

# The American Political Science Review

---

VOL. XL

APRIL, 1946

NO. 2

---

## A JOB ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE\*

JOHN M. GAUS

*University of Wisconsin*

Sentiment alone does not send my thoughts back to the first meeting of the Association which I attended—that held in Washington in December, 1920, a quarter of a century ago. You will have no time for that, although, perhaps, entry into a guild and fellowship has its appropriate niche for each of us, and so in some measure plays a collective rôle. The times and circumstances then and now, however, have useful common elements; both meetings followed and follow a world war; both reflect an atmosphere of exhaustion and of worry, of unsettlement, and also of new challenges to effort in the reshaping of things.

But lately I have been recalling particularly words spoken at that earlier meeting by the then Secretary of War, Newton Baker, when he addressed the assembled Associations. Some of you will remember how vividly he described an episode in an American offensive in France, when he stood beside the commanding officer in a small hut, the maps and charts before them, and messages poured in as the hour of assault arrived and the troops moved forward. After a time came an appeal from an advanced unit requesting the barrage to be lifted, as their objective was won. The commander studied the maps and charts. "Continue the barrage," he ordered; "we cannot yet have reached that point." Later, after the battle was over and prisoners were being questioned, the message was traced to an enemy officer who had thus tried to trick the Americans and had faked the appeal. Secretary Baker drove home his point. "Who, in times of peace, will similarly perform the task of that officer, in detecting from the flood of every conceivable kind of appeal on innumerable issues, of weighing the elements behind the appeal and ruling decisively, for purposes of action, what is true

\* Presidential address delivered before the American Political Science Association at its forty-first annual meeting, Philadelphia, Pa., March 28, 1946.

and what is false?" For the development of such critical thinking, of judgment based on knowledge, in society, he urged, such scholars as the political scientists and the historians, whose Associations he was addressing, have a major responsibility.

We have all had the experience some time of reading a news dispatch or hearing a broadcast concerning some episode or place with which we have personal acquaintance, and of noting in the account some statement which we know from our own first hand acquaintance to be untrue as reported. The point may seem minor, such as the location of a place, or the assignment of an office to a person; yet the inaccuracy may make us feel skeptical of the accuracy of the major point of the report by assuring us that the person reporting is not himself at home and thoroughly familiar with the subject he is reporting. Or the apparently minor point may actually be the key to the whole episode, so that when one removes it as untrue from the context, the entire account becomes worthless; or the point reported may be true in itself, but needing for proper evaluation surrounding and qualifying data which are not given. The problem presented to the reader or listener in such circumstances is relatively easy. He knows; he has been there; perhaps he has participated in the event; and he can reach quickly a relatively objective estimate of the report. But for most of us, at most times, getting the raw data, to say nothing of its setting, is more difficult, and we have neither the leisure, nor the personal equipment, nor the resistance to distraction, equal to the task of being citizens.

In the period since Secretary Baker spoke, the task has become more complicated. The tempo of change is more swift—no longer a moderate adjustment to a major change in a generation, but for our own generation two world wars and a world depression to assimilate. We were more than a century in the change from an eighty per cent farm-resident to an eighty per cent non-farm-resident society in the United States; the passage into a series of dominant metropolitan communities has been more rapid. Within those communities, within a briefer time a movement from the central mother city to the suburbs has proceeded swiftly. Nor have the farm and forest areas been unchanged. An earlier progression from forests and forest employments to cattle-raising and arable farming has faltered, slowed down, and even been reversed as farm lands judged sub-marginal begin to be gathered into areas marked for reforestation. In 1879, Major Powell, in his famous report on the Arid

Lands, urged a reappraisal of our land settlement policies and standards and a program of coöperative grazing and water control associations in the plains. Over fifty years later, the Report on the Great Plains, the Taylor Grazing Act, the Water Facilities Act, the Soil Conservation and Shelter Belt and Farm Security Programs, were all illustrations of the recognition of problems of change and adjustment whose need Powell had foreseen. The course of forest policy is equally instructive. Turner records the socially supported attitude of a Middle Western territorial delegate to Congress who protested the prosecution of persons taking lumber from the public lands as unfriendly to the builders of new communities. The statute books and public reports of the same area have in the last twenty years recorded forest crop legislation, land use classification and zoning, and the establishment of public forest preserves.

