "to do applied work and give them a head start in developing an applied focus for their PhD theses."[293]

The International Predissertation Fellowship Program (1990-2000) encouraged graduate students in the social sciences (especially economics, political science, psychology and sociology) to supplement their graduate training with a sophisticated understanding of developing country contexts early in their graduate career. The initiative "aimed at increasing the flow of the most talented second and third year graduate students in the nation's strongest social science graduate training departments into internationally oriented research careers."[294] From the outset the program was restricted to applicants from a select number of institutions (initially 19, later revised to 23), to maximize the program's impact at strategically placed institutions.[295]

Drawing on SSRC workshop surveys and field reports, two graduates of the International Predissertation Fellowship Program prepared *Overseas Research* (1997) as a "practical guide" distilling the do's and don'ts of field exploration. "Every year a great number of enthusiastic,

[291] "Program in Applied Economics," Social Science Research Council Program Announcement, 1998.
[292] Speakers at the program's first workshop included Paul Krugman (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Albert Fishlow (Council on Foreign Relations), Barry Eichengreen (University of California at Berkeley), Rebecca Blank (Council of Economic Advisors) and Daniel L. Rubinfeld (Deputy Assistant Attorney General).
[293] Michael M. Weinstein, "Students Seek Some Reality Amid the Math of Economics," *New York Times*, September 18, 1999, B7.
[294] "Draft Proposal for a New SSRC/ACLS Predoctoral Fellowship Program to Link the Social Sciences and Area Studies," February 1990.
[295] Between 1991-99 the program handed out 326 fellowships, out of 1310 applications. In this period fellows were distributed by discipline as follows: political science (27%), sociology (24%), anthropology (16%), economics (13%), history (8%), psychology (4%), geography (4%), and miscellaneous disciplines (5%). Fellowships were used for predissertation training in the following regions: Latin America and the Caribbean (35%), Africa (22%), Southeast Asia (14%), China (13%), Middle East (9%), South Asia (6%) and Central Asia (2%).

well-trained social scientists set out on their first overseas research project and, with an awesome display of energy and creativity, reinvent the flat tire," the authors wryly observed at the outset of their helpful book.[296]

The International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program (1997-) targeted doctoral candidates across the social sciences and humanities whose proposals for dissertation research outside the United States combined theoretical innovation with close attention to specific settings, cultures and histories. In the first three years of the program support was provided to over 150 graduate students for research on all parts of the globe. Approximately one-sixth of these fellows proposed to conduct research in more than one country.

Both the International Predissertation Fellowship Program (IPFP) and the International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program (IDRF) made workshops a central feature of their programs. The IPFP program held workshops on the challenges of conducing research in the developing world in 16 different countries. The program also encouraged fellows to share their field experiences by means of an email reflector that was set up in 1993. Both programs' workshops ran three to four days in length, with IDRF workshops featuring small panel presentations, guest lectures and group events. IPFP workshops, by contrast, emphasized each participant's preliminary research plans, but also included meetings with local scholars and visits to local research institutions. In the case of IPFP workshops, the readings were memoranda written by participants describing their research plans; IDRF workshops assigned readings on international field research. Both formats allowed fellows to reflect on their field research experiences and how they shaped plans for their dissertation research.

[296] Christopher B. Barrett and Jeffrey W. Cason, *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), p. 1.

The best fellows' workshops provided a respite from the competitive pressures of graduate life and an opportunity for peers to address one another as colleagues. They cultivated an intellectually serious, mutually supportive atmosphere that helped inspire new intellectual communities cutting across traditional lines. Participation allowed fellows to gain a clearer sense of the potential audience for their research outside their specialist area of interest. Although they were often billed as exercises in network-building, successful workshops encouraged thicker sets of bonds than the term "network" might imply.

CONCLUSION

The Council is, and always has been, a complex, multifaceted organization. In the course of its development it has embraced many different paradigms and approaches and underwritten innumerable styles of research. Rather than posing as a neutral forum, the SSRC from the early 1920s through the late 1990s took up an array of campaigns–from linking theory and practice in public administration and championing the cause of social indicators, to insisting on the relevance of mathematical training and the need to reform the field of international relations. Through the work of its committees, and the deliberations of its governance bodies, the Council has participated in controversies ranging from the underpinnings of empirical research and the relationship of scholarship to national security, to the state of area studies and the prospects for a truly international social science. As a standard bearer for quality research, the Council has promoted multiple, and sometimes inconsistent, scholarly agendas. Given the proliferation of its programs and fellowships, it seems unlikely that the organization's historical impact could be neatly summed up in a handy phrase or label.

The multifaceted quality of the Council's interventions is partly a function of its pliant internal apparatus, which can accommodate disparate research ambitions and dissimilar models of good

social science. Research committees and working groups draw participants from a wide range of fields and enjoy broad latitude in finding their own voice and defining their own agenda. Fellowship committees are similarly afforded a critical degree of freedom in selecting awardees whose projects offer exceptional promise. The fact that different pieces of the organization are not required to follow a uniform template means the Council can be (and can do) many things at the same time.

The founders and early leaders of the SSRC shared a commitment to interdisciplinary research and methodological pluralism that helped the organization avoid the temptation of collapsing itself into a single trend or faction. Even a broadly-defined behavioralism, which captured the imagination of Charles Merriam among others, and inspired numerous Council initiatives, was never entirely hegemonic within the SSRC system. For each committee that adopted the language of the behavioral revolution, others emphasized nuts-and-bolts policy issues or nurtured area-based collaborations that were difficult to justify from a positivist perspective. In any event, by the early 1970s behavioralism's gravitational pull, within the Council and beyond, was fading. In light of the segmentation and polarization of the post-60s academy it may have been difficult for a successor paradigm to achieve an impact comparable to behavioralism's powerful mid-century surge. At the same time, however, it may be argued that the Council's internal flexibility and ethos of committee self-determination meshed rather nicely with pluralistic, postpositivistic spirit of the research universities after the 1960s.

As research infrastructure expanded, the Council's special niche changed as well. Over time, the organization became less tied to one or two core programs and embraced a more eclectic range of activities. The increasingly visible profile of fellowship and training programs represented one aspect of this larger institutional shift; another was the deepening relationship with ACLS and a somewhat greater receptivity to the humanities more generally. The disciplinary mix represented

within the Council also changed, with a moderate decline in the committee-level representation of psychology and economics. Although the role of presidential leadership remained critically important, the fact that the organization drew on a broader range of funders to support a wider range of programs stimulated a firmer sense of committee and staff autonomy. Committees that developed strong internal leaderships, and maintained their activities over successive presidencies, were likely to find their sense of programmatic independence enhanced.

As a result of these developments, the organization underwent a gradual transition from a relatively tight operation, overseen by the president and two or three key staffers, to a somewhat looser structure engaged in building and promoting multiple scholarly networks. The transition to a network-promoting research platform suggested that the Council's historic emphasis on research planning was slowly (and unevenly) giving way to a "more direct engagement in the actual research process," in the words of Craig Calhoun. In a presidential report Calhoun went on to call for "moving from 'research planning' to research networks and/or shared research projects. This is something the Council has done before, but something I think we need more explicitly to claim as part of our mission."[297]

The Council, as we have seen, was part of a wider Progressive Era movement to develop organizations of expertise that could dispense disinterested knowledge to policymakers and social actors. In this context it plugged academic talent into a world of committee deliberations, report preparations, grantmaking and policy advising. Its establishment called attention to the ascendancy of what Thorstein Veblen described as the "captains of erudition"–nonprofit counterparts to the better-known captains of industry. The Council's very existence, as the historian Julie Reuben pointed out, "increased faculty autonomy within the university" by

[297] Craig Calhoun, "Report from the President," *Items and Issues*, Vol. 1, no. 2 (Summer 2000), p. 14.

"carving out an independent realm for research."[298] Its growth is emblematic of a much larger expansion of social science research infrastructure, in the universities and elsewhere, that led one political scientist to grandly describe the 20th century as "the century of the social sciences."[299]

Thorstein Veblen's characterization of research planners as captains of erudition is taken from his book *The Higher Learning in America* (1918). Veblen–Wesley Clair Mitchell's mentor in graduate school–insisted that innovation in research and teaching must come from intellectually curious, independent-minded individuals, rather than university trustees, public figures or moneyed interests. For Veblen, "scholars and schools devoted to the higher learning" were "of great intrinsic value, in some way a matter of more substantial consequence than any or all of the material achievements or possessions of the community." But "inasmuch as the popular sentiment runs plainly to the effect that magnitude, arbitrary control, and businesslike administration is the only sane rule to be followed in any human enterprise," the principle of free and open inquiry would remain at a disadvantage.[300]

In exploring the "various remedial measures" proposed by "critics of current university affairs," Veblen took note of the emergence of a new type of academic institution. The "new establishments"–"born of academic defeat" because their architects despaired of reforming the universities–were

> of the nature of retreats or shelters for the prosecution of scientific and scholarly inquiry in some sort of academic quarantine, detached from all academic affiliation and

[298] Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 209.
[299] Peter Wagner, cited in John Coakley and John Trent, *History of the International Political Science Association, 1949-1999* (Dublin: International Political Science Association, 2000), p. 1.
[300] Thorstein Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1993 [1918]), pp. 3, 1 and 202.

> renouncing all share in the work of instruction. In point of form the movement is not altogether new. Foundations of a similar aim have been had before. But the magnitude and comprehensive aims of the new establishments are such as to take them out of the category of auxiliaries and throw them into the lead. They are assuming to take over the advance in science and scholarship, which has by tradition belonged under the tutelage of the academic community. This move looks like a desperate surrender of the university ideal. The reason for it appears to be the proven inability of the schools, under competitive management, to take care of the pursuit of knowledge.[301]

Whether the formation of the Social Science Research Council should be viewed as a "desperate surrender" of the "university ideal"–or as a useful complement to modern universities and the social science disciplines, as Pendleton Herring and others have maintained–there is something disarmingly prescient about Thorstein Veblen's depiction of academic currents in the crucial interwar period. Certainly the Council was conceived of as a kind of "academic retreat or shelter"–even if committee members invariably returned to their home institutions–and its relationship to the classroom was indirect at best. Rather than placing their trust in departments, interdepartmental committees or disciplinary associations, the founders of the Council anticipated that its relatively autonomous multidisciplinary committee structure would indeed influence, guide and plan "the advance in science and scholarship."

The concept of an agenda-setting organization of and for the social sciences is not without its detractors, of course. More than a few critics have suggested that the rhetoric of empirical and/or disinterested social research masked an embedded political agenda. The Congressional hearings of the 1950s, New Left critiques of the late 1960s-early 1970s, and the populist backlash against federal funding of social research in the 1970s-80s, are suggestive of the concerns that have

[301] Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America*, p. 199.

surfaced. Although the SSRC is the world's oldest national organization of the social sciences, it has only intermittently achieved the level of access to and acceptance within policymaking circles associated with social science agencies in Europe and elsewhere. Thus, the close ties that developed between Council networks and federal agencies in the 1930s proved as impermanent as the early cold war anxieties that fueled the 1954 Reece committee. Charles Merriam's grandest ambitions–to transform the Council into a federal research planning body, or at least collaborate with federal agencies on a systematic basis–failed to materialize. The same may be said of his more tentative hope of eventually fusing the disciplines into a single social science. And yet in important ways the Council did realize Merriam's commitment to shaping research agendas through committee projects and staff initiatives. Not everyone was as sympathetic as Merriam or his foundation and university allies to the very notion of committee-driven research planning, however.

However one draws up the balance sheet of the Council in the 20th century–as an apparatus for scholarly research and training, or as a more broadly conceived public resource–it is worth emphasizing once more that in institutional terms the logic of continuity proved as powerful as the dynamic of change and discontinuity.

On the one hand, as the organization moved away from its predominantly domestic focus toward an increasingly international conception of its mission, committees continued to map out new avenues for research. Cross-disciplinary fields were subjected to committee scrutiny and as they established their legitimacy turned over to universities and research associations. If by the 1990s the Council was no longer at the center of the behavioral revolution, the area studies movement, the human development paradigm and so on, that was because these campaigns had secured footholds elsewhere. Program innovation proved the norm rather than the exception, as the Council reinvented itself through an evolving portfolio of activities.

At the same time, even as research committees actively embraced new themes and approaches, they often returned to hardy social science perennials–the political role of economic actors, the social impact of migration, the nexus of biology and society, the influence of culture on social structures, the sources of political instability and so on. Furthermore, the means used to address research and training challenges suggested a strong element of continuity with the past. After all, the preponderance of fellowships continued–as Wesley Clair Mitchell had long ago advised–to be targeted to younger researchers, at the dissertation or postdoctoral level.

Institutional precepts articulated by the founding generation continued to shape the organization's development. The values of pragmatism, flexibility, interdisciplinarity, methodological pluralism and connecting research to citizenship and policy were affirmed even as the content of program activities evolved. The post-60s mandate of moving in an international direction, and the gradual shift from research planning to network facilitation, arguably constituted the only major revisions to the founding generation's institutional script.

As long as social scientists remained interested in contributing "to practical judgement a bit more practicality and a bit more judgement," and more particularly in the "refinement of debate and a sharpening of the intelligence upon which the collective management of human affairs depends," there would be a role for the SSRC.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to the following individuals for speaking with me about the social sciences and the SSRC: Itty Abraham, Lisa Anderson, Radhika Balakrishnan, Sheila Biddle, Orville Brim, Jr., Craig Calhoun, Bruce Cumings, Josh DeWind, Diane di Mauro, Albert Fishlow, David Featherman, Martha Gephart, Peter A. Hall, Stanley Heginbotham, Pendleton Herring, Eric Hershberg, Steven Heydemann, Stanley Katz, Gloria Kirchheimer, Robert Latham, Gardner Lindzey, Jason Parker, Robert Pearson, Kenneth Prewitt, Sheri Ranis, Richard Rockwell, Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, David Sills, Allan Silver, Neil Smelser, Francis X. Sutton, David Szanton, Sidney Tarrow, Sidney Verba, Toby Volkman, Frederick Wakeman, Steve Wheatley, Heather Wolfe and Harriet Zuckerman.

The project was aided by the research efforts of Adam Frankel and Abigail Swingen, as well as Monica Blank and Darwin Stapleton of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Elsa Dixler was an exemplary and insightful editor. I owe a big debt of gratitude to my wife, Jennifer Scarlott, and to our daughter, Julia. Thank you both for the "writing time."

Kenton W. Worcester

AFTERWORD

I take pleasure in reflecting on the history of the Social Science Research Council from the perspective of my present position, where we are now concluding the decennial census of 2000. Census 2000 was widely described as the "largest peacetime mobilization in American history," a true but hardly interesting statement. A better description is that the census is the largest applied social science project in American history. A census is the systematic collection of data that will in turn be applied to the distribution of political power (reapportionment and redistricting), the allocation of federal funds (approximately $200b per annum at present), the enforcement of numerous federal, state and local laws (especially nondiscriminatory statutes), the design of new public policies, the investment of private sector resources and, of course, the deep understanding of society and economy that rests on a detailed portrait of the demographic and housing characteristics of the nation.

A census, we should recall, also fuels the empirical social sciences—demography, micro-economics, history, sociology and political science. It is part of the infrastructure of the scientific effort to describe and explain social dynamics, economic growth, population movement and on and on. Indeed, the birth of the modern social sciences in the United States toward the end of the 19th century coincided with the greater use by the government of census and survey data, albeit of a fairly primitive kind by today's standards. The 20th century has been called, correctly so, the "first measured century."

And yes, the systematic improvement of census-taking and more broadly of government data collection has been central to this accomplishment. But that accomplishment in turn depended

heavily on theoretical and methodological improvements coming from the social sciences. To put it most strongly, it is difficult to imagine a Census 2000 at the level of technical sophistication required had it not been for the maturing of the social sciences over the past 75 years--and the Council has been at the center of that maturation process.

I dwell on the census only to make a larger point, one amply illustrated in the excellent history to which this is an afterword. The words here written come after the text itself, but also after the 75 years and counting of the Social Science Research Council. Across this distinguished history, the Council has mediated between the social sciences and the society. It has reminded scholars of issues that require research planning because of the challenges that vex the country (or the world). And it has reminded those engaged in the practical dealings of social, political and economic life that the social sciences can help them, at least up to a point. Few institutions in the social sciences have performed this mediating task so adeptly, and many fewer yet so continuously over the better part of a century. The reasons are clearly recounted in the preceding pages.

The decennial census, then, is but an example of a much larger pattern that links our sciences with our society. The census is simply my vantage point for looking back on the history of the Council as an integral part of this pattern. This history tells us again and again that, by definition, the task of the Council is never ending. The old questions reappear in new guises each decade; new issues are added; there is always a fresh cohort of graduate students and young professors to be enticed into investigating these new formulations. Research planning and supporting young scholars have been the foundation for the Council since the beginning, and they no doubt will remain so even as the Council expands its intellectual and geographic reach.

In looking ahead, we do well to reflect on the bedrock principles of a history of accomplishment.

Kenneth Prewitt

Director, US Bureau of the Census

Social Science Research Council

The
First
Fifty
Years

Elbridge Sibley

copyright© 1974
Social Science Research Council
605 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10016

FOREWORD

As a part of the celebration of the Council's 50th anniversary Elbridge Sibley was invited to write this informal history. We are, of course, extremely fortunate to have been able to persuade him to interrupt his retirement for a few months in order to relive the past of an organization that he had served so well for twenty-six years as a senior member of its professional staff.

Most of the activities reviewed in this history took place before I joined the Council in 1972, and reading this manuscript has made me proud of the organization I serve as president. The first five decades of the Council's history are also in a very real sense the first five decades of social science research in the United States: very few research monographs, other than historical studies, published prior to 1924 are still read or even cited today. The Council and social science research as a significant scientific activity in the United States have grown up together.

An anniversary is an appropriate occasion to recall the past, and this history has been published so that others may share with us this rich inheritance. But an anniversary is also an occasion to restate purposes and to look toward the future. Following the final chapter of Elbridge Sibley's history, accordingly, I have included an Afterword, which suggests some of the directions which I believe the Council's programs are taking. I am grateful to my colleagues on the staff for their helpful suggestions in its preparation.

Eleanor Bernert Sheldon

PREFACE

An "authorized" biography of an organization should be read with due awareness of its presumable biases. The present volume is offered as a record of past accomplishments, written in the hope that more and greater achievements may be recorded in the future. Along with the accounts of successful undertakings, however, some episodes of frustration are included because they illustrate difficulties and dilemmas that such an organization as the Council has to face in its effort to advance the social sciences.

The writer's personal preferences have doubtless crept into the narrative here and there without his awareness. To alert the unwary to possible subtle biases, a note in the first person singular seems called for. I joined the Council's staff in 1944 on a temporary basis, but eventually served twenty-six years until retirement at the end of 1970; and even prior to that, the course of my career had been changed in the 1930's by a grant-in-aid of a few hundred dollars from the Council, which rescued me from somnolence in a very pleasant but isolated academic grove. Thus, during half of the period covered by this history, I was personally involved in the Council's work. I had my own ideas of what the Council ought to be doing, which from time to time differed from those of the chief executive and board of directors; but the fact that I stayed with the organization throughout half of my career attests my conviction that over the long run its policies and practices have been wisely conceived.

Some sections of the narrative which follows are largely drawn from memoranda prepared by contributors to Council activities in which they themselves played leading roles; I owe them much gratitude. These memoranda are published as articles in *Items*: Susan Ervin-Tripp, "Two Decades of Council Activity in the Rapprochement of Linguistics and Social Science" (March 1974, pages 1-4); Frederick Mosteller, "The Role of the Social Science

Research Council in the Advance of Mathematics in the Social Sciences" (June 1974, pages 17-24); Austin Ranney, "The Committee on Political Behavior, 1945-64, and the Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes, 1964-72" (September 1974); M. Brewster Smith and Gardner Lindzey, "Research on Social Behavior: Impact of Council Committees" (March 1974, pages 48); Joseph J. Spengler, "The Committee on Economic Growth, 1949-68" (June 1974, pages 24-28); Robert E. Ward and Bryce Wood, "Foreign Area Studies and the Social Science Research Council" (December, 1974).

For the bibliographical references throughout this volume, and still more for her unfailing ability and willingness to search out long-buried facts about the Council's history, I am indebted to Eleanor C. Isbell, my former colleague whose membership on the Council's staff both antedates and postdates my own. David L. Sills' skillful editing has improved the style of the narrative and eliminated some of my errors.

With advancing age memory becomes increasingly selective, and the primacy of some past experiences tends to outweigh the recency of others. *Caveat lector*!

New York Elbridge Sibley
May 1974

CONTENTS

1
INTRODUCTION

December 27, 1974 marks the 50th anniversary of the incorporation of the Social Science Research Council.

The half-century point is an appropriate time to review the history of the Council's efforts to strengthen and broaden the foundations of the social sciences. A review such as this, however, should not be simply an exercise in the pleasant art of institutional self-congratulation; rather, it should be a record of some salient features of the organization's undertakings so that those in whose hands the Council enters its second half-century may find some bench marks and guidelines.

An exhaustive history of the Council's activities would record failures as well as successes. This is not a matter for apology; quite the contrary, a record of uninterrupted successes could only signify that the Council had set its sights too low, avoiding the risks that are inevitably run in any serious effort to extend the boundaries of knowledge. As Simon Flexner observed on the basis of his long experience as head of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, "most research is a discouraging process of following trails which lead nowhere." The many successes that might have been attained by following only clearly-marked and well-beaten paths would have contributed less than a single venture that turned out fruitfully after many false starts.

With limited resources, the Council has often felt obliged to decline to embark on a project that seemed surely destined to fail (though the image of a Pasteur confronting the French Academy or a Galileo confronting the Holy Office has occasionally arisen to plague the conscience of the Council), but it has felt at the same time the duty to choose a risky project with the possibility of an important new result in preference to one offering the virtual certainty of a trivial one. Not all of the Council's undertakings have involved this choice, to be sure. There has been much needed spadework that would have gone undone but for the Council's initiative.

In this brief essay on the Council's history, its successes will be emphasized and its failures taken for granted as prerequisite to the former.

The Social Science Research Council is in a formal sense an association of thirty members incorporated for the purpose of advancing the social sciences. Practically speaking, it is an enterprise in which a continually changing group of some two or three hundred social scientists—less than a score being full-time salaried staff members of the Council and the rest unpaid volunteers—collaborate in pursuing that objective. Although the group now comprises less than 1 percent of the nation's professional social scientists, and its expenditures in recent years have represented between a quarter and a half of 1 percent of the estimated total expenditure for social science research in this country, its influence in the field has been disproportionately great.

The Council is uniquely qualified to accomplish certain things more efficiently than other organizations, many of which are vastly larger. Some salient characteristics that have contributed to the Council's disproportionately great influence can be briefly summarized:

It is the only autonomous organization of nationwide scope that is devoted exclusively to

the advancement of research in the social sciences.

As a nongovernmental organization, it is free from the constraints of governmental policy and from popular pressure for quick "payoffs" in the form of solutions for public problems that are beyond the present reach of social science.

Unlike the several disciplinary associations of social scientists, it is not concerned with the special interests of particular groups, or limited in its activities by the established boundaries of disciplines.

Unlike the universities, it is not subject to competing demands for services unrelated to research.

And finally, the election of its corporate members and the appointment of its working committees for limited terms permits continual infusion of new blood by the enlistment of social scientists who are actively working on the ever-changing frontiers of social science, and who welcome opportunities for collaboration.

The roster of social scientists who have contributed their voluntary efforts to the Council's undertakings over the years includes an impressive number of this country's outstanding leaders in their fields, as well as a smaller but recently growing number of their counterparts from abroad. Therein, rather than in the size of its budgets, is the essence of the Council's strength.

Organization, Personnel, Finances

The Council came into being in 1923 as a result of the initiative of the American Political Science Association's committee on research headed by Charles E. Merriam of the University of Chicago. Representatives of the American Economic Association, the American Sociological Society, and the American Statistical Association joined with Merriam and his associates in forming a Social Science Research Council and inviting the participation of the national associations in anthropology, history, and psychology. All of the latter joined in designating representatives to the Council in the year immediately after its incorporation on December 27, 1924. The membership of the Council's board of directors has ever since included three persons designated by each of the seven associations just mentioned; under a bylaw adopted a few years later, additional members-at-large, now nine in number, are selected by the Council. Many of the members-at-large have been from related disciplines and professions—geography, law, medicine, for example—that are not represented by the seven constituent associations. The Council is not, however, a federation of disciplinary associations; it does not purport to speak for them nor is it subject to their control. The designation of Council members by the associations assures representation of the range of major basic kinds of social science research; but once designated, each member is expected to act as an individual, applying his special competence in the interest of the social sciences as a whole.

Most of the intellectual work of the Council is carried on by committees of social scientists chosen for their special interests and competencies; overall guidance is in the hands of a Committee on Problems and Policy. A great majority of the members of these committees are not members of the Council's board of directors. At the present time there are about thirty committees with a total of some 250 members. The number and composition of these committees change from time to time as projects are completed, and new ones initiated.

The Council's professional staff has always been small in number. The first full-time salaried staff member, Robert S. Lynd, was hired in 1927; by 1931 the staff had grown to five, a number not exceeded until 1943; since then, it has ranged from four to ten until 1972. In 1973 it was increased to sixteen by the incorporation of staff members of the previously separate Foreign Area Fellowship Program. Most staff members have served for a few years, often on leave from

academic posts to which they returned; only a few senior staff members have remained for longer periods. The organization has thus sought to avoid the stagnation of bureaucracy by enlisting the talents of creative social scientists, many of whom have been distinguished members of their professions.

The Council opened its first office in 1927, in New York City. Although the Council's main office has remained in New York, it has intermittently maintained branch offices in Washington. With the onset of World War II, a general office was opened there, staffed by Donald Young and Paul Webbink, in quarters previously used by the Council's committees on Social Security and Public Administration, to facilitate contacts with social scientists who had come in large numbers to serve in wartime agencies. The administration of fellowship and grant programs was subsequently moved to that office, where it continued until 1957, when the Washington office was closed and the whole staff united in New York. A decade later Henry W. Riecken, vice-president and later president of the Council, established an office in Washington. That office was closed when he resigned in 1971. A third Washington office was opened in 1972 as the Center for Coordination of Research on Social Indicators, with Robert Parke as director.

Much of the financial support received by the Council during its lifetime has come from private philanthropic foundations. Several Rockefeller endowments, first the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund, followed by the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, were the largest donors in the early years. Since the 1950's, the Ford Foundation's support of the Council's foreign area training and research program has made it the largest single supporter of Council activities. Other private contributors of substantial amounts include the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Maurice Falk Medical Fund, the Grant Foundation, the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, Mr. Julius Rosenwald and the Rosenwald Fund, the Russell Sage Foundation, the Spencer Foundation, and the Twentieth Century Fund; some two dozen other institutions and individuals have also contributed appreciable amounts. Agencies of the federal government provided only small amounts of support prior to 1950; since then, a small but growing portion of Council support has come from such agencies as the U.S. Office of Education, the Federal Reserve System, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Science Foundation.

2
MAJOR ISSUES OF POLICY

The founders of the Council faced choices between three sets of alternatives in charting the course of the new organization. The first of these three issues was soon resolved, but the other two have proved to be hardly perennials:

1. Should the Council carry on research operations of large scale and long duration, or should its essential function be that of stimulating, planning, and appraising research and training research workers?

2. Should the Council give priority to supporting the initiatives of

individual social scientists, or to planning and organizing collective efforts?

3. Should the Council give priority to basic problems of social science theory and methodology, or to applying the social sciences to major problems of public concern?

As the next chapter relates, the firm choice was definitively made early in the Council's history. Subsequent proposals that the Council should become a large-scale research facility or should serve on a permanent basis as a holding company for such enterprises have been consistently rejected. But the Council's resources have always been divided between aid to individuals for their self-development or pursuit of their own research interests, and organized attacks on problems chosen by the Council. The proportion of expenditures devoted to fellowships and grants to individuals, about 30 percent until the middle 1940's, reached a maximum of 67 percent in 1961 and then declined to 35 percent in 1973. The Council's resources have likewise been divided in varying proportions between "basic" and "applied" research. Debate on this issue has continued, in changing contexts, throughout the lifetime of the organization.

It is not within the scope of this essay to argue the merits of these alternative policies, but to record some of the things that have been accomplished by one or the other approach.

The Early Quest for Directions

The wide variety of projects the Council has undertaken from time to time may appear to reflect aimlessness, but on closer examination it can be seen that beneath the heterogeneity of activities the basic purpose of advancing research in the social sciences has remained constant. In the five decades since 1924, the social sciences in the United States can be said to have developed from infancy to adolescence (let others judge whether early or late adolescence), and the Council's programs have correspondingly charged.

The 1922 report of the American Political Science Association's committee, whose initiative led subsequently to the establishment of the Council, summed up the prevailing condition of scientific research on politics which in its view called for a concerted attack by representatives of all branches of the social sciences:

1. That appreciable progress had been made in recent years in the development of a more scientific and inductive methodology in certain of the social sciences which might be of great value in other related social sciences.

2. That there was excessive over-specialization, too complete departmentalization, and isolation of the special social sciences.

3. That there was no effective medium to insure cooperative and coordinated research in the social sciences.

4. That the research efforts of some of the most competent men in political science were frequently crippled because of lack of equipment, lack of leisure, and heavy teaching loads in our colleges and universities.

5. That a sounder empirical method of research had to be achieved in

political science if it were to assist in the development of a scientific political control.

The first four propositions and the first part of the fifth clearly relate to the improvement of conditions for academic research. The last clause in the fifth proposition, referring to the use of the social sciences as instruments for political control, foreshadows a dilemma that the Council was to confront during its formative years. Granted that the ultimate value of the social sciences will be found in their contribution to the improvement of society, can the Council best help to realize that value by making frontal attacks on current social maladies or by concentrating single-mindedly on the development of more adequate basic science? Throughout the Council's history there have been vehement advocates for both views. Their interaction has probably had a salutary influence on the development of the Council's programs.

During the first few years of its existence, the Council was feeling its way in search of kinds of activity that might best serve its central purpose. The list of first undertakings in 1924 begins with one which has continued without interruption to the present: a program of fellowships for research workers, under which the first awards were made in 1925. The second item, research on "the scientific aspects of human migration," appears to have been included fortuitously on the basis of a request from the National Research Council that the new organization should supplement its own ongoing research on the subject, which was focused on the spatial aspects, by studies of the social aspects of migration. A grant of funds accompanied the request, making possible SSRC's first research project under the guidance of a committee appointed for the purpose. In the same year, the Council had four other committees, the functions of two of which were ultimately taken over by independent agencies, thus establishing a precedent to be repeated in the future. These were the Committee on International News and Communication headed by Walter S. Rogers, who subsequently founded the Institute of Current World Affairs, which has continued to function in that area; and the Committee on Social Science Abstracts which, after publishing such a journal on a demonstration basis, turned the publication over to an independent organization. The two remaining committees were charged respectively with encouraging a governmental agency to publish an annual index and digest of all State legislation, and with planning a survey of "the most significant social agencies in the United States" to ascertain what data they had available for social research, and what methods they used.

But the first year's array of projects did not exhaust the range of types of activity in which the Council would engage in the future; nor did it foreshadow the relative emphases that would be placed on them. For several years to come, the Council sought a clear sense of direction: should it be austerely devoted to the development of "pure" science, or should it attend primarily to the pressing social problems of the day? If the latter, should it assume the role of advisor, advocating policies it found scientifically valid, or should it limit itself to the role of a disinterested observer, presenting objective data and leaving it to the public and the politicians to draw their own conclusions and make their own policies?

In 1925, the newly created Committee on Problems and Policy recommended and the Council concurred in setting up research committees on five fields of public concern: effects of the Eighteenth Amendment, the negro problem (sic), crime, agricultural economics, and "certain significant phases of social and industrial relationships," The daily newspaper headlines of the time might have yielded a similar list of current social problems. It might seem that the Council had chosen to make currently salient public problems its central concern; but at the same time it had succeeded in securing funds for fellowships to enable individual scholars to pursue their personal interests in research, and it was going forward with its project to provide abstracts of the

social science literature.

The 1925 report also records agreement on some general guidelines that have survived relatively intact to the present: that the Council should not actually conduct research other than preliminary studies; that it should ordinarily deal only with problems involving two or more disciplines; and that it should generally serve only as a clearinghouse. The report concludes cautiously that "The Council is in an experimental state."

There were those who felt that the early preoccupation of the Council with the social problems of the day had already diverted it from its supposedly basic scientific mission. Walter V. Bingham asked in 1926, "How has the Council functioned? This question occurred to me [when I read] the list of committees as follows: Eighteenth Amendment, the Negro, Pioneer Belts, Capital and Labor, Cooperation with Agricultural Economists. . . . Research Agencies, Crime, Human Migration. . . . Why these particular topics rather than any other dozen chosen at random? Is Migration a legitimate child of this Council, or an orphan surreptitiously left on its doorstep? . . . If [an outsider] had looked over the . . . list of topics that have commanded the interest of the Council, he might well have jumped instantly to the conclusion that we are not a group of scientists but a group of welfare workers."

Encouraged by the interest of several major foundations notably the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial—in supporting the social sciences, the Council was emboldened to think in terms of a budget of about a half-million dollars for 1926-27; it actually succeeded in raising and spending some $160,000 in that year. At a meeting a year later Wesley C. Mitchell, then chairman of the Council, spoke rhapsodically: the histories of the social sciences which will be published when our grandchildren are growing gray will record that in the late 1920's a remarkable development took place in these fields in the United States of America. At that time, the histories will say, for the first time in civilized society, liberal funds were put at the disposal of representatives of the social sciences to spend in research for the promotion of knowledge in any way these men saw fit. And scarcely less remarkable, the histories will go on, at the same time an effort was made to pool the intellectual resources of persons who represented the social sciences in their then meager state of development...." He went on to wonder what would follow from the remarkable opportunities thus afforded in the "rosy dawn of endowed research." The present history is indeed being written at a time when the grandchildren of Mitchell's generation are beginning to have gray hairs, and they may be allowed to wonder what he would have to say if he could survey the scene today.

By 1927 the Committee on Problems and Policy, the Council's central planning body, voted to request that the word "Policy" be deleted from its name, on the ground that it found itself so overworked reviewing heterogeneous proposals for projects that it had no time to give thought to basic policy. In the same year, however, the committee concluded that formulation of comprehensive policy for the Council would be premature. Two years later the Council set forth as "the latest step in the experimental development of [its] objectives" what came to be reverently referred to within the organization as The Seven Roman Numerals:

I. Improvement of research organization
II. Development of personnel
III. Enlargement, improvement, and preservation of materials
IV. Improvement of research methods
V. Facilitation of the dissemination of materials, methods, and results of investigations
VI. Facilitation of research work

> VII. Enhancement of the general appreciation of the significance of the social sciences

Here it is noteworthy that there is no reference to dealing with currently important social problems. Evidently the pendulum by that time had swung away from the preoccupation with such matters that Bingham had condemned. But it did not stop swinging, for it is reported a little later that "Not the least significant step in the steady development of Council policy was the decision taken in 1933 . . . to give recognition to the immediacy of important public and social problems . . . not to avoid current issues by reason of their generally controversial character." It is added, however, that "This decision involved no intention of abandoning more remote and fundamental research..."

Commissions of Inquiry

The Council once tried an "experiment" designed to bring the social sciences—or it might be more accurate to say, informed and disinterested common sense—to bear upon certain issues of public importance without getting itself directly involved in partisan politics. In 1933, prompted by a sense of obligation to Do Something for the national welfare in a time of deepening depression, the Council took the novel step of appointing two Commissions of Inquiry on Public Problems. These commissions, modeled somewhat on British royal commissions but without governmental sanction, were charged respectively with the problems of government personnel and international economic relations of the United States. Once appointed and funded, the commissions were to be completely autonomous. The Council could take credit for having established them but would, it was assumed, have no responsibility for their findings and recommendations.

> As reported by the Council's executive director in 1935,
>
> The unofficial character of these commissions was believed to be an advantage.... Avoiding representation of interest groups on the one hand and of technical expertness on the other, the Council sought as members of the commissions simply men of outstanding capacity for objective, impartial judgment. After funds had been sought and obtained for the two commissions, these became wholly distinct and independent bodies without control by or responsibility to the Council.
>
> One of the primary interests . . . in these ventures was experimentation with commission procedure. Each commission had a director of research and technical staff. . . . Experts were engaged to make technical reports. . . . Hearings both open and closed were held. The commissions went out to seek the public and scattered their hearings, twenty-three in all, throughout the country. . . . Contrary to their initial expectations, both commissions found the hearings of great value. . . . The results of their inquiries were published by the commissions in reports containing their recommendations affecting public policy.

In contrast to the Council's usual scientific undertakings, the commissions obviously needed to have wide publicity if they were to have any effect. The services of Edward Bernays' firm of public relations counsellors were engaged, to the considerable dismay of some members of the Council and of its Problems and Policy Committee. "As soon as the commissions began to work

it became apparent," according to a social scientist who was later asked to appraise the undertaking, "that they and Mr. Bernays did not understand each other."

The commissions' reports received widespread notice in the press. The report of the commission on international economic relations, which recommended lowering barriers to international trade, was predictably praised by journalists who favored free trade and damned by those of contrary opinion. The report on government personnel, urging constructive changes in the civil service which had long been advocated by others, appears to have met with a generally favorable reaction, and continued for some years to be cited as authoritative by proponents of civil service reforms.

The Council has not subsequently created any commissions of inquiry. In voting in 1937 to discharge the committee that had been charged with their appointment, it was recorded that "The Council regards the creation of commissions of inquiry as an exceptional and not as a singular activity." That vote marks its withdrawal from the forum of debate on public policy, which it has not again voluntarily entered, except with reference to issue's specifically concerning the status of the social sciences.

An Eclectic Program

Throughout its history, the Council has continued to be concerned with pure and applied science. To be effective, and indeed even to survive, the Council must not only enlist the interest of social scientists who are both able and eager to engage in research; it must also present to those who control sources of funds a persuasive case for the public benefits to be expected immediately or ultimately from its activities. Consequently, the Council is subject to pulls in alternate directions by the trends of fashion in the academic world and by the ever-changing public issues of the day. To respond to these often incompatible demands and at the same time to pursue a coherent program aimed at the advancement of the social sciences has been no simple undertaking. Yielding indiscriminately to demands for support of the latest fads in the social sciences and to public clamor for immediate remedies for social ills would be suicidal for the Council; but so also would refusal to pay attention to them.

In the early years of the Council's existence some members complained that their time was largely occupied in considering a heterogeneous array of proposed projects while the Council had no clearly defined program of its own by which to measure the appropriateness of proposals. On the other hand, it has always been considered essential to give attention to proposals from outside, for truly seminal ideas appear sporadically, often from unexpected sources. Thus, the Council's general fellowship and grant programs have always left applicants free to seek support in pursuit of their own interests; and even under the more specialized programs of aid to individuals, such as grants and fellowships for foreign area research, the choice of topics has generally been left to the applicants. On the other hand, some of the Council's most significant contributions to the social sciences have been made by committees whose members were selected as sharing a common focus of interest. Examples of the latter include, among many others, the committees on political behavior, on personality development, on attitude and opinion measurement, and on economic growth and stability.

At the other end of the spectrum from activities concerned with the development and improvement of basic concepts and methods, the Council has undertaken in various ways to apply social science principles and methods to the analysis of current social problems. In this category, committees on social and economic research in agriculture, on crime, the Eighteenth Amendment,

interracial relations, labor relations, corporate relations, and human migration were appointed in the 1920's. Public concerns in the decade of the 1930's were reflected in the appointment of committees on pressure groups and propaganda, freedom of inquiry, national planning, and on social aspects of the depression. World War II and its aftermath saw the appointment of committees on war studies (which sought to capture and record for possible future use the experience of the government in setting up agencies to cope with the emergency), and on civil-military relations. The social impacts of political, technological, and economic changes in the postwar years were concerns of committees on the social aspects of atomic energy, housing (which was then in critically short-supply), economic growth, foreign areas, and comparative politics. Most recently, the committee on social indicators, with its own office in Washington, serves as a clearinghouse of research that is of direct relevance to governmental planning; and a newly appointed committee is concerned with the impact of television on social behavior.

Selected Bibliography

Commons, John R. "Report of the Representatives on the Social Science Research Council," *American Economic Review*, 15 (suppl.):157-159, March 1925.

Crane, Robert T., and others. "The Social Science Research Council," *American Political Science Review*, 18: 594-600, August 1924.

[Merriam, Charles E.] *Annual Report of the Chairman of the Social Science Research Council*, 1926. Chicago, February 1927.

Merriam, Charles E. "Annual Report of the Social Science Research Council" [1925], *American Political Science Review*, 20:185-189, February 1926.

Merriam, Charles E., Robert T. Crane, John A. Fairlie, and Clyde L. King. "Progress Report of the Committee on Political Research," *American Political Science Review*, 17:309-312, May 1923.

Social Science Research Council Hanover Conference, Dartmouth College, August 23-September 2, 1926, Unpublished Minutes, Vol. II.

Social Science Research Council Hanover Conference, Dartmouth College, August 18-September 1, 1928, Unpublished Minutes.

3
IMPROVING RESEARCH METHODS

Many of the Council's activities have been explicitly concerned with research methodology, but much of its contribution to the development and diffusion of improved methods of research has been made both through training and support for individual research workers and through the work of its numerous research planning and appraising committees concerned with particular substantive fields of research. This chapter is concerned with early attempts to treat methodology in general terms, with mathematical training and the development of mathematical methods, and with facilitating cross-fertilization between the discipline of history and those social science disciplines which have traditionally lacked temporal perspective.

One of the first committees set up by the Council in 1923 was the Committee on Scientific Method in the Social Sciences, headed by Horace Secrist, an economist at Northwestern University. The all-encompassing breadth of its terms of reference reflected the methodological infancy of social science research at the time. Its frustration is reflected in the Council's annual report for 1927-28:

> During the past year this committee has maintained its status as a lively forum for friendly controversy . . . as heretofore, those present were arrayed in two ardent parties: On one side were those who believe that it is not only profitable to study the problems of scientific method directly but that this study is essential for variety and effectiveness of research attack. On the other side were those who regard such study as the harmless amusement of those whose research sinews are too feeble to support more vigorous endeavors.

Despairing of agreement on any categorical specification of research methodology, the committee commissioned a collection of examples of various methods, which was published in 1931 under the title, *Methods in Social Science: A Case Book*, edited by Stuart A. Rice, then a professor of sociology and statistics at the University of Pennsylvania. Comparison of the title of that book with the name of the sponsoring committee appointed eight years earlier is perhaps indicative of a change in perception of the problem. In the committee's name, "Scientific method" is singular and "social sciences" is plural; the book's title, on the other hand, refers to a plurality of methods in a single field known as social science, which is viewed as a somehow integrated field in which numerous varieties of method are appropriate.

The range of methods illustrated in the fifty-two "cases" and numerous appendices in the 800-page volume embraces such disparate items as "subordination of imagination to observation" (Auguste Comte), the concept of instinct (William McDougall), testing and scaling (E. L. Thorndike), historical interrelation of culture traits (Franz Boas), and mathematical treatment of social data (Dorothy Swaine Thomas), to mention but a few.

The committee on scientific method was discharged in 1929, and the Council's subsequent efforts to appraise and improve the methods of the social sciences have generally been more sharply focused; as a rule, it has proved more fruitful to attack a methodological problem when it is encountered in a substantive context than to cope with "method" in the abstract.

Acting on this precept, the Council in 1937 appointed a Committee on Appraisal of Research. That committee, whose mandate was not limited to any particular discipline or subject matter, first undertook to appraise a number of selected works that were generally regarded as constituting major contributions in their several respective fields of inquiry. An "appraiser" was commissioned to prepare a critique of each selected work, asking three basic questions: "What did the author try to do? Did he do it the best way? What was the use of doing it?" (Or, in other words, what contribution, if any, did he make to scientific knowledge and how did he do it?) The author and the critic were expected subsequently to engage in a dialogue at a conference attended by the committee and several other social scientists. Several such appraisals were made.

In the first case Herbert Blumer, as critic of W.J.Thomas and Florian Znaniecki's *Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, held that the authors' generalizations could neither be derived from the data in their book nor proven by these data; that they stemmed rather from the authors' long and insightful previous acquaintance with Polish peasants. He found, nevertheless, that the work had had a seminal influence on American sociology. With that appraisal, the authors were on the whole in accord. Encouraged by the interest shown in Thomas' and Znaniecki's use of

personal documents, the Committee on Appraisal of the search subsequently sponsored reports on the use of personal documents in psychology, history, anthropology, and sociology.

Some other appraisals turned out somewhat less satisfactorily. The conference on Fred A. Shannon's critique of Walter Prescott Webb's *The Great Plains* was unhappily marked by *ad hominem* disputation; and several other projected appraisals proved abortive, in at least one case because the author declined to respond to his critic, and in another because the author of the critique produced an essay which "although worthy of publication, was not an appraisal" of the work in question.

The Committee on Appraisal of Research, discharged in 1946, was the last Council committee to be given such an inclusive mandate; subsequent work on methodology has been more specifically oriented.

Mathematics in the Social Sciences

The methods of social science research prevailing at the time of the Council's founding called for quite elementary mathematical skills as compared with those required today. As social science methods have evolved, types of mathematics that were not traditionally included in the usual curricula have come to be needed. The low average level of mathematical competence among social scientists has been a perennial impediment to the use of the most advanced methods of analyzing and interpreting social data. Almost from its beginning, the Council has made efforts to remedy this deficiency.

The Need for Mathematical Training

In the 1920's, as young social scientists were rejecting the "armchair" scholarship of their predecessors and turning to empirical observation of society, they came to realize that they must use statistical techniques to reduce their masses of empirical data to intelligible order, but most of them were ill-prepared to be able to do so understandingly, let alone creatively. Later there followed recognition of the need for more rigorous methods of generalization if they were to hope to derive from their empirical findings a body of scientific propositions that would be not merely descriptive but predictive—that would, in other words, ultimately be of practical use in coping with the problems of society. Looking sometimes with unconcealed envy at the achievements of natural scientists, some social scientists made naive efforts to apply the methods of physics in fields to which they were not adapted.

The prevalent deficiency of mathematical competence among social scientists has been repeatedly documented. In 1935, Carl Brigham found that three out of five applicants for SSRC graduate fellowships (presumably having superior aptitude for social science research) scored below the average of applicants for college entrance on the College Entrance Examination Board's scholastic aptitude test in mathematics; and, moreover, that many of those tested made lower scores *after* four years of college than before. A later Council study of the training of social scientists published in 1948 stressed the serious deficiency of most social scientists (with the exception of economists) in mathematics and statistical methods, noting that graduate students in government, history, and sociology scored on the average fifty points or one half standard deviation below the mean for those of all disciplines on the "quantitative aptitude" test of the Graduate Record Examination—as low, in fact, as students of literature.

Committee Activity

The Council's effort to raise the level of mathematical competence among social scientists began in 1929 with the appointment of a Subcommittee on Mathematics of its Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture. That subcommittee construed its mandate broadly and published recommendations, which will be cited presently, concerning the courses in mathematics that prospective social scientists in general ought to study.

Twenty years later a new Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists published a new set of recommendations for academic courses adapted to the needs of social science students, conducted summer training institutes to fill gaps in existing college and university curricula, and sponsored the preparation and publication of appropriate instructional materials.

The Council's Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists succeeded a committee of the same name that had been formed independently by William G. Madow, a mathematical statistician then on the faculty of the University of Illinois. Madow served as chairman of the Council's committee throughout its existence, from 1952 to 1958. A colleague described him as dreaming of "a community of social scientists whose mathematical strength was equal to its mathematical problems"— a description that well epitomizes the Council's aim.

Meanwhile, the development of better quantitative methods for the social sciences was also fostered through the work of numerous research planning committees in fields ranging from history to psychology, and through the Council's fellowship program that enabled individuals to obtain special methodological training for which they felt need in their own research. A notable instance of the latter was that of Samuel A. Stouffer, whose postdoctoral fellowship year working in England under the guidance of Karl Pearson and R. A. Fisher was a crucial early stage of his career as an outstanding leader in the development of quantitative sociology.

Comparison of the recommendations for undergraduate mathematical training offered in 1932 and 1955 by the two committees previously mentioned reveals how the level of mathematical sophistication demanded had risen in the course of two decades.

In 1932, it was cautiously suggested that, without taking too much time from other studies, students intending to concentrate in the social sciences would profit from studying two or three semester courses in logarithms, graphs, interpolation, equations and forms of curves, probability, and curve fitting. The committee urged that this be made prerequisite for any course in statistics, and that an introduction to the calculus should also be required for students of advanced economic theory. Looking ahead, they envisaged the possibility that "as further developments occur in the theory and research method of social disciplines, greater need for the general use of mathematical concepts and methods will become apparent. . ."—a prophecy that has indeed been fulfilled, as most of those who were students in those days must admit when they try to understand much of the social science literature of the 1970's.

In 1955, the committee recommended a two-year sequence of mathematics courses for undergraduate students of the social sciences, embracing logic and set theory, relations, axiom systems and mathematical models, functions, calculus, probability, and matrix theory. Relatively few social scientists had had the benefit of such a curriculum; in fact, perhaps a majority of those individuals who had more than minimal training in mathematics had acquired it as students majoring in physical sciences or engineering, in courses oriented toward those sciences rather than the social sciences.

Summer Institutes

In order to equip a number of social scientists with some appropriate mathematical skills and, in the long run more importantly, to demonstrate the feasibility of such instruction and to encourage its incorporation in regular academic programs, the committee conducted a series of summer institutes at which intensive graduate level courses were taught by faculty members recruited from across the nation. In all, 141 social scientists were enrolled as students in six institutes during the summers of 1953, 1955, and 1957. In 1957, 38 college teachers of mathematics attended another summer institute under the committee's auspices, designed to acquaint them with applications of mathematics in the social sciences.

Books

The committee provided funds for the preparation of textbooks and other instructional materials. At least a dozen substantial books and uncounted articles in both mathematical and social science journals have been ascribed to the committee's initiatives.

Publication in 1956 of the *Introduction to Finite Mathematics*, a textbook by John G. Kemeny and others, marked perhaps the most significant innovation in college mathematics texts suitable for social science students since F. L. Griffin's *An Introduction to Mathematical Analysis*, published in 1921. Kemeny, then a professor at Dartmouth College, was a member of the Council's Committee on Mathematical Training, and Griffin, a Reed College teacher, had been a member of the earlier Subcommittee on Mathematics.

Not only in graduate schools but also in undergraduate colleges, mathematics courses oriented toward the needs of social science students began to appear in the curricula during the later 1950's. In a survey in 1959 for the Mathematical Association of America, Mosteller and others found that 15 percent of the college students in the nation already had access to a course in finite mathematics, a type of course encouraged by both the Council's committee and the Association.

In view of the apprehension that seems to have been shared by many persons not fully acquainted with the Council that the Council has laid excessive emphasis on mathematics and quantitative techniques while disparaging other aspects of the social sciences—the committee's cautious appraisal of the results to be expected from its efforts will bear quotation here: "That some students will tend to overstress their mathematical knowledge, to use technique in place of thought, and to limit themselves to problems that can be solved mathematically must be anticipated. These dangers will be reduced as more and more social scientists study mathematics and more critical evaluation of their work ensues."

Accomplishments

Summing up the accomplishments of the committee's five years of activity, its chairman Mr. Madow wrote:

> Let us compare the present situation with that in which the committee was established. The differences are perhaps most striking in the following respects:
>
> There is greater acceptance among social scientists of the desirability, if not the need, of

the study of mathematics.

There is greater understanding among mathematicians that the applications of mathematics in the social sciences are serious mathematics.

There is fairly general acceptance of the need for the revision of the undergraduate mathematics curriculum to make it more satisfactory for the social scientist. Texts to facilitate this development are appearing, and the number of courses is growing.

There is fairly general agreement on the type of mathematics curriculum that social scientists should study.

Many universities and colleges have mathematical and statistical faculty members who have worked sufficiently on applications of mathematics in the social sciences to be able to make such applications, advise others about them, and teach mathematics to social scientists.

Many universities and colleges have social science faculty members who have used mathematics sufficiently in their own research to be able to guide, advise, and teach others to apply mathematics to social science problems.

There is more general understanding of the role of mathematics in social science research: that it is best used when casually used, that it is not a substitute for social science thinking, that it is not a temporary development but a continuing development.

The number of social scientists who use mathematics or can read mathematical social science literature has greatly increased.

During the six years following the discharge of the Committee on Mathematical Training in 1958, a new Committee on Mathematics in Social Science Research held a number of summer seminars on the use of mathematical models in various fields. Recognizing that the development of mathematical models and their application would continue indefinitely, the Council encouraged the formation in 1964 of the Mathematical Social Science Board, an independent body whose membership included several individuals who had been members of the Council's committees. The Committee on Mathematics was then discharged, and thus, as on several previous occasions, an innovative activity initiated by the Council was taken over on a more permanent basis by another organization, leaving the Council free to reallocate its resources to other subjects.

Two Recent Contributions to Formal Methodology

The Council's interest in developing more adequate mathematical methods for the social sciences did not lapse, however, with the termination of its Committee on Mathematics. A five-day working conference in 1970, cosponsored by the Council and the University of Wisconsin Social Systems Research Institute, brought together eighteen social scientists from diverse fields who shared an interest in causal analysis. Their papers, edited by Arthur S. Goldberger and Otis Dudley Duncan, and published under the title *Structural Equation Models* in the Social Sciences (1973), treat both general problems encountered in efforts to infer causality from statistical data and specific applications of models to such different subjects as economic, occupational, and educational attainment, demographic processes, and voting behavior.

As governmental and other forms of social intervention intended to bring about desired

changes in such matters as income distribution, health, crime, and educational inequalities have increased, social scientists have been challenged to devise means of evaluating their outcomes, in order to point the way to more effective programs. Typically, programs of intervention have been undertaken either with no provision for later evaluation or with provisions, that do not meet tests of scientific validity. A Council committee appointed in 1971 recommended that a suitable experimental design should be incorporated in a program at the outset if the results are to be subject to unequivocal evaluation. The product of the committee's work is a volume edited by Henry W. Riecken and Robert F. Boruch, *Social Experimentation: A Method for Planning and Evaluating Social Intervention* (1974).

Historical Perspective in the Social Sciences

A stricture perennially and often with much justification laid upon social scientists is that they have tended to ignore the temporal dimension of social phenomena. On the other hand, some historians have either denied the possibility of finding uniformities in past events or have indulged freely in intuitive generalizations whose validity cannot be tested.

Almost from its beginning, the Council has been a focus of intellectual encounters between historians and exponents of disciplines generally lacking in temporal perspective. These encounters have been fruitful for both parties; historians have developed more formal methods of analysis and generalization, while economists, sociologists, and others have realized that some of their work has rested implicitly on the dubious assumption that current social phenomena can be explained without reference to what happened the day before yesterday.

Two outstanding American historians interested in making historiography more scientific, Guy Stanton Ford and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., were influential members of the Council's board of directors in its early years. Some of the cross-fertilizing of history and other disciplines has been attempted by frontal attacks, most of which have been led by historians. Roy F. Nichols, a member of the Council's board of directors from 1935 to 1956—an exceptionally long term—is to be credited with much of the initiative that led to the work of two successive committees on Historiography (1943-45 and 1948-54), and one on Historical Analysis (1956-62). These three committees respectively produced the Council bulletins *Theory and Practice in Historical Study* (1946) and *The Social Sciences in Historical Study* (1954), as well as a volume edited by Louis Gottschalk of the University of Chicago, *Generalization in the Writing of History* (1963). These publications have had wide circulation and have doubtless given considerable impetus to the efforts of growing numbers of historians to apply more rigorous and scientifically valid methods in interpreting the past.

Less explicit but perhaps more pervasive has been the influence of mutual reaction between historians and others members of the Council's Committee on Problems and Policy and of many of its research planning and appraising committees. The postwar development of foreign area studies involved social scientists of other disciplines along with historians in research on areas that had previously been studied almost exclusively by the latter; research on urbanization brought together historians and sociologists; economists and historians worked together in the field of economic history. Many other examples could be cited.

Cross-fertilization of history and other disciplines has also been fostered by the Council's Research Training Fellowship program, under which in recent years a significant number of students of history have learned the methods of anthropology, sociology, psychology, and statistics. Historical demography is a special cross-disciplinary field in which these fellowships

have afforded training. In a recent survey of the growing use of quantitative methods, and of the computer as a means of handling large masses of historical data, an impressive number of the pioneering researches cited are those of former Research Training fellows of the Council. Conversely, some students and scholars of other disciplines have been enabled as Research Training fellows to gain historical perspective on the subjects of their research interests.

Selected Bibliography

Allport, Gordon W. *The Use of Personal Documents in Psychological Science.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 49, 1942. Prepared for the Committee on Appraisal of Research.

Beard, Charles A., and others. *Theory and Practice in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 54, 1946.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. *Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States, 1775-1921.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1935. Prepared with the aid of the Social Science Research Council.

Berger, Joseph, Bernard P. Cohen, J. Laurie Snell, and Morris Zelditch, Jr. *Types of Formalization in Small-Group Research.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962. Prepared with the aid of the Committee on Mathematics in Social Science Research.

Blumer, Herbert. *Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: I, An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's The Polish Peasant in Europe and America.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 44, 1939. Prepared for the Committee on Appraisal of Research.

Brigham, Carl C. *Examining Fellowship Applicants: A Report Made to the Social Science Research Council on the Method of Selecting Fellows for First-Year Graduate Study.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 23, 1935.

Bush, Robert R., Robert P. Abelson, and Ray Hyman. *Mathematics for Psychologists: Examples and Problems.* New York: Social Science Research Council, 1956. Prepared for the Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists.

Bush, Robert R., and William K. Estes, eds. *Studies in Mathematical Learning Theory*. Stanford Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, III. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959. Outgrowth of a workshop conducted at the Summer Institute on Applications of Mathematics in Social Science Research, 1957, sponsored by the Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists.

Bush, Robert R., and Frederick Mosteller. *Stochastic Models for Learning.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1955. Based in part on work at the Interuniversity Summer Research Seminar on Mathematical Models for Behavior Theory, 1951.

Bye, Raymond T. *Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: II, An Appraisal of Frederick C. Mills' The Behavior of Prices*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 45,

1940. Prepared for the Committee on Appraisal of Research.

Cochran, Thomas C., and others. *The Social Sciences in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 64, 1954.

"Collegiate Mathematics Needed in the Social Sciences," *American Mathematical Monthly*, 39:569-576, December 1932. Prepared by the Subcommittee on Mathematics, Advisory Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture.

Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists. "Recommended Policies for the Mathematical Training of Social Scientists. *Social Science Research Council Items*, 9:13-16, June 1955.

Debreu, Gerard. *Theory of Value: An Axiomatic Analysis of Economic Equilibrium.* Cowles Foundation for Research in Economics Monograph 17. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959. Prepared with the aid of the Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists.

Goldberg, Samuel. *Introduction to Difference Equations: With Illustrative Examples from Economics, Psychology, and Sociology.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958. Prepared with the aid of the Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists.

Goldberger, Arthur S., and Otis Dudley Duncan, eds. *Structural Equation Models in the Social Sciences*. New York: Seminar Press, 1973. Product of a conference cosponsored by the Council and the University of Wisconsin Social Systems Research Institute, November 12-16, 1970.

Gottschalk, Louis, ed. *Generalization in the Writing of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963. Report of the Committee on Historical Analysis.

Gottschalk, Louis, Clyde Kluckhohn, and Robert Angell. *The Use of Personal Documents in History, Anthropology, and Sociology*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 53, 1945. Prepared for the Committee on Appraisal of Research.

Griffin, F. L. *An Introduction to Mathematical Analysis*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921.

Kemeny, John G., J. L. Snell, and G. L. Thompson. *Introduction to Finite Mathematics.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Luce, R. Duncan, Robert R. Bush, and Eugene Galanter, eds. *Handbook of Mathematical Psychology.* 3 vols. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963, 1965. Prepared with the aid of the Committee on Mathematics in Social Science Research.

Madow, William G. "Activities of the Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists, 1952-57, and Suggestions for the Future," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 11:44-47, December 1957.

Mosteller, Frederick. "The Role of the Social Science Research Council in the Advance of Mathematics in the Social Sciences," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 28:17-24, June 1974.

Nichols, Roy F. "History and the Social Science Research Council," *American Historical Review*, 50:491-499, April 1945.

Rice, Stuart A., ed. *Methods in Social Science: A Case Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931. Compiled under the direction of the Committee on Scientific Method in the Social Sciences.

Riecken, Henry W., and Robert F. Boruch, eds. *Social Experimentation: A Method for Planning and Evaluating Social Intervention*. New York: Academic Press, 1974 (in press). Report of the Committee on Experimentation as a Method for Planning and Evaluating Social Intervention.

Shannon, Fred A. *Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: III, An Appraisal of Walter Prescott Webb's The Great Plains.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 46, 1940. Prepared for the Committee on Appraisal of Research.

Sibley, Elbridge. *The Recruitment, Selection and Training of Social Scientists.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 58, 1948.

4

SOME METHODOLOGICAL AND SUBSTANTIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The sections that follow review activities in diverse fields of inquiry that have yielded, in varying proportions, new insights and knowledge on the one hand, and new methodological developments on the other.

Psychological Aspects of Social Behavior

While many of the data of the social sciences relate to products of group behavior, such as economic and political institutions and their functioning, the Council has been involved with research on individual behavior as it affects and is affected by social behavior. Ranging from the biological sciences to the humanistic frontiers of psychology, Council committees and conferences have explored many aspects and factors of social behavior.

The Heredity-Environment Issue

Questions of the hereditary or environmental origin of differences in intelligence and predispositions have been a recurrent subject of research. A Committee on Interracial Relations, active from 1925 to 1930, gave attention to the problem. A critical review by Robert S. Woodworth of studies of twins and foster children which sought to isolate genetic and environmental influences was published as a Council bulletin in 1941. The heredity versus environment issue was relatively quiescent in the 1940's and 1950's, but arose again in acute form in the 1960's as a result of the frustrating finding that school desegregation had failed to equalize either the scholastic achievements or the intelligence test scores of white and nonwhite children. Eschewing the prevailing polemical treatment of the issue, the Council's Committee on Biological

Bases of Social Behavior undertook in 1971 a survey of the relevant research and policy questions, the results of which are reported in a volume tentatively entitled "Ethnic-Racial Differences in Intelligence: Genes and Environment," by John A, Loehlin, Gardner Lindzey, and James N. Spuhler (1975).

The present Committee on Biological Bases and its predecessor, the Committee on Genetics and Behavior, appointed in 1961, have sponsored summer institutes offering basic biological training to social scientists, few of whom have been equipped to work in this interdisciplinary field.

Personality and Culture

Most of the Council's activity relating to psychological aspects of social behavior, however, has dealt directly with social rather than biological factors. The social and cultural factors affecting personality have been explored in many contexts. Beginning in 1930, a Committee on Personality and Culture, chaired by Mark A. May and including such scholars as Edward Sapir, Ralph Linton, Robert Redfield, Robert S. Woodworth, W. J. Thomas, Thorsten Sellin, and Ernest W. Burgess, was influential in turning social scientists' attention from ill-founded speculation about "racial" types of personality to a realistic search for the sociocultural bases of personality. Its thinking underlay Sellin's work on culture conflict and crime, and that of Melville Herskovits on acculturation.

A successor Committee on Social Adjustment, under Burgess' chairmanship, instigated a survey of research that led to a Council bulletin, *The Prediction of Personal Adjustment* (1941), by Paul Horst and others. The bulletin dealt, among other things, with the prediction of success in marriage and with the recidivism of paroled prisoners. The Committee on Social Adjustment was also responsible for a bulletin by Roger G. Barker and others, *Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness* (1946; rev. 1953), one of the best-selling publications of the Council and still in demand after twenty years. Robert R. Sears' *Survey of Objective Studies of Psychoanalytic Concepts* was another important contribution to research on personality and interpersonal relations.

Psychological theory and anthropological method were combined in a series of cross-cultural studies of child-rearing practices and their effects on personality in six societies, conducted with the Council's assistance in the 1950's by a team led by John Whiting, an anthropologist. By this time, the clinically oriented "culture and personality" studies of earlier decades were being supplanted by studies using objective methods. The popularity and indiscriminate use of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) and other projective instruments designed to discover individuals' own attitudes by asking them to respond to an ambiguous stimulus or to predict or interpret the behavior of others led a Council committee to commission Gardner Lindzey to make a critical review of such techniques. His monograph, *Projective Techniques and Cross-Cultural Research*, was published in 1961.

Over the years, Council committees have sought to synthesize the results of research and to point to new directions for research on the interrelations of personality, culture, and social structure at all stages of the human life cycle. The titles of several committees indicate the range of interest: Personality and Culture (1930-40), Social Adjustment (1940-47), Social Adjustment in Old Age (1943-48), Personality Development (1954-57), Personality Development in Youth (1957-63), Socialization and Social Structure (1960-67), Comparative Developmental Behavior (1961-66), Work and Personality in the Middle Years (1972-).

Intellective Processes

Research on intellective processes has had the attention of other Council committees, including one on Simulation of Cognitive Processes (1957-66), which sought to exploit the capacity of electronic computers for rigorously logical analysis, and others on Intellective Processes Research (1959-64), and Cognitive Research (1972-). Other committees with more concrete terms of reference have also been concerned with studies of cognitive behavior. The Committee on Learning and the Educational Process (1962-71) was created to bridge the gap between the thinking of psychologists and professional educators. Its successive chairmen were Lee J. Cronbach, Richard C. Atkinson, and Wayne H. Holtzman. In an effort to improve the quality of educational research, it addressed such matters of current concern to the educational profession as preschool learning, learning by discovery, computer-assisted techniques of instruction, and programs of compensatory education for culturally deprived children. The work of the committees on Linguistics and Psychology and on Sociolinguistics (discussed later) has touched on the problems of children's acquisition of language and of competence in using it for communication in different social situations.

European Social Psychology

In an effort to realize the ideal of science unconfined by national boundaries, the Committee on Transnational Social Psychology, organized in 1964 under Leon Festinger's leadership, has helped to introduce European psychologists to the laboratory-based and theoretically-oriented social psychology that developed in the United States in recent decades. This enterprise has already borne fruit in the form of an association of European social psychologists who are now making independent contributions to the field.

Intergroup and International Tensions

In addition to the work of the Committee on Learning and the Educational Process, several projects relating to current problems of social behavior and attitudes have been undertaken since World War II.

With the advice of an interdisciplinary committee, sociologist Robin M. Williams, Jr. of Cornell University was commissioned to review and organize the existing literature concerning intergroup tension and conflict and how they might be abated. The resulting Council bulletin, *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions: A Survey of Research on Problems of Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Group Relations*, issued in 1947, not only provided a timely organization of existing knowledge and hypotheses; it ventured some predictions and policy suggestions that might have eased some of the social strains to which the United States has since been subjected, had they been more widely heeded.

In a similar venture, the social psychologist Otto Klineberg was commissioned shortly thereafter to make a critical study of social science contributions to the understanding of international tensions, a topic then of central interest to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. His monograph, *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research* (1950), provides a scholarly appraisal of the evidence bearing on this perennial problem.

Television and Social Behavior

A new interdisciplinary Committee on Television and Social Behavior was formed in 1973 to

examine the effects of a continual portrayal of violence on television viewers. In its initial plans, the committee expects to be responsive to this immediate concern, and also attentive to needs for research on other social and institutional effects of television.

Opinion and Attitude Measurement

The Council has contributed much to the improvement of methods of measuring opinions and attitudes and to the sample survey methods that are now so extensively used both in basic research and in gathering data for governmental and commercial purposes. Its first work on attitude measurement was carried on briefly in the 1920's by a committee headed by psychologist L. L. Thurstone, but it was not until the 1940's that its major work in this field was undertaken. Meanwhile, the *Literary Digest's* poll that predicted the election of Alfred Landon as president in 1936 by a large majority had demonstrated the fallacy of using large but biased samples, and a new generation of pollsters had begun to use ostensibly rigorous scientific methods of asking questions of small samples of persons scientifically selected to represent large populations. With the advent of the New Deal and later the war, agencies of the federal government used survey methods to assess public attitudes toward their policies and programs. Under pressure for quick answers in a time of national emergency, much sloppy work was done that threatened to bring the technique of sample surveys and the art of attitude measurement into disrepute. This was a matter of direct concern to the Council, since academic social scientists were making increasing use of survey data in their own research.

Sample Surveys

Over the objections of some who feared that an exposé of the fallaciousness of much survey research would stifle the growth of an "infant industry," the Committee on Social Adjustment commissioned Quinn McNemar in the 1940's to take a hard look at the "state of the art." McNemar minced no words in his 1946 report to the Council, citing example after example of biased sampling, meaningless responses to ambiguous or unintelligible questions, and faulty statistical treatment of data. He found the results of a well-known psychologist's statistical manipulations unequivocally meaningless," and concluded that another author's study of morale did not "add even one iota to scientific knowledge."

In 1945, a year before McNemar's report was published, the Council and the National Research Council joined in appointing a Committee on Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes, and Consumer Wants. Samuel A. Stauffer of Harvard, a sociologist, and S. S. Wilks of Princeton, a mathematical statistician, were chairman and vice-chairman of the committee whose eighteen original members included five professors, the heads of five prominent commercial survey organizations, two staff members of nonprofit research agencies, three government statisticians, and three members of research staffs of large corporations. The committee constituted a forum for dialogue between academic and nonacademic investigators, and it was a sufficiently prestigious group to command the entree and financial resources needed for a thorough appraisal of prevailing practices.

Subcommittees were formed to investigate problems of sampling, of biases introduced by interviewers, and of the use of panels of respondents in repetitive surveys—three major kinds of problems with respect to which prevailing practices were often faulty. The published reports of these subcommittees, written by such influential members as Herbert H. Hyman, Frederick F. Stephan, Philip J. McCarthy, and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, have, it can be hoped, had a salutary effect on the practice of survey research; they have certainly contributed to laying a firmer foundation for it.

Pre-election Polls

The election in 1948 of Harry Truman instead of Thomas E. Dewey, whom the nation's leading pollsters had confidently predicted to be the next president of the United States, brought consternation not only to the pollsters themselves but to academic social scientists who feared that all surveys and measurements of attitudes would be discredited. Both groups felt that an impartial inquiry into the reasons why the polls had gone astray was necessary. The Committee on Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes, and Consumer Wants was obviously disqualified for this task because several of the very prophets whose prophecies had failed were among its members; and if these pollsters were themselves to employ technical consultants to appraise their work, the consultants' findings would be suspect of bias. So the Council quickly assembled a Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts under the chairmanship of S. S. Wilks, with his Princeton colleague Frederick F. Stephan as executive secretary. Funds for the investigation were provided by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. A technical staff of five, working literally day and night, produced a report to the committee in less than six weeks; the committee in turn issued its public report less than two months after the surprising presidential election, setting a record for speedy response in what was viewed as an emergency for the public esteem of social science research.

In his foreword to the committee's 1949 report, Pendleton Herring, then president of the Council, explained the Council's concern in the matter and the reason for haste:

> Appointment of the committee rested upon the judgment that extended controversy regarding the pre-election polls among lay and professional groups might have extensive and unjustified repercussions upon all types of opinion and attitude studies and perhaps upon social science research generally. In a situation of this kind research men have an especial responsibility to inquire into the practical applications which have been made of particular research techniques, and to determine to what extent errors were attributable to defects in the techniques themselves, or their application, or in the inferences drawn. . . .
>
> Quick action seemed necessary after the election for several reasons. An authoritative factual inquiry was needed to terminate the growing controversy or to focus discussion upon specific issues at the earliest possible moment. Had there been any delay in organizing the inquiry, both memories and materials might have been impaired or inaccessible, or active interest would have gradually diminished. On the other hand, the appointment of perhaps a dozen committees . . . was being proposed. It was far preferable that social scientists . . . undertake a single unified and independent appraisal. . . .

Considering the pressure for haste under which the staff and committee members worked, the 396-page report presents a remarkably exhaustive analysis of not only the three major national polls—Gallup, Crossley, and Roper—but also of numerous state and local polls by newspapers and others. While no precise measure is assigned to several sources of error in the pre-election polls and in forecasts of the outcome of the election based on them, the report found that the polls failed to obtain wholly representative samples of the voting populations (or failed to adjust their results properly to compensate for sampling bias), and failed to deal adequately with the probability that a given respondent would actually vote, or that he would change his choice of candidates very late in the campaign. It also pointed out that estimating within fairly narrow limits the distribution of the popular vote is easier than predicting which candidate will receive a majority of the votes in the Electoral College in a contest in which the differences between the popular votes for the leading candidates are extremely narrow.

Perhaps the greatest service to social science research of the special committee on pre-election polls was its demonstration that the incorrect prediction of Dewey's election was not a basis for losing faith in survey methods in general. Those methods were far from perfect in many respects, as the studies amply document, but they have continued to be improved, and remain a major source of government, business, and social science data.

The American Soldier

At the end of World War II the War Department turned over to the Council for analysis a great volume of data from some 200 surveys of soldiers' attitudes that had been made by a remarkable team of social scientists in the Research Branch of the Army's Information and Education Division. The officer in command of the division was a member of the Council, General Frederick Osborn, and the research group was headed by Samuel A. Stouffer, who had long been active in Council activities. Stouffer assembled a group of outstanding young social scientists, including John A. Clausen, Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Leland C. DeVinney, Louis Guttman, Carl I. Hovland, Irving L. Janis, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Arthur A. Lumsdaine, Fred D. Sheffield, M. Brewster Smith, Shirley A. Star, Edward A. Suchman, Robin M. Williams, Jr., and others who have later become prominent. Initial reluctance of upper echelons of the military hierarchy to permit polls among enlisted men was soon overcome as the utility of the results was demonstrated. Eventually more than half a million soldiers responded to the Research Branch's questionnaires. Even during the war, the research group was able to give some attention to improving survey methods, but its primary obligation was to produce quick answers to questions of immediate relevance to the military effort. At the end of hostilities the group had amassed an unparalleled body of data that could yield important methodological and substantive contributions to social science if it could be freely analyzed and interpreted.

General Osborn was able to negotiate the release of the data to the Council, and later to write in his foreword to the four-volume Council series, *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*, that "The Army has exercised no control on the interpretations or conclusions here expressed, which are the sole responsibility of the authors in their capacity as civilian social scientists." The publication was produced by Stauffer and his former colleagues of the Research Branch, who worked intensively for several years under the auspices of a committee appointed by the Council. Two volumes entitled *The American Soldier* present the substantive data; they are followed by two volumes of methodological studies, including a detailed presentation by Louis Guttman of the now famous scaling technique which he had earlier described in a Council bulletin, *The Prediction of Personal Adjustment* (1941), by Paul Horst and others.

Scaling

Further work on the theory and methods of scaling—the quantitative measurement of qualitative data—was carried on under the auspices of another Council committee in the 1950's by Warren S. Torgerson. His 1958 monograph reflected much progress since the Council appointed its first committee on Measurement of Attitudes and Public Opinion in 1928.

The transition from family farms to large-scale agriculture, which has led to a decline in the proportion of the nation's work force engaged in farming from 37 percent in 1900 to 4 percent in 1970, had gathered irresistible momentum in the third decade of this century, bringing with it a host of social and economic problems. The experiment stations attached to land grant colleges were the earliest recipients of federal funds for social and economic research, but much of their research on these problems was of poor quality, even in terms of the more primitive standards of social science research of the time. The Council undertook to remedy this. A Committee on

Social and Economic Research in Agriculture began work in 1925. Under the editorship of John D. Black, a series of twenty-one Council bulletins issued in the years 1930-33 presented critical appraisals of the scope and method of research in that field, with suggestions for improvement. Edwin G. Nourse headed special committees which provided 106 fellowships for advanced training of agricultural economists and rural sociologists, and organized a series of advanced courses taught by specialists from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Brookings Institution and attended largely by workers in government service. The committee remained active until 1942, giving special attention to agricultural marketing and to the problems of disadvantaged rural families, and providing advisory service with the aim of improving the federal Census of Agriculture.

With interruptions, the Council's work in the field of agricultural economics continued to 1966, with growing emphasis in the later years on world-wide problems of agriculture in relation to general economic development.

Despite revolutionary advances in plant genetics and agricultural techniques that make possible vastly increased agricultural productivity in industrially advanced countries, inadequate nutrition still prevails among the large part of the world's population that is dependent for its sustenance on the produce of traditional small-scale agriculture. The obstacles to realization of the potential benefits of advances in agricultural technology are economic and sociological: the economic institutions of peasant societies are not readily adapted to more efficient agricultural production, and the tradition-guided peasant resists change in the practices he has learned from his father. Special skills of social scientists are needed in coping with these obstacles, and the Social Science Research Council has contributed, often indirectly and inconspicuously, but none the less significantly, toward meeting that need.

S. P. Bose, an official of the West Bengal government's agriculture department, had been trained as an agronomist in Britain. In endeavoring to bring the benefits of his knowledge to the undernourished people of India, he was frustrated by an inability to have improved techniques put into practice, and he came to the United States for a year's study of rural sociology under Charles P. Loomis at Michigan State University.

Loomis, then head of the department of sociology, had earlier held two SSRC fellowships. As a predoctoral fellow in agricultural economics and rural sociology, he had studied the life cycle of farm families; on a postdoctoral fellowship he did field research in Germany on the methods applied in that nation's program of rural resettlement. Dr. Bose has credited his mentors at Michigan State with confirming his interest in the problem of receptivity to innovations in agriculture, and helping him learn from the experience of American rural sociologists. Bose, in turn, has been sent under United Nations auspices to share with workers in Africa his own experience in India and the methodological training he received in the United States. The causal links from Loomis' SSRC fellowships in the 1930's to the dissemination of improved agricultural practice in Ghana in the 1960's perhaps seem remote, but it is in such ways that social science gradually makes its effects felt.

Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., who studied agricultural economics at the University of Chicago as an SSRC fellow, was prominently involved in philanthropically funded efforts to improve agriculture in southeast Asian countries. For thirteen years he was a member of the staff of the Agricultural Development Council, and for several years its vice-president. The economic and social problems faced in the diffusion of new strains of grain have been a central concern of that organization. Allan R. Holmberg, a professor of anthropology at Cornell, arranged for the purchase by that university of a hacienda in Peru which served as a center both for teaching local

farmers more productive agricultural methods and for training young social scientists who would contribute further to improving the economic life of primitive agricultural communities elsewhere. Holmberg had developed his interest in such communities years before as a predoctoral fellow of the Council.

Eugene A. Wilkening, professor of rural sociology at the University of Wisconsin, has continued throughout his career to specialize in research on acceptance of innovations in farming, a problem on which he worked as a predoctoral research training fellow of the Council.

The Council currently does not have a committee or program in the field of agriculture but, as the examples cited indicate, it has in the course of past decades helped to lay the social scientific foundations for ameliorative work that now continues under other auspices, both governmental and nongovernmental.

The Behavioral Study of Politics

The Council has been in the forefront of a movement toward more incisive and realistic research on political behavior and the functioning of political institutions. Charles E. Merriam, who was one of the principal founders of the Council, was also a vigorous advocate of a political science that would observe and analyze the actual political behavior of people, rather than being wholly preoccupied with the formal structure and doctrines of political institutions and the writings of political philosophers. Austin Ranney, reviewing the Council's work in this field, said of Merriam that his pleas from the mid-1920's on for a more scientific as well as a more socially useful study of politics had little immediate impact on the discipline's research and teaching, but his associates and students—notably V. O. Key, Jr., Harold D. Lasswell, Gabriel A. Almond, Herbert A. Simon, and David B. Truman—all became leaders of the post—1945 movement which sought all and achieved many of his goals. While the empirical study of political behavior is nothing new in the world-witness for example de Tocqueville's and Bryce's "field studies" of American politics in the nineteenth century, and Stuart A. Rice's pioneer statistical study of the voting behavior of farmers and workers in the early twentieth century—the mainstream of academic political science until recently tended to be isolated from the actual, as distinguished from ideal, forms and processes of government. The Council has contributed substantially to changing this state of affairs.

Several Council committees have dealt during the last two dozen years with different aspects of the field, but all have sought, by a behavioral approach, to escape from the formalism that had characterized the discipline of political science. The first of these was the Committee on Political Behavior, appointed in 1949 with V. O. Key as its first chairman and with Pendleton Herring, then president of the Council, as an active participant in its work. David B. Truman, another of the original members,, recently wrote that:

> The origins of the Committee lay in dissatisfaction with a political science that was intellectually fragmented, and for the most part unequipped to look behind official formalism, anecdotal and journalistic. It was a political science unready to address the large (or small but strategically significant) questions concerning politics and political orders—the persistent questions of authority and distribution of power, of change and stability, of super- and subordination, of succession and accountability—with modern techniques and with a language capable of ordering pertinent empirical data in terms useful for dealing with . . . classic issues of political life. . . . The Committee [insisted] . .

. that "political behavior" was not a "field" within political science but an approach pertinent to the whole range of problems in the study of politics.

The committee early reached consensus that it should be guided by two methodological emphases: "the notion of process" (i.e., recurrent patterns of action on the part of all pertinent actors in political systems) and the device of comparative analysis. This was a far cry from the traditional textual analysis of documents. The first of these methodological precepts led to the committee's involvement in studies of voting and its encouragement of the creation of archives of electoral data and data from surveys of citizens' political behavior. The emphasis on comparative studies was reinforced by current interest in the political development of newly independent states, and led in 1954 to the spinning off of a separate Committee on Comparative Politics, headed by Gabriel A. Almond, which focused its attention on the interplay of interests in the political processes of nations of widely diverse historical backgrounds, including both those that had only recently emerged from colonial status and those with long experience in self-government.

By 1963 the "behavioral revolution" which the Council had done much to bring about was well-advanced, though still resisted in some quarters, and there was wide acceptance of the canons of more rigorous and quantitative research on political processes. It was time to move forward to a new frontier in the study of politics. The Committee on Political Behavior was succeeded in 1964 by the Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes, which undertook "to explore the possibilities of studying substantive policy questions," the predecessor committee having focused its attention on the processes by which policies are formed. Could the substance of policies, their content and their impacts, be investigated without sacrificing objectivity and methodological rigor? The implications of that question were explored at length in conferences in 1966 and 1967. Concluding that objective policy studies are both feasible and urgently needed, the committee supported research on the impacts of certain civil rights laws on the Black communities in several American cities. The committee also provided financial assistance for a longitudinal study of an American city in the wake of civil disturbance, conducted by Joel D. Aberbach and Jack L. Walker of the University of Michigan. Their *Race in the City: Political Trust and Public Policy in the New Urban System* (1973) is based upon this research.

In keeping with the methodological orientation of its precursors, the committee turned its attention to cross-national comparative studies. Meanwhile, the Committee on Comparative Politics was becoming increasingly concerned with policy studies; on the basis of that convergence of interests, these two committees were succeeded in 1972 by a new Committee on the Comparative Study of Public Policy. Here once again was exemplified the Council's practice of redirecting its efforts toward the "cutting edge" of social science. The terms of reference of the new committee and the composition of its membership cut across the boundary between the United States and the rest of the world, thus marking another step away from provincialism.

Research in political behavior calls for skills of which older generations of political scientists scarcely felt a lack. (Even in the 1950's, V. O. Key found himself obliged to teach the simplest of statistical methods to his graduate students of politics at Harvard.) Through its fellowship program and its sponsorship of summer training institutes, the Council has offered numerous political scientists training which they did not acquire in their formal academic work.

"In sum," writes Ranney, "while the main impact of the Committee on Political Behavior was on the discipline of political science, the work it sparked has also been felt by historians, social psychologists, sociologists, legal scholars, and by law schools, courts, Congress, and state legislatures."

Research on National Economies

In the wake of World War II the economic revival of technologically advanced nations and the economic development of technologically backward and politically unstable countries containing the majority of the world's population presented problems of great urgency. Both statesmen and scholars were apprehensive of economic stagnation or worse, and economic planning—anathema to the economic liberalism of an earlier time—came to be regarded as necessary. A great deal of preliminary groundwork, both theoretical and empirical, had to be done before economists would be able to cope with the problems and to evaluate possible ways of dealing with them.

Simon Kuznets, the chairman of the Council's Committee on Economic Growth from 1949 to 1968, observed that "in economics, the problems of the growth of nations have been lying dormant practically since the middle of the nineteenth century." In a memorandum submitted to the Council in 1948, he pointed out that economic development is affected by a multitude of factors to which economists had traditionally given insufficient attention: science and technology, natural resources, the efficiency of the state and other agencies of social control, in fact the whole pattern of social organization and culture. The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, in awarding the Nobel Prize in economics to Kuznets in 1971, cited "his empirically founded interpretation of economic growth which has led to a new and deepened insight into the economic and social structure and process of development." The reference to social structure is not without significance; the initial membership of the Committee on Economic Growth appointed by the Council in 1949 in response to Kuznets' initiative included a sociologist and an anthropologist along with several economists. The committee retained its interdisciplinary composition throughout the two decades of its lifetime, and its work continued to reflect its founder's conviction that purely economic factors are insufficient to explain the growth or decline of economies.

The topics of eleven of the sixteen conferences organized by the committee suggest the broad range of factors to which it gave attention: quantitative description of technological change, the role of cities in economic development and cultural change, entrepreneurship, the state and economic growth, commitment of the labor force, natural resources, the rate and direction of inventive activity, relations, between agriculture and economic growth, the role of education, demographic trends, social structure and social mobility. The committee's success in enlisting the efforts of scholars with such varied interests can be ascribed in great measure to the continuous close collaboration of Kuznets and another economist of exceptionally broad scholarly interests, Paul Webbink, vice president of the Council.

Several of the committee's conferences were cosponsored by other organizations, including the Council's own Committee on Social Implications of Atomic Energy and Technological Change, the University of Chicago's Research Center in Economic Development and Cultural Change, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies, the Harvard Research Center in Entrepreneurial History, Resources for the Future, the National Bureau of Economic Research, and the Population Council. In addition to publications resulting directly from the committee's activities in this country, a large number of scholars in foreign countries were induced by Kuznets to contribute publications relating to economic growth in many parts of the world.

Joseph J. Spengler, a member of the committee, summed up its accomplishments as follows:

> The publications resulting from the activities of the committee have increased manyfold our knowledge of the forces shaping growth and development in the West and in Japan since and even before the early nineteenth century. They present much of this knowledge in quantitative terms, thus enabling students to sift out the separate contributions of various kinds of inputs while appreciating the long time dimensions of some of the forces at work. The studies make for caution against accepting at face value some of the commonly employed indicators of development and welfare and against too exclusive resort to simplistic models whence recalcitrant elements have been abstracted. From the standpoint of the Council, especially important is the evidence of the complexity of growth processes, of the inadequacy of any particular discipline to cope satisfactorily with this complexity, and of the need for solid interdisciplinary approaches to many of the problems faced, some old and some precipitates of the growth process itself.

In 1959, midway in the period when the Committee on Economic Growth was active, a Committee on Economic Stability was set up under the chairmanship of R. A. Gordon of the University of California. As an epilogue, so to speak, to a theme that had preoccupied the National Bureau of Economic Research in much earlier years, the new committee posed the question: Is the business cycle obsolete? For an attack on that problem, more powerful tools were at hand than had been available long ago to Wesley C. Mitchell, one of the Council's founding fathers, for his pioneering work on economic cycles and trends. Econometrics had reached a high state of development, and computer technology now made it practical to deal with large bodies of data. The committee decided to concentrate on econometric model building, which in its judgment was "ripe for a major breakthrough." Lawrence R. Klein of the University of Pennsylvania and James S. Duesenberry of Harvard assumed the task of designing an econometric model of the United States economy that would be amenable to empirical testing and practical application. Four years later, after a series of lengthy conferences, they and their colleagues had produced such a model. Continuing responsibility for periodic updating of the parameters of the model was handed over to the Brookings Institution in 1963, in keeping with the Council's policy of limiting its commitments to the initiation of innovations and avoiding responsibility for carrying on repetitive activities whose value its pilot studies have demonstrated.

Pursuing further its central interest in economic stability and instability, the committee addressed itself to two special problems: By what processes do the monetary and fiscal policies of states affect rates of economic activity? And how are economic cycles transmitted from country to country? Bert Hickman of Stanford University, Franco Modigliani of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Albert Ando of the University of Pennsylvania undertook to work on the relation of monetary policy and cycles; they constructed another model of the national economy, especially adapted to the problem at hand, which became known as the MIT-Pennsylvania-SSRC Model, in distinction from the Brookings Model.

Meanwhile, consultations with economists from the United Kingdom, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Japan led to the formation of two working teams, one for North America and Japan and the other for Europe, which, as Project LINK, is linking the international sectors of the econometric models of several national economies.

Possibly influenced by the thinking of the Committee on Economic Growth, and encouraged by the success of its econometric model, the Committee on Economic Stability considered the possibility of "a model encompassing a broader range of social behavior and using talents quite different from those in econometrics." While there appear to have been no immediate tangible results of that deliberation, it as well as the work of Kuznets' committee may conceivably have planted some of the intellectual seeds that have produced the growing demand for something

more adequate than the gross national product as an index of national well-being and that has given rise to current efforts to develop "social indicators."

The work of the two committees just discussed yielded a great store of information on the workings of the economies of many countries, but the economy of the most populous country of all, China, where a quarter of the people on earth live, remained virtually a *terra incognita* (or, in the apt misspelling in the stenographic report of a Congressional hearing, *terror incognito*). In 1961 Simon Kuznets headed a new Committee on the Economy of China while still chairman of the Committee on Economic Growth. Walter Galenson of Cornell University, as director of research for the committee, recruited a mixed team of Western and Asian economists who sought to collate and interpret as much information as could be found on the economy of a nation whose government strictly and rather effectively banned the export of economic data.

The Chinese economy in historical perspective was the topic of a 1973 conference sponsored by a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Contemporary China. The conferees, including several who had earlier taken part in the work of the Committee on the Economy of China, focused their attention on the several decades before the revolution of 1949, seeking to observe factors which may have conditioned subsequent economic developments under the communist regime.

Population Studies

In the field of population studies as in many others, the Council took an early lead in identifying salient problems and initiating research which in the course of years would be carried further by other organizations. Dorothy Swaine Thomas summarized the first three decades' work in an article published in 1952, from which much of the following account is excerpted.

In the spring of 1924 the Council received its first research grant: $18,000 for a study of migration and the mechanization of industry under the newly formed Committee on Scientific Aspects of Human Migration. During the next five years this committee and its successor, the Advisory Committee on Population, laid out and supervised a comprehensive plan of research which yielded an extraordinarily distinguished series of publications. Among these were a monumental statistical-historical compilation, interpretation, and analysis of data on international migration directed by Walter F. Willcox and published in 1929-31 by the National Bureau of Economic Research.

These committees also sponsored a number of studies on Negro migration from the South, directed by Frank A. Ross of Columbia University. One of these was his student Clyde V. Kiser's pioneering attempt to explicate some of the economic, psychological, and cultural factors, at both origin and destination, that affected the course, timing, magnitude, and characteristics of an identifiable stream of migrants from St. Helena Island, South Carolina.

Paul S. Taylor's 1928-32 monographs on Mexican labor in the United States, which provided important data and insights on problems involved in the assimilation of Mexican migrants into American communities, constituted a third major group of publications under the auspices of this committee. Although the Advisory Committee on Population was discontinued in 1929, there was apparently no slackening of interest in population research on the part of the Council, for two additional committees in the field were appointed within the next two years.

In 1934 the Council sponsored another project in population research, this time in response to the recommendation of its Committee on Commissions of Inquiry on Public Problems

that the redistribution of population then taking place in the United States be examined. The study was carried on under the guidance of a Committee on Population Redistribution with Joseph H. Willits of the University of Pennsylvania as chairman. This research project was stimulated by the economic emergency of the early depression years, and by the unprecedented measures that were being undertaken or proposed by the federal government to alleviate unemployment by moving and redistributing the population. Directed towards assessing the economic gains that might be achieved through migration and balancing these against the social costs of community dislocation and human uprooting, the study utilized both comparative and historical approaches, and systematized statistical and other data bearing on both unguided and controlled migration. It formed the basis of a comprehensive report by Carter Goodrich, director of the study, and his associates, and of a number of supplementary monographs, primarily methodological in scope, such as C. Warren Thornthwaite's 1936 analysis of net internal migration.

Also occasioned by the critical state of the national economy was the appointment of the Committee on Social Aspects of the Depression in 1936. Of the thirteen research memoranda prepared and published under its auspices by the end of 1937, three dealt with population phenomena during the depression years: Samuel A. Stouffer's and Paul F. Lazarsfeld's on the family, Warren S. Thompson's on internal migration, and Donald R. Young's on minority peoples. The orientation of the committees just mentioned was undoubtedly attributable to the fact that population problems were currently receiving exceptional attention both from laymen as matters of social policy and from social scientists as a promising field of research.

In contrast to the immediate relevance of the several projects just mentioned to problems of public concern, a Committee on Migration Differentials appointed in 1936 was charged simply with raising standards of research in a field characterized at the time as "a chaotic, ill-defined, and unsystematized mass of what seemed to be planlessly empirical studies on the one hand or dataless speculative essays on the other." Scientifically acceptable American studies then dealt either with the unprecedented northward movement of Negroes after World War I or with the dramatic uprooting of peoples from areas of distress during the severe depression of the 1930's. Excellent as some of these studies were, the committee found that even they suffered from a lack of knowledge of migration and migrants under less extreme conditions, and that there were few norms against which their findings could be evaluated; there were no explicit data on internal migration in the United States in the decennial census or other official sources at that time.

Among some 200 American and European studies of migration the committee found only five that seemed worthy of extended repetition and a dozen or so others that had promising implications for future research. The committee's 1938 report was undoubtedly influential in bringing about improvements in the collection and analysis of data on internal migration in the United States. By 1950, when a new Council committee was appointed to bring up to date the results of the former committee's work, it was able to draw upon vastly improved data. The decennial census of 1940 was the first to include a direct question bearing on internal migration, and the 1950 census also inquired about previous residence. Between the two censuses, a remarkable series of analyses of migrants were prepared on the basis of the Census Bureau's Current Population Surveys, and Social Security records became available as another major source of data. After 1950, the Council and the Bureau of the Census collaborated on several programs in the field of population research (see Chapter 7).

Linguistics and the Social Sciences

Like Moliere's bourgeois gentleman who spoke prose all his life without knowing it, social scientists have generally taken for granted the languages and patterns of verbal behavior which uniquely characterize human societies and without which human social institutions would be inconceivable. While social scientists neglected to investigate the relationships of language and society, linguists studied language virtually in vacua. In recent years, the Council has enlisted social scientists and linguists in a common effort to understand the interrelations of language and society. The following account of their work is drawn freely from a 1974 article by Susan Ervin-Tripp, "Two Decades of Council Activity in the Rapprochement of Linguistics and Social Science."

In 1951, an interuniversity summer research seminar was held at the instigation of John B. Carroll, a Harvard psychologist. The participants in the seminar discovered the term "psycholinguistics" and went on to specify areas of profitable interchange in the study of mother tongue acquisition, language structure and thought, the analysis of linguistic structure with psychological methods, and the interrelations of dialect and social class. Carroll and Charles E. Osgood, an experimental psychologist interested in learning and symbolic processes, were at the center of these interdisciplinary activities.

An aftermath of the Cornell meeting was the creation of the Council's Committee on Linguistics and Psychology, which generated an active decade of conferences. The first and most general of these was a summer seminar on psycholinguistics held in conjunction with the annual Linguistics Institute of the Linguistic Society of America, Bloomington, Indiana in 1953. The seminar had a tripartite conceptual framework: linguistics, information theory, and the "learning theorists' conception of language as a system of habits."

The first fruit of the seminar was a monograph entitled *Psycholinguistics: A Survey of Theory and Research Problems* (1954), edited by Osgood and Sebeok. This comprehensive survey dealt with areas touched on at the Cornell seminar in more complete programmatic and theoretical form. In some cases it provided insightful new views of old issues and in the next decade research followed to realize the prospectus. The monograph was reissued a decade later and is still not out of date. On reading it, one is struck with an anomaly perhaps characteristic of integrative efforts at their inception. In almost every respect, contemporary psycholinguistics has overthrown its progenitors. One might argue that the very forces which led to the creation of the new field were brewing change in the parent fields. The psychology of learning dominant in the 1953 seminar was associationist; current psycholinguistics is better characterized as "cognitive," emphasizing the active, integrative operations of the mind.

The committee had several major accomplishments in the following decade. By spotlighting a series of important issues which required cross-disciplinary work, it not only led people to think about these issues; it helped to legitimize research on them in the eyes of funding agencies. Various conferences and projects under its auspices brought together scholars to discuss problems which some of them are still studying two decades later.

The conferences sponsored by the committee included a wide range of topics: bilingualism, content analysis, association, meaning, style, linguistic universals, and aphasia. Four of these led to publications, on style in language, trends in content analysis, approaches to the study of aphasia, and universals of language.

In a major research undertaking in 1955 and 1956, called the Southwest Project in

Psycholinguistics, field teams of psychologists, linguists, and anthropologists led by John B. Carroll studied the relations of language and behavior among monolingual and bilingual members of five American Indian and Spanish-American communities.

Interest in psycholinguistics was shared by the Council's Committee on Intellective Processes Research, which sponsored a conference in 1961 on the acquisition of language. The papers from that conference have frequently been reprinted, and are regarded as basic contributions in a major area of psycholinguistics. The present Committee on Cognitive Research carries on this interest in developmental language studies.

The Committee on Linguistics and Psychology was discharged in 1961: its mission had been accomplished and psycholinguistics was flourishing. Appointment of the Committee on Sociolinguistics in 1963 marked a next step in the integration of linguistics and the social sciences. In the case of psycholinguistics, the initiative had come from within psychology, perhaps because it was evident at that time that the psychological models derived from animal studies could not accommodate the problems of complex human behavior. In the case of sociolinguistics, linguists, spurred by Charles A. Ferguson, a member of the former Committee on Linguistics and Psychology, took the initiative. Then director of the Center for Applied Linguistics, Ferguson was aware of policy decisions regarding language which many governments were making with an inadequate research base. The original Committee on Sociolinguistics included senior scholars in sociology and linguistics who were interested in cross-cultural and comparative research, the language of social groups, and the relation of language to political integration.

The first major activity of the new committee was a seminar held in Bloomington in conjunction with the Summer Linguistics Institute in 1964. The seminar brought together sociologists, anthropologists, and linguists to discuss a range of earlier work on languages in contact, linguistic indices of social stratification, and the relation of social and political change to the linguistic integration of societies. Participants in the seminar prepared a special issue of the journal *Sociological Inquiry* (Spring 1966) on a variety of sociolinguistic topics.

During the next few years there were two small conferences, concerning language problems in cross-cultural research and multilingualism and social change, and two major conferences resulting respectively in books, *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (1968) and *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages* (1971). The focus of the first of these was on societal issues. Developing nations are often multilingual; they must adopt a *lingua franca*; standardize diversity; develop literacy; and find means to communicate in schools, industries, cities, and political assemblies. Political decisions about language choice affect the power of competing groups and affect national unification, as the blood shed over language differences testifies. The second conference had as its focus the emergence of pidgin and creole languages in multilingual situations where conditions of marginality prevent the learning of the linguistic norms of a contact group. Pidgins and creoles provide the most vivid instance of communicative need generating a code, and provide an ongoing laboratory for the study of language origins. Both conferences brought together scholars who had studied similar conditions in widely separate parts of the world, and defined a range of issues for collaboration between linguists and others. Surveys of linguistic problems of ethnic minorities in New York, Washington, D.C., Detroit, and elsewhere were initiated independently, but many of the individuals involved were members of the committee, and it played a leading role in stimulating the spread of such work.

Another interest of the committee has been "micro-sociolinguistics" or the study of face-to-face interaction. A major project underwritten by the committee was a program of cross-

cultural study of the acquisition of communicative competence. That project had three foci: cross-linguistic study of semantic, phonological, and grammatical development in children; the development of the social functions and social rules of language in children, or child sociolinguistics; and the ethnography of communication, the study of the nexus of beliefs and practices regarding language which are the milieu of the child's language learning. The project began with the development of a field manual by a cross-disciplinary faculty and student group in Berkeley, and the preparation of dissertations based on studies in field sites in eight countries. Summer workshops sponsored by the committee in 1968 brought together thirty-two students with seven field workers, faculty, and visiting scholars for intensive study of these three problem areas.

Two new journals have been initiated by members of the committee, one of these, *Language in Society*, with the committee's active encouragement. Continuing series of exchanges of working papers have resulted from conferences sponsored by the committee on problems of communication in the classroom and other topics.

The essential thrust of the committee's work has been described as tending toward a new perspective on language as a means to social ends. The committee's present chairman, Dell Hymes, believes that sociolinguistics will not and should not become a discrete discipline. The emergence of a new generation of social scientists who can discuss linguistic problems without immediately identifying themselves as linguists, psychologists, anthropologists, or sociologists is cited as evidence of progress in that direction.

The Social Sciences and the Professions

In the 1950's, committees on Psychiatry and Social Science Research and on Preventive Medic ine and Social Science brought together representatives of these fields to assess the contributions that the basic social sciences could make toward more effective medical knowledge and practice, and conversely, what the experience of practitioners might contribute to basic science.

Between the 1920's and early 1930's when committees on crime were active, and 1959, when the Committee on Political Behavior initiated a program of grants for research on American governmental and legal processes, there was no Council committee concerned explicitly with research in law and jurisprudence. Conventional legal scholarship and research had been so largely preoccupied with exegesis of legal scriptures and averse to behavioral studies that its exponents often found little common ground with social scientists. However, lawyers interested in fostering social science research on law and legal processes have from time to time served as members-at-large on the Council's board of directors, a number of social scientists have studied law on fellowships of the Council, and the Council has conducted summer training institutes on law for social scientists.

Problems of supply and demand for professionally trained persons and for scientists, with implications for educational policy, have been obviously of concern to the several research councils. The Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, of which the Council is a member, has twice appointed commissions to examine the situation and outlook. The first Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training worked from 1949 to 1954 and published a report by its director of research, Dael Wolfle, entitled *America's Resources of Specialized Talent* (1954). The second Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Education was active from 1963 to 1969. Its staff, headed by John K. Folger, produced a report

on *Human Resources and Higher Education* (1970). Substitution of the word *education* for *training* in the title of the second commission indicates that while the first group's attention was focused especially on an inventory of talent as indicated by academic credentials and test scores, the second dealt to a greater extent with the implications of its findings for the educational system of the nation.

Survey of the Behavioral and Social Sciences (BASS Survey)

In late 1966, the Council and the National Academy of Sciences jointly appointed a committee to prepare a report on the status and future needs of the social science disciplines. Under the chairmanship of Ernest R. Hilgard of Stanford University and the co-chairmanship of Henry W. Riecken of the Council, and with funds provided by the National Institute of Health, the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Russell Sage Foundation, the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee undertook an extensive survey of the social sciences in the United States.

The survey required a number of data-gathering procedures. The basic data on training, research, and finances came from a sample survey of universities granting the Ph.D. degree. This survey, carried out under contract by the Bureau of Social Science Research in Washington, D.C., included questionnaires to departmental chairmen in arts and science faculties; to university financial officers; to professional schools that carry out research in the social and behavioral sciences; and to the numerous institutes, laboratories, and centers performing such research within the university but outside the administrative structures of the departments and professional schools. Other data were obtained from university, industrial, and governmental reports.

The overall findings of the survey were published in a report entitled *The Behavioral and Social Sciences: Outlook and Needs* (1969). The six major recommendations of the survey were (1) that substantial financial and intellectual support be given to the development of a system of social indicators; (2) that nongovernmental behavioral and social scientists begin to prepare the equivalent of an "Annual Social Report to the Nation"; (3) that a special commission be established to investigate the procedural and technical problems of devising a national data system for social scientific purposes; (4) that an interagency commission be established within the federal government to investigate the problems of protecting the anonymity of respondents in sample surveys; (5) that universities consider the establishment of broadly based training and research programs in the form of a "Graduate School of Applied Behavioral Science"; and (6) that federal funds for research increase annually 12 to 18 percent to sustain normal growth.

In addition to the basic survey, panels from each of the disciplines met and wrote reports on the status and needs of their fields. Each report was published as a separate volume. Included are reports on anthropology, economics, geography, history as a social science, political science, psychology, psychiatry as a behavioral science, sociology, and the social science aspects of statistics, mathematics, and computation. Although in a series as extensive as this there is naturally considerable variation in quality, the volumes as a whole provide a useful and revealing picture of the social sciences in the United States.

Social Indicators

A major new undertaking of the Council was marked by the establishment in 1972 of the Center for Coordination of Research on Social Indicators in Washington, D.C. The Center's work is guided by an Advisory and Planning Committee headed by Otis Dudley Duncan, professor of

sociology at the University of Arizona. The eleven-person committee is interdisciplinary and international in membership, drawing from the fields of sociology, statistics, social psychology, and economics, and from Germany, Norway, Canada, and the United States. The committee brings a wide range of knowledge to the task of coordinating research on the measurement and analysis of social trends, drawing on the members' experience in universities, private research organizations, and government agencies.

Expressions of need for systematic and objective means of monitoring social change emerged in the writings of professional social scientists, social commentators, legislators, and governmental administrators in the United States in the mid-1960's, when the term "social indicators" became a part of the social science lexicon. But the intellectual history of the social indicators movement extends much further into the past, and the Council has long played a part in it.

William F. Ogburn, an influential member of the Council from 1925 to 1941 and its chairman in the years 1933-36, was the author of a seminal work on the process of social change, and the director of research for the President's (Hoover) Research Committee on Social Trends. Four of the six committee members responsible for the monumental report of that committee, *Recent Social Trends in the United States* (1933), were members of the Council: Wesley C. Mitchell (chairman), Charles E. Merriam (vice-chairman), Shelby M. Harrison (secretary-treasurer), and Mr. Ogburn.

In the interval between the 1930's and the 1970's, the problems involved in measuring social change and devising indices of social well-being and the quality of life occupied the attention of various committees of the Council, notably the committees on Economic Growth and on Economic Stability. Both of these committees, while primarily concerned with measures of economic activity, called attention to the inadequacy of such measures, by themselves, as indices of human well-being.

In addition to Duncan, social scientists who have recently played prominent roles in the social indicators movement include a former research training fellow of the Council, Mancur Olson, who served as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Social Indicators in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and was the author of *Toward a Social Report*, the first publication of the federal government to specify the kinds of information needed but not available in existing official statistics; and Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, who before becoming president of the Council was active in the Russell Sage Foundation's work on social indicators and had collaborated with Wilbert E. Moore in editing a symposium, *Indicators of Social Change: Concepts and Measurements.*

The Center seeks to stimulate communication among researchers, including those in the academic community and those working on applied planning and policy problems at federal, state, and local levels, and to facilitate the sharing of information about approaches, data, and methods. Toward that end, the Center maintains a library and reference service, publishes a newsletter, and initiates contacts with numerous researchers in the United States and abroad.

A central purpose of the Center is to set in motion those processes by which fruitful lines of basic inquiry and applied analysis may be identified and encouraged, by which gaps and oversights may be recognized, by which nonproductive approaches may be appraised and corrected, and by which common methodological and theoretical problems may be identified and solved. The key role played by the Center's Advisory and Planning Committee in these efforts is illustrated by the Committee's exploration, in collaboration with the Council's Committee on

Economic Stability, of the prospects for development of socioeconomic models; its symposium on *Social Indicators, 1973*, the first publication of its kind to be issued by the federal government; and its plans to commission a series of review papers on methodological and substantive problems in social indicators development, the first of which will address the topic of cohort analysis.

Finally, through such means as conferences, working groups, and special projects, the committee and the Center's staff seek to encourage the standardization of measurement procedures required by the comparative and longitudinal perspectives inherent in the concept of social indicators; to stimulate the replication of significant past studies and the production of new statistics in areas lacking systematic data; and to advise those responsible for continuing data collection programs and archives of social statistics how to make use of the best scientific methods in tabulating, analyzing, and reporting their data, and in making their resources available to others in suitable form. Through the interest and initiative of the committee, the Center has begun projects in criminal justice statistics, the standardization of survey personal-history questions, and the development of social indicators from survey archives.

The establishment of the Center was made possible, and its current work is largely supported, by grants from the National Science Foundation.

Selected Bibliography

Aberbach, Joel D., and Jack L. Walker. *Race in the City: Political Trust and Public Policy in the New Urban System.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973. Report on research assisted by the Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes.

Aitken, Hugh G. I., ed. *The State and Economic Growth: Papers of a Conference Held on October 11-13, 1956, under the Auspices of the Committee on Economic Growth*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1959.

Anderson, C. Arnold, and Mary jean Bowman, eds. *Education and Economic Development.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965. Outgrowth of a conference cosponsored by the Committee on Economic Growth and the University of Chicago Comparative Education Center, April 4-6, 1963.

Ball, R. J., ed. *The International Linkage of National Economic Models*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1973. Sponsored by the Committee on Economic Stability.

Barker, Roger G., in collaboration with Beatrice A. Wright, Lee Meyerson, and Mollie R. Gonick. *Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 55, revised edition, 1953. Sponsored by the Committee on Social Adjustment.

Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee. *The Behavioral and Social Sciences: Outlook and Needs*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969. Report prepared under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Science and Public Policy and the Social Science Research Council Committee on Problems and Policy.

Bellugi, Ursula, and Roger Brown, eds. *The Acquisition of Language: Report of the [Third] Conference Sponsored by the Committee on Intellective Processes Research*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Serial No. 92), 1964.

Bergson, Abram, and Simon Kuznets, eds. *Economic Trends in the Soviet Union*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963. Outgrowth of a conference, sponsored by the Committee on Economic Growth, May 6-8,1961.

Black, John D., ed. Social Science Research Council Bulletins 1-21, 1930-33. "Scope and Method" Series, prepared under the direction of the Advisory Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture.

Bronfenbrenner, Martin, ed. *Is the Business Cycle Obsolete?* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969. Product of a conference sponsored by the Committee on Economic Stability in cooperation with the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, April 3-7, 1967.

Butlin, N. G. *Australian Domestic Product, Investment and Foreign Borrowing, 1861-1938/39*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1962. Prepared with the aid of the Committee on Economic Growth.

Campbell, Angus, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller. *The Voter Decides*. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1954. Report of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center study of voting behavior in the 1952 presidential election, sponsored by the Committee on Political Behavior.

Carroll, John B. "Linguistic Relativity, Contrastive Linguistics, and Language Learning," *IRAL* (International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching), l(l):1-20, 1963. A partial summary of findings of the Southwest Project in Comparative Psycholinguistics.

The Census of Agriculture. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 40, 1937. Prepared under the direction of a committee appointed jointly by the Advisory Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture and the American Farm Economic Association.

Clausen, John A., ed., and others. *Socialization and Society*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968. Report of the Committee on Socialization and Social Structure.

"Committee on Political Behavior, 1949-1964, Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes, 1964-1972: A Report on the Activities of the Committees." Unpublished report, Social Science Research Council, August 1973.

Deane, Phyllis, and W. A. Cole. *British Economic Growth, 1688-1959*. University of Cambridge Department of Applied Economics Monographs, No. 8. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1962. Sponsored by the Committee on Economic Growth.

Duesenberry, James S., Gary Fromm, Lawrence R. Klein, and Edwin Kuh, eds. *The Brookings Quarterly Econometric Model of the United States*. Chicago: Rand McNally &

Company, and Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1965. Sponsored by the Committee on Economic Stability.

Eckstein, Alexander, Walter Galenson, and Ta-Chung Liu, eds. *Economic Trends in Communist China*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1968. Product of a conference sponsored by the Committee on the Economy of China, October 21-23, 1965.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. "Two Decades of Council Activity in the Rapprochement of Linguistics and Social Science," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 28:1-4, March 1974.

Executive Office of the President: Office of Management and Budget. *Social Indicators, 1973*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Fishman, Joshua A., Charles A. Ferguson, and Jyotirindra Das Gupta, eds. *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968. Papers prepared for the conference sponsored by the Committee on Sociolinguistics, November 1-3, 1966.

Folger, John K., Helen S. Astin, and Alan E. Bayer. *Human Resources and Higher Education: Staff Report of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Education*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Foster, George M. Problems in *Intercultural Health Programs*. Social Science Research Council Pamphlet 12. New York, April 1958. Sponsored by the Committee on Preventive Medicine and Social Science Research.

Frazier, E. Franklin. *The Negro Family in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. Prepared under the auspices of the Advisory Committee on Interracial Relations.

Galenson, Walter. "The Committee on the Economy of China: A Review of Its Work, 1961-70," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 24:1-6, March 1970.

Goodrich, Carter, and others. *Migration and Economic Opportunity: The Report of the Study of Population Redistribution*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1936. Sponsored by the Committee on Population Redistribution.

Greenberg, Joseph H., ed. *Universals of Language: Report of a Conference Held at Dobbs Ferry, New York, April 13-15, 1961*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1963. Sponsored by the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology.

Harris, Chester W., ed. *Problems in Measuring Change*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963. Proceedings of a conference sponsored by the Committee on Personality Development in Youth, April 30-May 2, 1962.

Herskovits, Melville J., and Mitchell Harwitz, eds. *Economic Transition in Africa.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964. Based on papers prepared for the Conference on the Economies of SubSaharan Africa, sponsored by the Committee on Economic Growth, November 16-18, 1961.

Hess, Robert D., and Roberta M. Bear, eds. *Early Education: Current Theory, Research, and Action*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1968. Papers prepared for the Conference on Preschool Education, sponsored by the Committee on Learning and the

Educational Process, February 7-9, 1966.

Hickman, Bert G., ed. *Econometric Models of Cyclical Behavior.* Studies in Income & Wealth, of the Conference on Research in Income and Wealth, No. 36, Vols. 1-2. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972. Papers of a conference jointly sponsored by the Committee on Economic Stability and the National Bureau of Economic Research, Conference on Research in Income and Wealth, November 14-15, 1969.

Holtzman, Wayne H., ed. *Computer-Assisted Instruction, Testing, and Guidance.* New York: Harper & Row, 1970. Product of a conference cosponsored by the Committee on Learning and the Educational Process and the College Entrance Examination Board Commission on Tests, October .21-22, 1968.

Horst, Paul, and others. *The Prediction of Personal Adjustment: A Survey of Logical Problems and Research Techniques, with Illustrative Application to Problems of Vocational Selection, School Success, Marriage, and Crime*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 48, 1941. Prepared for the Committee on Social Adjustment under the direction of the Subcommittee on Prediction of Social Adjustment.

Hovland, Carl I. "Computer Simulation of Thinking," *American Psychologist*, 15:687-693, November 1960. Statement on the concerns of the Committee on Simulation of Cognitive Processes.

Hovland, Carl I., Arthur A. Lumsdaine, and Fred D. Sheffield. *Experiments in Mass Communication.* Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Vol. 3. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Analysis of Experience of the Research Branch, Information and Education Division, ASF.

Hyman, Herbert H., and others. *Interviewing in Social Research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954. Sponsored by the Joint Committee on Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes and Consumer Wants.

Hymes, Dell, ed. *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971. Product of a conference cosponsored by the Committee on Sociolinguistics and the University of the West Indies, April 9-12, 1968.

Israel, Joachim, and Henri Tajfel, eds. *The Context of Social Psychology: A Critical Assessment.* European Monographs in Social Psychology 2. New York: Academic Press, 1972. Outgrowth of discussions at the European Research Training Seminar in Experimental Social Psychology, University of Louvain, cosponsored by the Committee on Transnational Social Psychology and the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, July 31-September 2, 1967.

Johnson, Charles S. *The Negro in American Civilization.* New York: Henry Holt, 1930. Prepared under the auspices of the Advisory Committee on Interracial Relations.

Johnson, Guion G. *A Social History of the Sea Islands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930. Prepared under the auspices of the Advisory Committee on Interracial Relations.

Johnson, Guy B. *Folk Culture on St. Helena Island*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930. Prepared under the auspices of the Advisory Committee on Interracial Relations.

Kalven, Harry, Jr., and Richard D. Schwartz. "Administration of the Law of Torts: The 1961 Summer Research Training Institute on Interrelations of Law and Other Social Institutions," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 16:2-6, March 1962.

Kennedy, Louise V. *The Negro Peasant Turns City ward*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930. Sponsored by the Advisory Committee on Population.

Kessen, William, and Clementina Kuhlman, eds. *Thought in the Young Child: Report of a Conference on Intellective Development, with Particular Attention to the Work of lean Piaget.* Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Serial No. 83), 1962.

Kiser, Clyde V. *Sea Island to City*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Sponsored by the Advisory Committee on Population.

Klineberg, Otto. *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 62, 1950. Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Social Relations Aspects of International Tensions.

Kuhlman, A. F. *Guide to Material on Crime and Criminal Justice.* New York: H. W. Wilson, 1929. Prepared for the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal justice, Advisory Committee on Crime.

Kuznets, Simon. *Six Lectures on Economic Growth*. Glencoe: Free Press, 1959; *Postwar Economic Growth: Four Lectures*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964; *Economic Growth and Structure: Selected Essays.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1965; *Modern Economic Growth: Rate, Structure, and Spread*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966; *Economic Growth of Nations.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971. All based in part on studies sponsored by the Committee on Economic Growth.

Kuznets, Simon, Wilbert E. Moore, and Joseph J. Spengler, eds. *Economic Growth: Brazil, India, Japan.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1955. Papers prepared for the Conference on Economic Growth in Selected Countries, sponsored by the Committee on Economic Growth, April 25-27, 1952.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "The Use of Panels in Social Research," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 92:405-410, November 1948. Report on a study sponsored by the Joint Committee on Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes and Consumer Wants.

Leighton, Alexander H., John A. Clausen, and Robert N. Wilson, eds. *Explorations in Social Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1957. Prepared for the Committee on Psychiatry and Social Science Research.

Lindzey, Gardner. *Projective Techniques and Cross-Cultural Research*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961. Initiated under the auspices of the Committee on Social Behavior.

Loehlin, John A., Gardner Lindzey, and James N. Spuhler. "Ethnic-Racial Differences in Intelligence: Genes and Environment" (tentative title). San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1975 (in press). Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Biological Bases of Social Behavior.

May, Mark A., and Leonard W. Doob. *Competition and Cooperation: A Report of the Sub-Committee on Competitive-Cooperative Habits, of the Committee on Personality and Culture*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 25, 1937.

McNemar, Quinn. "Opinion-Attitude Methodology," *Psychological Bulletin*, 43:289-374, July 1946. Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Social Adjustment.

Moore, Wilbert E., and Arnold S. Feldman, eds. *Labor Commitment and Social Change in Developing Areas*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960. Outgrowth of a conference held by the Committee on Economic Growth, March 28-30, 1958.

Morrisett, Lloyd N., and John Vinsonhaler, eds. *Mathematical Learning*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Serial No. 99), 1965. Report of a conference sponsored by the Committee on Intellective Processes Research, May 4-6,1962.

Mosteller, Frederick, and others. *The Pre-election Polls of 1948:Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 60, 1949.

Mussen, Paul H., ed. *European Research in Cognitive Development*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Serial No. 100), 1965. Report of a conference sponsored by the Committee on Intellective Processes Research, July 26-August 1, 1962.

National Bureau of Economic Research. *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity: Economic and Social Factors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962. Papers of a conference sponsored jointly by the Universities-National Bureau Committee for Economic Research and the Committee on Economic Growth, May 12-14, 1960.

Olson, Mancur, and others. *Toward a Social Report*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Osgood, Charles E., and Murray S. Miron, eds. *Approaches to the Study of Aphasia*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963. Report on the Interuniversity Summer Research Seminar on Aphasic Speech, 1958, sponsored by the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology.

Osgood, Charles E., and Thomas A. Sebeok, eds. *Psycholinguistics: A Survey of Theory and Research Problems*. Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics, Memoir 10, October 1954. Report of the Interuniversity Summer Research Seminar on Psycholinguistics, 1953, sponsored by the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology. Reissued, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965.

Perkins, Dwight H. *Agricultural Development in China, 1368-1968*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969. Sponsored by the Committee on the Economy of China.

Perkins, Dwight H. "The Chinese Economy in Historical Perspective: Report on a Conference," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 28:8-10, March 1974.

Pollak, Otto, with the assistance of Glen Heathers. *Social Adjustment in Old Age: A Research Planning Report.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 59, 1948. Prepared for the Committee on Social Adjustment in Old Age.

Pool, Ithiel de Sola, ed. *Trends in Content Analysis*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959. Based on the Conference on Techniques of Content Analysis, sponsored by the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology, February 9-11, 1955.

Ranney, Austin. "The Committee on Political Behavior, 1945-64, and the Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes, 1964-72," *Social Science Research Council Items*, September 1974.

Ranney, Austin, ed. *Political Science and Public Policy.* Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1968. Product of conferences sponsored by the Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes, June 1517, 1966 and August 28-29, 1967.

Recent Social Trends in the United States: Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends. 2 vols. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1933.

Redfield, Robert, Ralph Linton, and Melville J. Herskovits. "A Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation," *Man*, 35:145-148, October 1935. A report of the Subcommittee on Acculturation, Committee on Personality and Culture.

Roe, Anne, and Barbara Burks. *Adult Adjustment of Foster Children of Alcoholic and Psychotic Parentage and the Influence of the Foster Home*. Memoirs of the Section on Alcohol Studies, Yale University, No. 3. New Haven, 1945. Prepared for the Subcommittee on Study of Foster Children, Committee on Social Adjustment.

Romney, A. Kimball, and Roy G. D'Andrade, eds. "Transcultural Studies in Cognition," *American Anthropologist* (Special Publication), Vol. 66, No. 3, Pt. 2, June 1964. Report of a conference sponsored by the Committee on Intellective Processes Research, April 17-20, 1963.

Rosovsky, Henry. *Capital Formation in Japan, 1868-1940*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. Prepared with the aid of the Committee on Economic Growth.

Schmookler, Jacob. *Invention and Economic Growth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966. Prepared with the aid of the Committee on Economic Growth.

Sears, Robert R. *Survey of Objective Studies of Psychoanalytic Concepts*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 51, 1943. Prepared for the Subcommittee on Motivation, Committee on Social Adjustment.

Sebeok, Thomas A., ed. *Style in Language*. Cambridge: Technology Press, and New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1960. Proceedings of the Conference on Style, sponsored by the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology, April 17-19, 1958.

Sellin, Thorsten. *Culture Conflict and Crime*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 41, 1938. A report of the Subcommittee on Delinquency, Committee on Personality and Culture.

Shaw, C. R., and others. *Delinquency Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929; *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931. Both prepared for the Subcommittee on Personality Traits and Community Factors in Juvenile Delinquency, Advisory Committee on Crime.

Sheldon, Eleanor Bernert, and Wilbert E. Moore, eds. *Indicators of Social Change: Concepts and Measurements*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.

Shulman, Lee S., and Evan R. Keislar, eds. *Learning by Discovery: A Critical Appraisal*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966. Proceedings of a conference held by Stanford University and the Committee on Learning and the Educational Process, January 28-29, 1965.

Shuy, Roger W., ed. *Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects, Report of the Twenty-Third Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*. Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, No. 25. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, March .1973. Papers of the conference jointly sponsored by the Committee on Sociolinguistics and Georgetown University, March 16-18, 1972.

Smelser, Neil I., and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds. *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966. Papers prepared for a conference held by the Committee on Economic Growth, January 30-February 1, 1964.

Smith, M. Brewster, and Gardner Lindzey. "Research on Social Behavior: Impact of Council Committees," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 28:4-8, March 1974.

Sociological Inquiry, Vol. 36, No. 2, Spring 1966. Includes papers prepared in connection with the summer research seminar cosponsored by the Committee on Sociolinguistics and the Center for Applied Linguistics, June 22-August 14, 1964.

Southworth, Herman M., and Bruce F. Johnston, eds. *Agricultural Development and Economic Growth*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967. Sponsored by the Committee on Agricultural Economics.

Spengler, Joseph J. "The Committee on Economic Growth, 1949-68," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 28:24-28, June 1974.

Spengler, Joseph J., ed. *Natural Resources and Economic Growth: Papers presented at a conference held at Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 7-9, 1960, under joint sponsorship of Resources for the Future, Inc., [and the] Committee on Economic Growth*. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future, Inc., 1961.

Stephan, Frederick F., and Philip I. McCarthy. *Sampling Opinions: An Analysis of Survey Procedure*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958. Report on studies initiated under the auspices of the Joint Committee on Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes and Consumer Wants.

Stevenson, Harold W., Eckhard H. Hess, and Harriet L. Rheingold, eds. *Early Behavior: Comparative and Developmental Approaches*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967. Revisions of papers prepared for conferences held by the Committee on Comparative Developmental Behavior.

Stauffer, Samuel A., and others. *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life; The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath; Measurement and Prediction*. Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Vols. 1, 2, 4. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949-50. Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Analysis of Experience of the Research Branch, Information and Education Division, ASF.

"Studies in Political Development," 1-7. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963-71. Series sponsored by the Committee on Comparative Politics.

"Studies in the Social Aspects of the Depression," Social Science Research Council Bulletins 27-39, 1937. Prepared under the direction of the Committee on Studies in Social Aspects of the Depression.

Taylor, Paul S. *Mexican Labor in the United States*. 2 vols. (7 nos.) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1928-32. Sponsored by the Advisory Committee on Population.

Thomas, Dorothy Swaine. "The Committee on Migration Differentials and Its Relation to Other Council Activities," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 6:18-20, June 1952.

Thomas, Dorothy Swaine, and others. *Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials. Social Science Research Council Bulletin* 43, 1938. Report of the Committee on Migration Differentials.

Thornthwaite, C. Warren. *Internal Migration in the United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934. Sponsored by the Committee on Population Redistribution.

Torgerson, Warren S. *Theory and Methods of Scaling*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958. Prepared for the Committee on Scaling Theory and Methods.

Volkart, Edmund H., ed. *Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W.I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951. Sponsored by the Committee on W. I. Thomas' Contributions to Social Science.

Whiting, Beatrice B., ed. *Six Cultures: Studies of Child Rearing*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963. Studies planned and initiated with the aid of the Committees on Social Behavior and on Personality Development.

Whiting, John W. M., Irvin L. Child, William W. Lambert, and others. *Field Guide for a Study of Socialization*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966. Revision of a Field Manual originally prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Social Behavior.

Willcox, W. F., ed. *International Migrations, Vol. I, Statistics*, by Imre Ferenczi; Vol. II, *Interpretations*, by a Group of Scholars. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1929, 1931. Sponsored by the Advisory Committee on Population.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions: A Survey of Research on

Problems of Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Group Relations. *Social Science Research Council Bulletin* 57, 1947. Sponsored by the Committee on Techniques for Reducing Group Hostility.

Wolfle, Dael. *America's Resources of Specialized Talent: The Report of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

Woodworth, R. S. *Heredity and Environment: A Critical Survey of Recently Published Material on Twins and Foster Children*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 47, 1941. Prepared for the Committee on Social Adjustment.

Woofter, T. J., Jr. *Black Yeomanry: Life on St. Helena Island.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930. Prepared under the auspices of the Advisory Committee on Interracial Relations.

Wright, John C., and Jerome Kagan, eds. *Basic Cognitive Processes in Children: Report of the Second Conference Sponsored by the Committee on Intellective Processes Research*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Serial No. 86), 1963.

Young, Donald. "Memorandum on Suggestions for Research on Social Adjustment," *American Journal of Sociology*, 46:873-886, May 1941. Prepared for the Committee on Social Adjustment.

5

RESEARCH TRAINING AND SUPPORT

Throughout its history, a major concern of the Council has been the training of research workers and facilitation of their independent research. Programs of fellowships for training and grants to individuals for research have been continuously maintained from the mid-1920's to the present. Before turning to an account of the details of these programs, it is well to observe that their influence has not been limited to the individual recipients of such support. The Council has not sought to duplicate the activities of universities and endowed foundations; rather, it has sought by its fellowship and grant programs to demonstrate to them and to social scientists in general the value and the feasibility of departures from traditional policies and practices. In this context, a report made in 1931 by the Committee on Social Science Personnel is pertinent; in fact, many of its comments and recommendations might well have been written forty years later:

> The American graduate school has, over half a century, taken on a formidable function which now seriously handicaps it in fulfilling its original mission of advancing knowledge and training others to do likewise. The graduate school has been inundated with vast numbers of students neither capable of nor interested in creative scholarship or scientific research.

The committee viewed with some alarm the fact that the number of Ph.D. degrees conferred (in all fields) had risen from 126 in 1890 to 1,064 in 1924. (About 30,000 Ph.D. degrees were

conferred in 1970, including nearly 4,000 in "social sciences" plus another 1,600 in psychology.)

"What we have been describing," the committee continued, "is a trend toward standardized mass-production. . . . Regardless of individual differences in aptitude or objectives, all have been subjected . . . to substantially the same institutional treatment." It recommended "that at least some graduate students of exceptional promise be given an opportunity to follow a different program. . . . Elbridge Sibley's study, *The Recruitment, Selection, and Training of Social Scientists*, published by the Council in 1948, reaffirmed and further documented the concern that the former report expressed.

Research Training Fellowships

The 1931 recommendation of the Committee on Social Science Personnel epitomizes the rationale that has always guided the Council's Research Training Fellowship program: to provide opportunity for some talented social scientists to obtain unusual training, in the hope that the example of their subsequent research may stimulate revision of academic policies and practices. Specific needs for innovative programs of research training have changed in the course of five decades, but the basic principle has remained: the Council's fellowships should point the way to needed improvements by providing models for emulation. "*Plus pa change, plus c'est la meme chose*" can be said without disparagement of the Research Training Fellowship program, because if it had not changed in response to changing needs it would not have continued to serve well the purpose for which it was originally designed.

At the outset some Research Fellowships, as they were then entitled, were granted for specific research projects, but the committee in charge very soon concluded that fellowships should be used to promote the development of research workers, rather than to support research itself. The committee thought that often this could best be accomplished by enabling a new-fledged Ph.D. to undertake research that would involve direct contact with the raw materials of his subject. In other cases, the fellowship term was to be spent in study rather than research. For many years it was a virtually inviolable rule that a fellow of the Council should spend his term away from his home institution. In 1935, ten years after the postdoctoral fellowship program was launched, special predoctoral Field Fellowships, which required the recipient to do research away from his own campus, were offered to advanced candidates for the doctorate. The fellows were forbidden to spend time in writing their doctoral dissertations until their return from the year in the field. In 1946, the postdoctoral and predoctoral fellowship programs were merged under the title of Research Training Fellowships, symbolizing the conviction that the doctoral degree should represent a milestone rather than the end of one's development as a scientist, and providing maximum flexibility for applicants wishing to tailor special training programs to fit their particular needs.

As field work or some other form of empirical research experience gradually came to be accepted as an essential phase of the doctoral curricula, the Council's fellowships came to be used also to foster other improvements in research training. Wesley C. Mitchell, the first chairman of the fellowship committee, had anticipated as early as 1926 another potential service the fellowships might provide:

> One need is seldom stated, though the Committee cannot believe it to be rare. Very few of the applicants express a desire for further study. . . . Yet it is worth considering whether work with a master of his field may not help a young scientific inquirer to attain his highest capacity more than work by himself.

With the passage of time, awards of fellowships for formal study, especially the study of mathematics or other "tool" subjects, as well as cross-disciplinary study in the social sciences, became increasingly frequent. Growing numbers of historians and political scientists were interested in learning the substance and methods of other social sciences, and a perceptible but unfortunately much smaller number of students trained in the other disciplines sought a chance to gain some temporal perspective through the study of history. By the 1960's the fellowships were being used in most cases to broaden the appointee's disciplinary base. Only one out of five of the Research Training fellows appointed in 1969 and 1970 was studying while on fellowship under the same disciplinary rubric as that of his doctorate, and in each of those cases the study was on an aspect of the discipline on which the fellow had not previously concentrated.

An important feature of the Research Training Fellowship program has been the individual guidance given by the Council's staff. Candidates have often been led to recognize deficiencies in their preparation and encouraged to take advantage of opportunities for further training adapted to their particular interests and needs.

The approximately 1,800 appointees under the basic fellowship program in the forty-nine years 1925-73 represent a small and diminishing fraction of the total number of doctorates in the social sciences, but they include a far greater proportion of those who have distinguished themselves in research; more important, the influence of the fellowship program in providing models for emulation has been considerable.

The Research Training Fellowship program, unrestricted as it has been to particular substantive or methodological areas, has often been crucially helpful to individuals who have become leaders in previously uncultivated fields of scientific inquiry for which no specialized institutional support was available. Nowhere has this value of the program been more clearly demonstrated than in reference to foreign area studies. An impressive number of scholars who played leading roles in expanding the horizons of the social sciences beyond North America and Western Europe gained expertise on foreign areas as Council fellows many years before special fellowship programs for foreign area studies were initiated after World War II. To mention a few: Ralph Bunche (Africa), Owen Lattimore (East Asia), Robert B. Hall (Japan), Lewis Hanke (Latin America), Philip E. Mosely (Slavic nations), Margaret Mead (Oceania). Likewise, long before the Committee on Mathematical Training came into existence, many individuals took advantage of the opportunity to study mathematical and statistical methods; before the current emphasis on a behavioral approach to the study of politics became fashionable, and before quantification and generalization became accepted as respectable practices in historiography, individual political scientists and historians availed themselves of the opportunity afforded by the Research Training Fellowship program to gain some understanding of the research methods of sociologists and psychologists.

Special Fellowship Programs

Other more specialized fellowship programs have been maintained by the Council at various times. These have included Fellowships in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology (1928-33; 106 appointments), as well as Southern Fellowships (1929-33; 59 appointments) which were intended to contribute to some improvement of the relatively low level of research in the South at the time, particularly with reference to race relations. At the urging of a donor concerned lest the normative aspects of politics be lost from sight as a result of the prevailing behavioral approach to the social sciences, 63 fellowships in Political Theory and Legal Philosophy were awarded during

the decade 1954-64.

Demobilization Awards were granted in 1944-46 to help social science students finish their doctoral studies, and young social scientists to resume research careers that had been interrupted by wartime service. These 151 awards were in some cases in the nature of training fellowships, but in others they took the form of research grants.

The Council's foreign area fellowship programs will be discussed in Chapter 6, along with other aspects of the development of area studies.

The fellowship programs thus far described have been generally limited to candidates at and beyond the late predoctoral stage of training. Two other programs have been offered for less advanced students. Graduate Study Fellowships were granted to 22 college seniors in the years 1935 to 1937. These were the only Council fellowships ever awarded on the basis of formal competitive tests designed to measure academic achievement and aptitude; the program was undertaken in the belief that the social sciences were not enrolling a desirable proportion of the brightest students. Many of the appointees subsequently qualified for the more advanced Research Training Fellowships, and one of them, Paul A. Samuelson, later received a Nobel Prize in economics. The program was not long continued, presumably because it was thought that its purpose could as well or better be served through the recruiting and selecting processes of the graduate schools themselves.

A more radical experiment was the Undergraduate Research Training Program initiated in 1953. It was proposed to the Council by Robert H. Knapp and David C. McClelland, professors of psychology temporarily serving on the Ford Foundation's staff, and was undertaken with some skeptic ism by the Council, whose staff had been accustomed to dealing only with candidates at later stages of training. In brief, the program involved granting a stipend to a college junior who would devote the summer following his junior year to a small research project under the supervision of a faculty advisor, and write up the results during his senior year. The advisor was offered an honorarium for his service. The initial skepticism turned to enthusiasm as the first year's experience revealed that some undergraduates were capable of working at higher levels of research than even their own teachers had supposed. Council fellowships for the first year of graduate study were awarded to 78 of the 210 who held undergraduate stipends.

An important purpose of the program was to reinforce the interest of some promising students who might be considering the possibility of making their careers in one of the social sciences. Any intention to "buy" talented youths away from other fields of science or scholarship was properly disavowed, but a few of the awards nevertheless appear to have had that result. More than half of the undergraduates who participated in the program subsequently went on to graduate study in the social sciences; four years after the program terminated, one out of eight had already received the Ph.D. degree, and another one out of four was still pursuing it.

Robert N. Wilson, the staff member who was largely responsible for administering the undergraduate program, described the typical development of a student's motivation from an undisciplined urge to understand and serve humanity to a disciplined interest in scientific research. Faculty sponsors of undergraduates in the program have commented that their experience opened their eyes to the ability of bright college students to meet real intellectual challenges in the social sciences if given opportunity and encouragement. The program appears to have made an imprint on the teaching of the social sciences to undergraduates, at least in some of the institutions involved.

The Council's efforts to obtain funds to carry on the undergraduate program beyond the four-year trial period were unsuccessful. Shortly thereafter, in 1959, the National Science Foundation announced its offering of grants for "undergraduate research participation," and its staff acknowledged that the success of the Council's program had influenced its decision. Thus, in another instance, a pioneering activity carried on for a limited time by the Council was continued by another organization.

Summer research training institutes for research workers have been offered in fields not yet systematically covered in regular university curricula and in fields in which there had been major new developments since the workers' student days. In addition to the summer institutes in mathematics mentioned earlier in Chapter 4, institutes, usually lasting six or eight weeks, have been held on such topics as survey methods in health research, law and social relations, research on international affairs, quantitative methods in agricultural economics, field study methods in sociology (for graduate students whose own institutions had not afforded opportunities for such experience), organization theory, research on credit and monetary policy, research on judicial processes, research on electoral behavior, the computer simulation of cognitive processes, and selected areas of biological science for social scientists.

Research Grants to Individuals

A general program of Grants-in-Aid, unrestricted as to discipline within the sphere of the social sciences or as to topic, was initiated in 1926 and continued under that title until 1964. Awards were small, often only a few hundred dollars, and the numbers granted in the annual competitions were also small. Preference was given to applicants located in institutions that made little or no provision for faculty members' research. The combination of a little tangible aid and the intangible value of recognition by a national organization—"the cachet rather than the cash"—was sometimes crucial in salvaging not only a small research project but a research career that might otherwise have withered.

A novel program of Faculty Research Fellowships in the 1950's was specifically designed to encourage academic institutions to make provision for independent research by their faculty members and to recognize this as a normal part of the professor's role. Under this program the Council contracted to pay half of the fellow's salary and to provide an allowance for research expenses for three years, the college or university agreeing to release the faculty member from half of the normal teaching load for that period. The number of awards was small—about a half dozen annually—as the program was intended to demonstrate the feasibility of combining research with teaching rather than provide large-scale and continuing funding. The program was terminated after a decade, since by that time greatly increased resources for research had become available from both private and governmental agencies, and support of faculty members' research had come to be regarded as a normal responsibility of a respectable university.

In recent years specialized grant programs have tended more and more to overshadow the former general ones. This trend has resulted in some measure from the growing tendency of the major private foundations to stipulate the kinds of projects for which their grants to the Council may be used. Grants for research on particular foreign areas have been offered to individuals through the area studies committees, and there have been special programs of grants for research on governmental affairs, civil-military relations, and problems of ethnic or racial minorities. Occasional stipends for specific studies commissioned by the Council and some of its research planning committees have given numerous other individuals opportunities to do research on problems in which they were already interested.

Despite the variety of ways in which the Council has provided funds for individuals' research, it has never purported to play the part of a foundation, granting funds to other research organizations; nor has it served as a major source of funds for individuals. Indeed, it has often found it necessary to explain to would-be beneficiaries the difference between its role and that of the foundations on which it is in turn dependent for support.

Selected Bibliography

Committee on Social Science Personnel. "Training for Research in the Social Sciences," Supplement to the 1931-32 Annual Report of the Social Science Research Council.

Fellows of the Social Science Research Council, 1925-1939. Social Science Research Council, 1939.

Fellows of the Social Science Research Council, 1925-1951. Social Science Research Council, 1951.

Mitchell, Wesley C. "The Research Fellowships of the Social Science Research Council," *Political Science Quarterly*, 41(4):16-18, December 1926.

Sibley, Elbridge. *The Recruitment, Selection, and Training of Social Scientists*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 58, 1948.

Sibley, Elbridge. *Support for Independent Scholarship and Research*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council.

Sibley, Elbridge. "The Alumni of the Council's Undergraduate Research Training Program," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 15:4648, December 1961.

Wilson, Robert N. "The Undergraduate Social Scientist," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 8:25-29, September 1954.

6

FOREIGN AREA TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Foreign area studies, in the sense in which the term is now used, were virtually nonexistent in the United States before World War IL Although the study of European society and culture was a traditional interest of American scholars, and anthropologists had long studied tribal societies, social

The parochialism of the social sciences in the United States began to break down during World War II because of our interactions with non-Western societies. These experiences served to make painfully obvious our almost total unpreparedness as a nation to deal effectively with the sudden intensification of American contacts with what were unfamiliar societies and cultures. Few Americans knew the languages involved; those who did were apt to lack the necessary professional skills. That working modicum of familiarity with the relevant historical, political,

economic, social, and psychological facts that we could muster and utilize in our dealings with Britain, France, and Germany was lacking for non-Western societies. This deficit had to be made up and under the most urgent and demanding circumstances, those of modern and total warfare.

Since the problem was initially one of providing intensive and specialized training in unfamiliar languages and cultures, the government turned to the universities for assistance. Existing academic resources in these fields were pitifully thin but, under wartime conditions and with extensive federal support, specialized training programs were hastily improvised, improved over time and, ultimately, some rather impressive results were achieved. The needed interpreters and translators were trained, the universities acquired a great deal of valuable experience in the intensive teaching of foreign languages, and the field of area studies was created.

Stimulated by the government's rapid introduction of programs of training for wartime and postwar service in hitherto little known parts of the world, the Council appointed a Committee on World Regions in 1943 "to scrutinize the implications for social science" of these programs. That committee functioned only briefly. A year earlier, the Council had joined with the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Research Council, and the Smithsonian Institution to form the Ethnogeographic Board, whose principal mission was to provide information about unfamiliar societies with which the war was suddenly bringing Americans into contact.

The Board developed a roster of some 10,000 persons with knowledge of little known areas of the world, compiled extensive geographical and ethnographic materials, published a manual, *Survival on Land and Sea* (1944), widely distributed to members of the armed forces, and in general served as a center of information. It also conducted a survey of area study programs in American universities.

Observers of and participants in these activities were concerned about their postwar implications and anxious that the momentum for constructive academic change implicit within them not be lost in the more relaxed circumstances that were certain to attend the ending of the war. In general they tended to share some or all of the following views:

1. Higher education in the United States was too narrow in its geographic compass.
2. It must be broadened to include non-Western peoples and cultures.
3. More attention should be paid to the U.S.S.R. and the nations of Eastern Europe.
4. The most fruitful way to study such academically "new" areas was by the so-called whole-cultural or interdisciplinary techniques (largely anthropological in antecedents) adumbrated in the wartime training programs.
5. Since the traditional departmental units of a university were discipline oriented and presumptively hostile to interdisciplinary innovations, a new organizational format would have to be devised for these new interdisciplinary programs, that is-a foreign area program.
6. Finally, great emphasis should be placed on intensive instruction in the spoken and written forms of the current languages of the foreign area being studied, preferably utilizing the techniques of language teaching developed in the programs.

Prominent among the proponents of these views were several strategically placed officials of the Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. There shortly emerged a loose but effective liaison and

working arrangement among these groups. The Council, operating with grants from these foundations, established a Committee on World Area Research to conduct surveys and studies of new developments in what now came to be called "the area field" as well as to administer a program of Area Research Training Fellowships for younger scholars desirous of advanced language or area training at home or in the field. All of the major surveys and appraisals of the early development of foreign area studies in the United States were products of the World Area Research Committee's work: *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences* (1947) by Robert B. Hall; *Area Research and Training: A Conference Report* (1948) by Charles Wagley; *Area Research: Theory and Practice* (1950) by Julian H. Steward; and *Area Studies in American Universities* (1951) by Wendell C. Bennett. It is thus fair to assert that this committee served as the primary planning, coordinating, and evaluative agency at the national level for the entire foreign area and language movement in the United States.

The Council recently undertook, at the request of the U.S. Office of Education, a comprehensive review of foreign area studies in American academic institutions. Richard D. Lambert of the University of Pennsylvania was engaged to direct the study; his voluminous report, *Language and Area Studies Review*, was published in 1973. Using the criteria of adequate library resources, adequate language instruction, courses in at least five pertinent subjects, and an integrated program of study and research on contemporary aspects of a certain area, Hall had found 14 qualifying area study programs in American universities and colleges in 1946-47. Bennett found 25 in 1951. Lambert, however, using comparable criteria, found 312 in 1970. During the quarter century between Hall's and Lambert's studies, the Council's staff and committee members maintained close working relationships with those of the other research councils and with the major foundations which were supporting newly established centers of area studies in selected universities throughout the nation.

Joint Research Planning Committees

The whole-culture approach that characterizes the area and language movement in the United States implies that the insights of humanistic scholarship should be combined with the findings of the social sciences in order to understand an alien society and culture. Accordingly, most of the Council's work in foreign area studies has been carried on by committees jointly appointed by it and the American Council of Learned Societies, with membership including both social scientists and humanists. During the last three decades the scope of their activities has grown to encompass most of the world outside of the United States: Latin America (the first committee was appointed in 1941), the Slavic area (1948), Asia (1949), the Near and Middle East (1951), China (1959), Africa (1960), Japan (1967), Korea (1967), and Eastern Europe (1971). The structure and area of responsibility of the committees concerned with these areas have varied somewhat from time to time. As a whole, the area committees provide a mechanism for the support of scientific and scholarly research in areas that by now embrace nearly all of the world.

Fiscal and administrative responsibility for the joint committees on foreign areas is divided between the Council and the American Council of Learned Societies. The following pages summarize activities relating to the six areas for which the Council currently has major administrative responsibility: Latin America, the Near and Middle East, China, Africa, Japan, and Korea. Each of these committees, as well as those administered by the ACLS, offers research grants to individual scholars on a competitive basis. Each is also concerned with continuing assessments of the state of the field, conducting conferences and seminars on selected topics, and stimulating new research or other activities of general and basic utility to the field.

Funds provided by the Ford Foundation for the Council's various activities relating to foreign area studies currently account for some four-fifths of the Council's total expenditures.

Latin America

The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, appointed in 1959, was preceded by two successive committees in the years 1941-48; Latin America is the area in which the Council has the longest record of activity.

During the early 1960's, the committee held two important conferences of scholars from the United States and Latin America, resulting in the publication of two bench mark volumes. *Social Science Research on Latin America* (1964), edited by Charles Wagley, presents a critical assessment of the status and prospects of research by North American scholars in seven disciplines; *Social Science in Latin America* (1967), edited by Manuel Diégues Junior and Bryce Wood, also provides an assessment of the status of research—that by Latin American scholars.

The committee's first substantive contribution to scientific research on Latin American society was a collection of eight studies in sociology, political science, anthropology, and history focused upon the effects of social and economic change on different social groups; These papers were published as *Continuity and Change in Latin America* (1964), edited by John J. Johnson. In the ensuing years, the committee provided financial assistance to enable Latin American scholars to travel to more than twenty conferences in both hemispheres; these conferences eventuated in numerous publications and in the launching of a new periodical, the *Latin American Research Review*.

A notable result of the committee's endeavors with Latin American scholars has been the formation of the Latin American Social Science Council, whose membership now embraces more than seventy institutes. The idea of this Council was discussed at the committee's first major conference in 1961, and it took form a few years later.

The committee also contributed to efforts in the mid-1960's to form a professional organization of Latin American specialists in the United States. In 1966, the committee provided funds for scholars from many universities to attend a conference in Washington, D.C., cosponsored with the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress, at which the Latin American Studies Association was created.

In addition to its conference activities, the committee has played an active role in the development and funding of special projects designed both to stimulate new research and to synthesize existing but unorganized knowledge about a field. The topics for these projects have been selected by North and Latin American scholars at research planning meetings organized by the committee. Most have been carried out under the codirection, and with the participation, of scholars in both regions. The first project, begun in 1966, is a bibliography and guide to sources on the economic history of Latin America and consists of comprehensive, annotated bibliographies and essays on sources for the study of the economic history of six Latin American countries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. "Latin America: A Guide to Economic History, 1830-1930," is expected to be published in 1975. The project was directed by Roberto Cortés Conde of the Instituto Torcuato di Tella and Stanley J. Stein of Princeton University, and the volumes are being edited by them. The second phase of this project involves the preparation of a volume on the external influences affecting the economic development of six Latin American countries from 1870 to 1930.

With the purpose of both synthesizing and stimulating new analytical approaches to the study of U.S.-Latin American relations, the committee organized a conference in 1972 in Lima, Peru, to explore the political factors governing relations in the hemisphere. The conference papers, prepared by both U.S. and Latin American social scientists, were published as *Latin America and the United States: The Changing Political Realities* (1974), edited by Julio Cotler and Richard R. Fagen.

The Near and Middle East

In 1951 the Council appointed a Committee on the Near and Middle East. Its major accomplishment was the sponsorship of a conference that led to a volume, *Social Forces in the Middle East* (1955), edited by Sydney N. Fisher.

The committee was reconstituted in 1955 and in the following years gave attention to the development of language tools and skills in the languages of the area, the development of library resources, the creation of bibliographical services, and training and research problems in the various disciplines. In 1957, a grant from the Ford Foundation permitted the committee to initiate a program of grants-in-aid to social scientists already having research experience in the field, a program that has continued to the present. In 1959 the American Council of Learned Societies joined in sponsorship of the committee and the scope of its activities was accordingly enlarged to include concern for the continued development of the humanities.

In the 1960's the committee's Subcommittee on Library Resources played a facilitating role in encouraging the organization of book purchases in the Near and Middle East, using blocked currency funds (under the Public Law 480 program), while a Subcommittee on Languages developed standard transliteration systems for Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. In 1966, the committee concluded that there were now enough scholars in the field of Middle East studies to make a national organization both practical and worthwhile, and accordingly brought a nucleus of scholars together to discuss this prospect; the meeting led to the formation of the Middle East Studies Association of North America.

In that same year, the committee helped in the establishment of the Center for Arabic Studies Abroad at the American University in Cairo to provide intensive instruction in Arabic for students at the graduate level.

Among the conferences the committee sponsored during that period was one on urbanization, held in Berkeley, California, in 1966; its papers were published as *Middle Eastern Cities* (1969), edited by Ira Lapidus. Another, on economic history, was held in London in June 1967. The papers were subsequently published in a volume, *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East* (1970), edited by M. A. Cook.

Believing that the time was ripe for closer collaboration between scholars in the United States and those in the Near and Middle East, the committee recommended to the Councils in 1972 that three social scientists from the area be added to the committee. At the same time, the Ford Foundation provided for a program of collaborative research grants to encourage scholars from the U.S. and the area to undertake research on joint projects.

Under way in 1974 were projects on elite studies in the developing Middle Eastern states, analyses of the growth patterns of North African cities, and an extended comparison of the economic, political, and social development of North Africa and Turkey in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

China

Appointment of the Joint Committee on Contemporary China in 1959 was the Council's first intensive effort since the 1920's (when its Committee on International Relations had encouraged studies of international, financial, and economic relations in China) to focus scholarly attention on research problems in the China field. At a time when debate about China was influenced more by the politically and emotionally charged atmosphere of the day than by knowledge of the subject, the committee sought to bring the study of China up to the level of a mature intellectual field. Despite political difficulties the committee can claim credit for having markedly increased both the quantity and the quality of research on post-revolutionary China.

The committee sponsored a number of major conferences, designed not only to stimulate new research but also to synthesize and give focus to scattered contributions in order to increase understanding of a particular problem. The Subcommittee on Chinese Government and Politics, for example, sponsored conferences resulting in a series of major publications, including *Chinese Communist Politics in Action* (1969), edited by A. Doak Barnett; *China: Management of a Revolutionary Society* (1971), edited by John M. H. Lindbeck; *Ideology and Politics in Contemporary China* (1973), edited by Chalmers Johnson; and *Elites in the People's Republic of China* (1972), edited by Robert A. Scalapino.

In economics, after the completion of the program of the Committee on the Economy of China, a subcommittee was appointed to continue the development of this field. Its first major conference will result in *The Chinese Economy in Historical Perspective* (1975), edited by Dwight H. Perkins. However, not all of the committee's conferences have centered on the social sciences. A conference on the role of the writer, for example, brought together a number of experts to discuss literature as a reflection of changing social values.

A monumental bibliography, utilizing advanced computer technology, was prepared under the auspices of the Subcommittee on Research on Chinese Society. Begun in 1964, the 2,300-page 3-volume *Modern Chinese Society: An Analytical Bibliography*, edited by G. William Skinner, Winston Hsieh, and Shigeaki Tomita, and including materials in Western languages, Japanese, and Chinese, was published in January 1974.

After the almost total exclusion of Americans from the People's Republic for over two decades, there now exist the beginnings of an extensive people-to-people dialogue. A formative role in the development of this important phase of Sino-American relations was played by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China, established in early 1966 jointly by the National Academy of Sciences, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Social Science Research Council.

Though the committee has found it easier to send representatives of the relatively apolitical and obviously important disciplines of science and technology to China than it has social scientists, it has had some success in arranging for visits by social scientists. In the late spring of 1973, a delegation of the committee visited China. Among its members were Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, the president of the Council, a sociologist; Albert Feuerwerker, director of the Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, an historian; Ezra F. Vogel, director of the East Asian Research Center, Harvard University, a sociologist; and Max Loehr, a specialist in Oriental art and archeology at the Fogg Museum, Harvard University. In the specialized field of developmental psychology, a delegation of experts on early childhood development, led by William Kessen, a psychologist at Yale University, visited China in late 1973.

In addition to activities of the Joint Committee on Contemporary China, a Joint Committee on Sino-American Cooperation in the Humanities and Social Sciences has supported projects by American scholars in collaboration with colleagues in Taiwan; and a Committee on Exchanges with Asian Institutions has funded research by Americans at centers in Tokyo, Taipei, and Seoul.

Africa

Until recent years Africa south of the Sahara had been virtually ignored by American scholars with the exception of a few anthropologists interested in tribal societies. When the Joint Committee on African Studies was appointed in 1960 to administer a grant-in-aid program, the community of social scientists and humanists qualified for research in that area was still small, although thanks both to the National Defense Education Act fellowships and the Foreign Area fellowships, the numbers were growing.

In 1964, the committee's activities were broadened to include a program of research conferences on topics ready for the concerted attention of scholars from more than one discipline. Nine conferences have been held under the committee's auspices. Several have resulted in published volumes: *The City in Modern Africa* (1967), edited by Horace Miner; *Africa and the West: Intellectual Responses to European Culture* (1972), edited by Philip D. Curtin; *The Traditional Artist in African Societies* (1973), edited by Warren d'Azevedo.

As the number of American specialists on Africa has been increasing, the growing Africanization of African universities has increased the number of African research scholars, who have been invited to participate in many of the committee's conferences. To strengthen close collaboration of African and American scholars, the committee was enlarged in 1973 to include a historian from Senegal and a political scientist from Nigeria.

Japan

Studies of Japan by American scholars have had a remarkable growth in the last decade, and the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies has played a crucial role in bringing their findings together in systematic fashion. Following its appointment in 1967 on the recommendation of the Conference on Modern Japan (an activity of the Association for Asian Studies), the first major effort of the committee was to assess as comprehensively as possible the variegated and extensive Western studies of Japan in the humanities and social sciences. A series of nine disciplinary conferences sponsored by the committee brought together for the first time groups of specialists from the U.S. and abroad to determine the intellectual contours of the field, its problems and prospects. The conferences evaluated the state of research and teaching, related studies of Japan to broader theoretical issues, isolated neglected topics, and outlined research subjects which promised to improve or extend further scholarship.

An elaborate survey of scholars and institutions was also conducted to provide extensive aggregate data to help describe the field. The report, "Japanese Studies in the United States," distributed by the Council in 1970, is the most wide-ranging and systematic intellectual portrait of Japanese studies ever assembled. The results of this undertaking not only brought together scholarly findings but also stimulated new ideas and more sophisticated and informed scholarly approaches.

Based on the disciplinary surveys, the committee decided to sponsor conferences on five broad themes which would help cover academic gaps and correct imbalances. The themes chosen were industrialization and its social consequences for modern Japan; decision making and the structure of leadership in Japanese society; the Muromachi Age in Japanese history; leadership and decision making in Japan's international relations; and the comparative value of Japan's unique development as a nonWestern modern industrial state. Within these broad areas attention was then focused on specific topics or problems which seemed likely to contribute to a better understanding of Japan. The results of the conferences are scheduled for publication by the University of California Press in a series of five volumes.

The success of many projects sponsored by the committee can be partially attributed to the binational character of almost all research projects it has sponsored. Japanese scholars have participated directly in the design and planning of the research conferences, and Japanese scholars have also presented many conference papers. In addition, the committee, through its liaison with the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, has cooperated with Japanese scholars on a number of specific collaborative projects. The topics have ranged from cross-cultural study of the influence of socializing agents on cognitive functioning, communication styles, and educability of children to binational research on United States-Japan relations from World War I to the Manchurian incident (1914-31). Most recently, the committee sponsored the compilation and publication of *The Allied Occupation of Japan, 1945-52: An Annotated Bibliography of Western Language Materials* (1974), by Robert E. Ward and Frank J. Shulman. A Japanese-language volume on the topic had been previously published as part of the same collaborative project, so that a significant resource base now exists for any further studies of this important chapter in both Japanese and American history.

Korea

A Joint Committee on Korean Studies was established in 1967; its initial program was the improvement of the quality and availability of library resources for research. To this end, the preparation of two annotated bibliographies was supported: *Soviet Works on Korea: 1945-1970* (1973), compiled by George Ginsburgs, and a bibliography of basic reference materials on Korea compiled by Yong Mok Kim, drawing on both Korean and Japanese language sources.

The committee is also sponsoring a number of research conferences. One—cosponsored with the Population and Development Studies Center of Seoul National University—examines the relationship of population growth to economic development in South Korea; it will be held near Seoul in January 1975, timed to be coordinate with the activities of the International Population Year sponsored by the United Nations. A second conference will focus on a comparison of North and South Korean politics, scheduled for March 1975 in Honolulu, and cosponsored by the Center for Korean Studies of the University of Hawaii. A third will examine the social structure of Korea during the Yi Dynasty (1392-1910), which is remarkable for its stability and longevity; the conference is scheduled to be held in South Korea in September 1975.

Foreign Area Fellowships

The first program of Area Research Training Fellowships was initiated by the Council in 1948 with funds from the Carnegie Corporation. It was designed by the Committee on World Area Research to meet the training needs of persons who were or proposed to become specialists on the contemporary cultures of major foreign areas. During a period of six years, the Council awarded 153 predoctoral and postdoctoral fellowships. Travel grants were also given to 63 senior scholars

for research in their areas of specialization.

This program was terminated in 1953, when the Ford Foundation launched its much larger Foreign Area Fellowship Program. Ten years later, the Ford Foundation transferred responsibility for administration of that fellowship program to a joint committee of the Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, under whose auspices it has continued. Some 2,600 fellowships have been granted during the period 1953-74. The Ford Foundation has remained the sole source of financial support for the program. In 1973, the program was merged with the other area research programs of the Councils in order to relate the dissertation fellowships more closely to the intellectual concerns of the area committees.

The expansion of knowledge about non-Western societies during the past two decades has had a profound impact on the humanities and the social sciences, and this fellowship program has unquestionably played a crucial role in this development. By supporting selected groups of highly talented graduate students during their doctoral research abroad, and by introducing comparative data and expanding the traditional range of interests in the social sciences and the humanities, the program has served to diminish intellectual parochialism. Frequently, the research undertaken has not been easy. Most fellows have had to function in unfamiliar cultural settings where little or no prior research had been directly relevant to their projects. Trained in a specific discipline and in the theories and findings of previous research, students have had to use difficult languages and sometimes obscure dialects while attempting to obtain usable data. Nonetheless, in aggregate terms, the research undertaken by these fellows has resulted in major additions to the scientific knowledge on specific foreign areas, has suggested major modifications in our theoretical knowledge of man and society, and has provided the skilled teachers required to impart knowledge of these areas to college and university students.

The Directory of Foreign Area Fellows 1952-1972 (1973), prepared by Dorothy Soderlund, lists 2,050 scholars who have held these fellowships. From their extensive lists of publications and their careers following their fellowship years it is clear that a significant number have become leading researchers in their disciplines.

Other International Programs

A complete list of the Council's area-related enterprises would include a number of programs designed to take advantage of particular opportunities for area research when access to some parts of the world has been subject to political restrictions, and to help qualified social scientists avail themselves of government-supported international exchange programs.

The Council has participated in the Committee on International Exchange of Persons, recently renamed the Council for International Exchange of Scholars. That committee has cooperated since 1948 with the Department of State and the Board of Foreign Scholarships, selecting senior American and foreign scholars for grants under the Fulbright-Hays Act and assisting foreign grantees in arrangements for their work in this country. Fulbright-Hays grants to mature scholars and advanced students have been an important source of financial support for research abroad, though by no means restricted to area research in the sense in which that term has been used by the Council.

The International Research and Exchanges Board, an agency jointly established in 1968 by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Council, arranges exchange programs

between scholars in the United States, the Soviet Union, and the countries of Eastern Europe.

The Council has undertaken two international training enterprises, offering social scientists in foreign countries opportunities to become familiar with American social science and with methods of research that have been developed in this country. The training activities of the Committee on Transnational Social Psychology are mentioned in Chapter 4 in the discussion of psychological contributions. The other program is that of the Committee on Social Science in Italy, sponsored jointly with the Adriano Olivetti Foundation, which was active from 1965 to 1973 in efforts to improve Italian social science research and training. This binational committee was dissolved when adequate Italian resources had been mobilized.

From 1957 to 1964, a program of international conference travel grants stimulated more widespread American participation in international conferences of social scientists held in other parts of the world. Nearly 400 grants were made for travel to 67 meetings abroad.

Assessment

The Council's foreign area training and research program—and the broader area studies movement of which it is an important component—has helped in the past three decades to transform a substantial segment of academic life from a near-total concentration on the American situation to a genuinely international orientation. Colleges, universities, and the society have all profited greatly from this transformation.

The social sciences have also profited from the experience. A large proportion of this raw data that has been available to social scientists in processed or readily usable forms is American in content; as a consequence, both the methodologies and the theories of the contemporary social sciences have to an unrealistic and perhaps critically unsound degree been built on foundations that are predominantly or exclusively derived from American practice and experience. Thus, while we recognize in principle the importance of culture as a determinant of social attitudes, values, and behavior, in practice we have too often proceeded along lines that may prove to be disastrously culturebound.

From a social science viewpoint, the initial value and essentiality of area studies and of the Council's role in their development derives from this limitation of the American experience. Area studies are calculated to restore a measure of cultural equilibrium to an otherwise American-biased endeavor, to supply social science data derived from a rich variety of cultural contexts, and to add orderly descriptions, analyses, and interpretations of political, economic, and social systems other than our own.

Selected Bibliography

Barnett, A. Doak, ed. *Chinese Communist Politics in Action*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969. Papers prepared for the Conference on Microsocietal Study of the Chinese Political System, sponsored by the Subcommittee on Chinese Government and Politics, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, August 29-September 1, 1967.

Bennett, Wendell C. "The Ethnogeographic Board," *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, Vol. 107, No. 1, April 14, 1947.

Bennett, Wendell C. *Area Studies in American Universities*. New York: Social Science

Research Council, 1951. Sponsored by the Committee on World Area Research.

Casagrande, Joseph B., and Elbridge Sibley. "Area Research Training Fellowships and Travel Grants for Area Research: An Epilogue," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 7:37-42, December 1953.

Cohen, Jerome Alan, ed. *Contemporary Chinese Law: Research Problems and Perspectives.* Harvard Studies in East Asian Law, 4. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970. Product of the Conference on Chinese Communist Law: Tools for Research held by the Subcommittee on Chinese Law, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, May 27-30, 1967.

Cook, M. A., ed. *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1970. Product of the conference cosponsored by the Joint Committee on the Near and Middle East and the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, July 4-6, 1967.

Cotler, Julio, and Richard R. Fagen, eds. *Latin America and the United States: The Changing Political Realities*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974. Papers prepared for the Conference on Inter-American Relations held by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, November 30-December 3, 1972.

Curtin, Philip D., ed. *Africa and the West: Intellectual Responses to European Culture.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972. Product. of the conference on African intellectual reactions to Western culture, held by the Joint Committee on African Studies, October 9-11, 1969.

d'Azevedo, Warren L., ed. *The Traditional Artist in African Societies.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973. Product of the conference cosponsored by the Joint Committee on African Studies, Indiana University, and the University of Nevada Desert Research Institute, May 28-30, 1965.

Diégues Junior, Manuel, and Bryce Wood, eds. *Social Science in Latin America: Papers Presented at the Conference on Latin American Studies Held at Rio de Janeiro, March 29-31, 1965*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967. Sponsored by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies in collaboration with the Latin American Center for Research in the Social Sciences, Rio de Janeiro.

Ethnogeographic Board, Smithsonian Institution Staff, and others. *Survival on Land and Sea.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1944.

Fisher, Sydney N., ed. *Social Forces in the Middle East: Papers Presented at a Conference Sponsored by the Committee on the Near and Middle East*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955.

"Foreign Area Training Fellowship Program Transferred from the Ford Foundation to Joint Sponsorship by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 16:1, March 1962.

Freedman, Maurice, ed. *Family and Kinship in Chinese Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970. Product of a conference sponsored by the Subcommittee on

Research on Chinese Society, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, September 15-18, 1966.

Ginsburgs, George. *Soviet Works on Korea, 1945-1970.* School of International Relations, University of Southern California, Far Eastern and Russian Research Series, No. 4. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1973. Prepared for the Joint Committee on Korean Studies.

Hall, Robert B. *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences*. Social Science Research Council Pamphlet 3, May 1947. Sponsored by the Committee on World Area Research.

Joint Committee on Japanese Studies. "Japanese Studies in the United States: A Report on the State of the Field, Present Resources and Future Needs," *Association for Asian Studies Newsletter*, Vol. 16, Suppl. No. 1, September 1971.

Johnson, Chalmers, ed. *Ideology and Politics in Contemporary China.* Studies in Chinese Government and Politics No. 4. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1973. Product of a conference sponsored by the Subcommittee on Chinese Government and Politics, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, August 2-6, 1971.

Johnson, John J., ed. *Continuity and Change in Latin America.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964. Product of the conference held by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, January 30-February 2, 1963.

Lambert, Richard D. *Language and Area Studies Review.* American Academy of Political and Social Science Monograph 17, October 1973. Final report on the review sponsored by the Social Science Research Council.

Lapidus, Ira M., ed. *Middle Eastern Cities: A Symposium on Ancient, Islamic, and Contemporary Middle Eastern Urbanism.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969. Product of a conference cosponsored by the Joint Committee on the Near and Middle East, and the University of California, Berkeley, Committee for Middle Eastern Studies, Center for Planning and Development Research, and Department of City and Regional Planning, October 27-29, 1966.

Lewis, John Wilson, ed. *The City in Communist China.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1971. Product of a conference on urban society and political development in modern China, cosponsored by the Subcommittees on Research on Chinese Society and on Chinese Government and Politics, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, December 28, 1968-January 4, 1969.

Lindbeck, John M. H., ed. *China: Management of a Revolutionary Society*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1971. Product of a conference sponsored by the Subcommittee on Chinese Government and Politics, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, August 18-22, 1969.

Miner, Horace, ed. *The City in Modern Africa.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967. Product of the Conference on Methods and Objectives of Research on Urbanization in Africa, sponsored by the Joint Committee on African Studies, April 1-3, 1965.

Perkins, Dwight H. *The Chinese Economy in Historical Perspective.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975 (in press). Papers prepared for the conference held by the Subcommittee on Research on the Chinese Economy, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, June 18-19, 1973.

Scalapino, Robert A., ed. *Elites in the People's Republic of China*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1972. Product of a conference sponsored by the Subcommittee on Chinese Government and Politics, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, August 1824, 1970.

Skinner, G. William, Winston Hsieh, and Shigeaki Tomita, eds. *Modern Chinese Society: An Analytical Bibliography*. 3 vols. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974. Prepared under the auspices of the Subcommittee on Research on Chinese Society, Joint Committee on Contemporary China.

Soderlund, Dorothy, ed. *Directory of Foreign Area Fellows, 1952-1972, of the Joint Committee on the Foreign Area Fellowship Program.* Social Science Research Council, 1973.

Steward, Julian H. Area Research: Theory and Practice. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 63, 1950. Sponsored by the Committee on World Area Research.

Thompson, John M. "Foreign Area Fellowship Program to Merge with Other Area Programs of the American Council of Learned Societies and Social Science Research Council," *Social Science Research Council Items*, 26:41-44, December 1972.

Wagley, Charles. *Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas*. Social Science Research Council Pamphlet 6, June 1948. Sponsored by the Committee on World Area Research.

Wagley, Charles, ed. *Social Science Research on Latin America: Report and Papers of a Seminar on Latin American Studies in the United States, Held at Stanford, California, July 8-August 23, 1963*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964. Sponsored by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies.

Ward, Robert E., Frank Joseph Shulman, and others. *The Allied Occupation of Japan, 1945-1952: An Annotated Bibliography of Western Language Materials*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1974. Compiled for the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies and the University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies.

Ward, Robert E., and Bryce Wood. "Foreign Area Studies and the Social Science Research Council," *Social Science Research Council Items*, December 1974.

Willmott, W. E., ed. *Economic Organization in Chinese Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972. Product of a conference held by the Subcommittee on Research on Chinese Society, Joint Committee on Contemporary China, with the aid of the Committee on the Economy of China, August 16-22, 1969.

Wright, Mary C., ed. *China in Revolution: The First Phase, 1900-1913.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968. Product of the Conference on the Chinese Revolution of 1911, sponsored by the Joint Committee on Contemporary China, August 22-27, 1965.

7

THE COUNCIL AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

An essential attribute of the Council is its character as a nongovernmental organization, free from any a priori commitment to governmentally established policy, and free from any obligation to direct its activities to governmentally suggested goals. Unlike the National Research Council, for example, which was chartered by the Congress for the explicit purpose of advising the government on scientific matters, the Social Science Research Council has no such statutory obligation. In the course of its history, it has received a very small percentage of its funds from governmental agencies, and such public funds as it has received have been earmarked for specific purposes which in the judgment of the directors were consistent with the Council's objectives. It has, however, had many mutually rewarding collaborative relations with governmental agencies.

Improving Federal Statistical Activities

In the 1930's, the Committee on Government Statistics and Information Services, sponsored jointly by the Council and the American Statistical Association, made an exhaustive investigation of the chaotic statistical activities of government agencies and recommended corrective measures. It was no small task: in 1933-34 the committee's research staff in Washington numbered between fifty and sixty, and the committee itself held thirty full-day meetings. In keeping with the committee's recommendation, the Central Statistical Board was established by Presidential executive order in 1933 and later by an act of Congress. Subsequently, the Board's staff was attached to the Bureau of the Budget where, after changes of name and with added statutory authority, it now carries on coordinating functions as the Statistical Policy Division of the Office of Management and Budget. Stuart A. Rice, who had long been associated with the Council and had served on the Committee on Government Statistics, became the first chairman of the Central Statistical Board.

Research on Social Security

There have been other instances in which the Council has rendered technical service to the federal government, probably the most notable being the work of the Committee on Social Security, which was active from 1935 to 1943, in the formative years of the social security system. The committee maintained a research staff in Washington for eight years, under the direction first of J. Frederic Dewhurst and later of Paul Webbink. The composition of the committee differed from that of most Council committees: its eleven original members included only four from academic institutions. Three were from organizations in the field of social welfare, two were executives of large corporations, one was a member of the staff of a labor union, and one the director of the Public Administration Clearing House. The committee was broadly charged with bringing the resources of the social sciences to bear upon the problems entailed in the sudden establishment of a national system of social security insurance, problems for which both public officials and social scientists had been generally ill-prepared. It immediately undertook both to carry out a large

volume of research through its own staff and to serve as a clearinghouse for agencies and individuals either needing the results of research in discharging their administrative and legislative responsibilities or in a position to contribute to the research effort. Its services to official agencies included the provision of advice on matters of personnel, the development of research and administrative programs, the actual participation of its staff members in the establishment of agencies and of procedures for the administration of the social security system, and undertaking research at the suggestion of officials. It maintained close contacts with the Social Security Board, which frequently turned to it for technical and consultative services. The committee's own work was supplemented by that of the Council's Committee on Public Administration, which was able to bring to bear on the organization and procedural problems of the new-fledged system of social insurance its experience gained in several years' study of the workings of federal administrative agencies.

The termination of the Committee on Social Security in 1943 by no means marked the end of the Council's concern with research on employment and related matters. The Committee on Labor Market Research, formed in the same year with J. Douglas Brown as its first chairman, was predominantly academic in membership and outlook, but much of its work related directly to matters of concern to the government.

Louis J. Ducoff and Margaret J. Hagood's publication, *Labor Force Definition and Measurement* (1947), helped to clarify some technical problems that had beclouded debate on public policy. John D. Durand's demographic analysis, *The Labor Force in the United States, 1890-1960* (1948), based on data from the decennial censuses, with projections into the future, and Gladys L. Palmer's monograph, *Labor Mobility in Six Cities* (1954), embodying the results of collaborative research at several universities, were similarly relevant to practical problems affecting the nation's economic well-being. The Committee on Labor Market Research also sponsored studies of employers' hiring policies, preferences, and practices in selected labor market areas, under the direction of E. Wight Bakke—a pioneering research on another facet of the nation's economic life which has become to an increasing extent subject to governmental regulation.

Collaboration with the Bureau of the Census

The Bureau of the Census has repeatedly turned to the Council for consultation and guidance in making its work of gathering and disseminating information more useful for scientific purposes. Since 1946, the two organizations have collaborated in producing two volumes of Historical Statistics; in publishing series of monographs analyzing and interpreting the data of decennial censuses bearing on various social and economic aspects of the nation; in mapping areas for compilation and publication of social and economic statistics that reflect meaningful regional differences; and in planning measures to make official data more accessible for legitimate research while protecting the privacy of individual persons and firms. This last matter has of course been one of growing concern as the use of computers has made the development and use of dossiers on individuals technically more feasible. A Council Committee on Preservation and Use of Economic Data wrestled with the conflict between the social scientists' "need to know" and the citizens' right to privacy, with particular reference to the collection and use of official data on individuals and firms.

The Social Sciences in the National Science Foundation

In the aftermath of World War II, the federal government groped for suitable ways to institutionalize support for basic scientific research as an indispensable national resource in an

age of high technology, and to insure that it would not languish with the liquidation of wartime agencies that had given it great impetus. When legislation creating the National Science Foundation was under consideration, the previously academic question of the claim of social scientists to be recognized as scientists was debated in the political arena. As finally enacted, the National Science Act of 1950 authorized the new agency to support work in "other scientific fields" as well as in the natural sciences; the social sciences, however, are nowhere mentioned in the act. Representatives of the Council who testified at the pre-enactment legislative hearings, while arguing the legitimacy of the social sciences, were aware that there was sufficient opposition to their explicit inclusion in the pending bill to threaten defeat of the measure as a whole. Accordingly, they contented themselves with urging that the law should leave the door ajar for possible entry by the social sciences in the indefinite future. That strategy, although regarded as timid by some more aggressive members of the social science community, paid off. Beginning with projects that could be justified as complementary to the natural sciences, the social sciences gradually established themselves in the Foundation's program. Through informal contacts with officials of the Foundation, the Council contributed in intangible but significant measure to the ultimate acceptance of the social sciences as a legitimate part of the national scientific effort. Harry Alpert, who joined the Foundation's staff in 1953 as its first program officer for the social sciences, was a former fellow of the Council, and Henry W. Riecken, later vice-president and president of the Council, was the Foundation's first assistant director for social science, 1958-1964. In 1960, the Foundation established a Social Science Division, and somewhat later signified the removal of a long-standing barrier by adding political science to the list of the social sciences it is prepared to aid. The methodological revolution in political science, in which the Council had played a significant role, was evidently a major factor contributing to the revised evaluation of a discipline that had previously been stigmatized as too unscientific for Foundation support.

Selected Bibliography

Anderson, William, and John M. Gaus. *Research in Public Administration: Part I, Report of the Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council, 1934-1945; Part II, Research in Public Administration, 1930-1945*. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1945.

Bakke, E. Wight, and others. *Labor Mobility and Economic Opportunity*. Cambridge: Technology Press, and New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1954. Sponsored by the Committee on Labor Market Research.

Berry, Brian J. L., with Peter G. Goheen and Harold Goldstein. *Metropolitan Area Definition: A Re-evaluation of Concept and Statistical Practice*. U.S. Bureau of the Census Working Paper No. 28. Washington, D.C., June 1968. Report on a study made for the Committee on Areas for Social and Economic Statistics.

"[1950] Census Monograph Series." 13 vols. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1955-58. Sponsored by the Committee on Census Monographs in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

"1960 Census Monograph Series." 5 vols. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966-71. Sponsored by the Committee on Population Census Monographs in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Committee on Preservation and Use of Economic Data. "Report of the Committee . . . to the Social Science Research Council, April 1965," in *The Computer and Invasion of Privacy: Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, July 26, 27, and 28, 1966*, Appendix 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Ducoff, Louis J., and Margaret J. Hagood. *Labor Force Definition and Measurement: Recent Experience in the United States*. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 56, 1947. Sponsored by the Committee on Labor Market Research.

Durand, John D. *The Labor Force in the United States, 1890-1960*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1948. Sponsored by the Committee on Labor Market Research.

Effective Use of Social Science Research in the Federal Services. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950. Prepared with the assistance of the Social Science Research Council.

Fuchs, Victor R. *Changes in the Location of Manufacturing in the United States Since 1929.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962. Sponsored by the Committee on Analysis of Economic Census Data.

Government Statistics: A Report of the Committee on Government Statistics and Information Services. Social Science Research Council Bulletin 26, 1937. Sponsored with the American Statistical Association.

McKinley, Charles, and Robert W. Frase. *Launching Social Security: A Capture-and-Record Account, 1935-1937*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970. Report on a study made under the auspices of the Committee on Public Administration.

"Memorandum of the Social Science Research Council on the Federal Government and Research in the Social Sciences," October 1945, in *Hearings on Science Legislation before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, 79th Congress, 1st Session,* Part 4, pp. 740-743.

Nelson, Ralph L. *Concentration in the Manufacturing Industries of the United States: A Midcentury Report*. Economic Census Studies 2. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963. Sponsored by the Committee on Analysis of Economic Census Data.

Noland, E. William, and E. Wight Bakke. *Workers Wanted: A Study of Employers' Hiring Policies, Preferences, and Practices in New Haven and Charlotte*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. Sponsored by the Committee on Labor Market Research.

Palmer, Gladys L., with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd. *Labor Mobility in Six Cities: A Report on the Survey of Patterns and Factors in Labor Mobility, 1940-1950*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1954. Prepared for the Committee on Labor Market Research.

Parnes, Herbert S. *Research on Labor Mobility: An Appraisal of Research Findings in the United States.* Social Science Research Council Bulletin 65, 1954. Sponsored by the Committee on Labor Market Research.

"Reports Prepared for the Committee on Social Security." 9 vols. Washington: Social Science Research Council Committee on Social Security, 1938-43.

"Studies in Administration." 13 vols. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1937-45. Series published for the Committee on Public Administration.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Historical Statistics of the United States, 1789-1945: A Supplement to the Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949. Prepared with the cooperation of the Committee on Economic History and the Advisory Committee on a Source Book of Historical Statistics.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. Prepared with the assistance of the Advisory Committee on Historical Statistics.

AFTERWORD

Eleanor Bernert Sheldon

A recurrent theme underlying this history of the Council's first fifty years is that of innovation. The social sciences themselves are of course an important innovation in man's efforts to understand and improve his world, and the Council has always sought not to repeat successes in the social sciences, but to encourage innovations and improvements. These innovations have included contributions to theory, contributions to methodology, and contributions to the application of the social sciences to different aspects of social life. The seven chapters of Elbridge Sibley's history provide many illustrations of each type of contribution.

Precisely because of its commitment to innovation, the Council tries to view the accomplishments of its own history neither as monuments carved out of stone nor as books safely deposited upon shelves. Rather, we view all that has passed as a prologue to our future.

Lacking the gift of prophecy, I cannot identify in any precise way the special needs of the next decade or two that will provide the context for the Council's program. But I can indicate and briefly describe some of the major research themes that the Council will seek to develop as part of its overall activities no matter what directions society may take.

Through its foreign area programs of research and fellowship support, as well as through a number of its research planning committees, the Council has sought to make the social sciences in the United States less provincial, to assist in the international development of the social sciences, and to introduce comparative data into social science analysis. These developments are described in Chapter 6 of Elbridge Sibley's history.

It is certain that the Council will continue and extend these activities. Although distance makes attendance at meetings more difficult, the Council seeks to enlist foreign scholars as members of both area and other committees. We seek to encourage genuine collaboration in the planning, the financing, and the conduct of research projects and research conferences: a binational program of research carried out with the collaborative planning and financing of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science is one model of such activities. In keeping with such collaborative activities, initiatives from abroad are welcomed in the identification of problems

and the setting of research agenda. Science is one of the most international of all human activities; although the social sciences are inherently bound to specific societies more than are the physical sciences, there is much that can be accomplished by the Council toward the internationalization of the social sciences. In addition to internationalizing the membership of committees, other collaborative activities are possible with international social science associations, with the social science research councils of other countries, and with the social science research activities of United Nations organizations.

International collaboration in social science research activities has obvious advantages for the training of researchers and for the development of a truly international community of social scientists. It also has a genuine scientific rationale as well: it is in large part through comparative research that the social sciences can approximate the conditions of experimentation and thus achieve some measure of validation of research findings. Although there are a number of ways of carrying out comparative research within a national society, international comparisons are particularly valuable. The Council's foreign area committees provide both an intellectual rationale and a useful mechanism for international comparative research.

There are many styles that such research can take. A recent model is provided by a research conference sponsored by the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies. Concerned with what was called "the comparative uses of the Japanese experience," each participant—starting from the perspective of Japan's unique position as the only non-Western nation that has become a modern industrial society—prepared a paper comparing a Japanese institution or historical event to a foreign one: factories, the novel, the family, and responses to modernizing influences are examples of topics covered in the papers, half of which were prepared by Japanese scholars. The resulting volume will hopefully be not only a valuable contribution to Japanese studies but an important contribution to the methodology of comparative research as well.

Another appropriate model is provided by the early planning activities of an ad hoc group that is currently assisting the staff to find ways of integrating the programs of the Council's foreign area committees and its research planning and appraisal committees. The hope is to plan a program of research that will draw upon the strengths of both types of committees and, in turn, contribute to these strengths. One area of potential research currently being explored is that of ethnic identity in plural societies—a near-universal phenomenon that will increase in importance as the nation-state changes and as people throughout the world seek to find in their ethnic communities the sense of tradition and the feelings of identification that are viewed as being diluted or lost in mass, industrial societies. Although ethnic identification may not eventually emerge as the topic of a large-scale research program, it serves as an example of the value of using the Council's committee structure as a framework for exploring and planning comparative research.

The Council has always collaborated closely with the American Council of Learned Societies, particularly in the development of trained researchers on foreign areas and in the support of research in these areas. A substantial proportion of Council committee work is jointly sponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies and it is anticipated that this effective collaborative relationship will continue.

Although the Council was founded to advance research in the social sciences, it has always interpreted this mandate broadly. For example, since its beginnings the Council has maintained close ties with the field of history, a bridging discipline between the social sciences and the humanities. Prominent historians have always served on the board of directors and have been active in Council committees. A series of Council publications in historiography has served

to make many historians more aware of their own methods, and a program of mathematical and statistical applications to the social sciences has given historians greater access to and ability to analyze quantitative data.

Another example of the Council's broad view of the scope of the social sciences is its support of research and training in language and linguistics. In the development of the fields of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics the Council has played a leading role. Since 1963 a Council committee has encouraged the field of sociolinguistics, which is in part the investigation of language as a cultural medium that binds people together and imparts shared meaning to social and community life. Clearly here is an important arena for the collaboration of social scientists and humanists.

The Council has also worked closely with natural scientists on problems of common concern—for example, in the Committee on Genetics and Behavior and its successor, the Committee on Biological Bases of Social Behavior, and in certain physiological aspects of linguistics. In the future, the Council expects to continue the same pattern of integration of knowledge, not earmarking certain resources for humanistic or natural science research and others for purely social science research, but rather focusing on any and all matters where Council programs may contribute to a better understanding of the human condition.

In these few pages I have attempted to sketch out some of the themes that will be central to the Council's program in the near future. These themes will by no means define the Council's program. Innovations at the Council as elsewhere have always taken place within a context defined by the society, and the needs of the society, of the time. Innovation, stated differently, has in large part been a response to conditions set by others, to "the spirit of the times." This pattern, which might be termed "innovation as response," will certainly continue in all that the Council does. The Council will seek to respond to the initiative of individual social scientists both at the universities and on its staff; it will identify needs that cannot be met by other institutions; and it will appoint committees to appraise promising new leads. It will continue to search for meaningful modes of interdisciplinary research. It will seek to clarify the scientific and policy aspects of issues of values and ethics in social science research. It will continue to develop and disseminate improved methods of analysis. And it will stress the Council's unique capabilities in playing a facilitating and integrating role within the social science community.