These illustrations of change are from what may appear to be the simpler, natural elements in the life of a community. In transportation, industry, commerce, and finance, the examples would be more complex, such as the public facilitation of insurance of bank deposits or mortgages on houses, the regulation of rates and services of railroads, motor trucking, or air transport services; the subsidizing of the merchant marine, or the production and marketing of various goods and services; or the establishing of procedures in the conduct of industrial relations. Each one of you will be familiar in some detail, many of you as pioneer participants, in some activity of this kind. Your very familiarity will have encouraged, perhaps, a weariness with the topic, a sense of the extreme difficulty of formulating programs that permit substantial justice to all those affected, a discouragement at the technical difficulties in applying effectively the most wisely conceived general policy when one is immersed in immediate problems of administration, and awareness of the difficulty of understanding on the part of the mass of citizens whom one is endeavoring to serve. And we are confronted by the effects upon this intricate system of depression and war, with all the exacerbating of personal worries into group hatreds and suspicions, with all the dislocations and destructions which have at once invaded not only the most gigantic economic and political organizations but the careers and homes of the humblest persons. No wonder there is so much a sense of frustration and exhaustion, at the very moment when such difficult decisions have to be taken.

In the preface to his play *John Bull's Other Island*, Bernard Shaw speaks of political hatred as "the only hatred that civilization allows to be mortal hatred." We have had it raw and strong for a long time. Perhaps it flourishes the greater because the tempo and extent of change of which I have been speaking have brought such inner uncertainty to so many people of all groups, incomes, and other external circumstances. It leads everyone to some escape—an escape from freedom, as one writer has put it, or perhaps an escape to some relief in seeking a personal or group superiority to others—at its extreme, to sadism and persecution. This circumstance reminds me of a phrase Gilbert Murray employed in a discussion of Greek religion in the Hellenistic period—"the failure of nerve." For there is a useful comparison to be made between our period and that. A period of civil war and the clash of rival city states and their empires had resulted in the engulfment of them all by the Macedonian Empire of Philip and Alexander. The appeal of Isocrates and others to revise and enlarge their loyalties through a peaceful federation was unsuccessful. Nor was this all. Alexander expanded enormously the area of contact and acquaintance, at least superficially, of the Greeks with Eastern peoples, and planted in the near East and Egypt new cities deliberately planned to incorporate a mixture of peoples of different cultures. As a symbolism of the new synthesis, and to produce a cement for the new and vast political system, as well as to quiet and submerge the tradition of participation of persons as citizens in public affairs, a conception of the ruler as having divine attributes was fostered, facilitated doubtless by some borrowings from mystery cults and strange dogmas coming out of the newly and superficially conquered lands stretching to the valley of the Indus. The effort to assimilate within a single system the varied attitudes and customs of East and West, coming so swiftly after the collapse of the known and explored apparent security of the City State, was too much for the nerve which had sustained the attempt to inquire coolly and skeptically and reasonably concerning the nature of the universe and man and his institutions. In a chartered world, Murray points out, science and philosophy will be produced because there is confidence in experience and reason, and dangers and terrors are matters to be explored in sober spirit, sustained by society, and with a recognition of one's duties to it. But when the charts are lost, or are demonstrably useless, where war, famine, and anarchy are present, where there seems

to be no relation between responsible human effort and measurable results, where vast new possibilities, uncertainties, threats, and strange new knowledge have somehow to get fitted into the scheme of things, the nerve fails. What efforts at orderly inquiry and creation persist are attacked or viewed with extreme suspicion and distrust at the time when they are needed most.

In our time it is not the city state but the national state which, after some centuries of evolution out of the king's household, has revealed its inadequacies in relations beyond its borders as human activities and interest spill over them and their imperial accumulations. The attempts at solving the difficulty by New Orders that are old empires writ large do not inspire much confidence. Within the national state, it is only here and there, chiefly in a few relatively small and homogeneous communities, that people have achieved some more successful processing of skills and resources into a standard of living and way of life that seem capable of absorbing at least internal change, and even these fortunate communities are the early prey of the leviathans. And now has come for us all, everywhere, again the problem of reaching some adequate assimilation of ideas and practices of both the East and the West.

The situation was foreseen and discussed by Henry Adams in his *The Education of Henry Adams*, a book which seems to me of major importance for us for many reasons. He interprets, for example, two other postwar periods in our history—those following the Civil War and the Spanish American War; and in both he had a personal stake in attempting to penetrate and interpret events. In the first period, he had, like his brother, and indeed his generation, a personal choice of career to be made. He chose to go to Washington and to attempt a new kind of journalism, one which might interpret events and institutions to American citizens. Those articles—such as, for example, the one on "Civil Service Reform," on the sessions of Congress, and on the railroad financing of the period are worthy of our study today. I am more concerned here to point out that his appraisals of the post-civil war decade in these articles and in his subsequent *Education* stress the fact of change, of the dissolving of values and the sense of need of deliberate institution and process invention and building; and then stress the task, presented by events and illustrated by his own efforts, of interpreting to the citizen what was happening, how it was affecting our institutions, and what needed to be done.

"It required," he wrote, "all the new machinery to be created—capital, banks, mines, furnaces, shops, power-houses, technical knowledge, mechanical population, together with a steady remodelling of social and political habits, ideas, and institutions to fit the new scale and the new institutions."

Twenty years later, a self-styled stable-companion to friends active in public affairs, he was noting the implications of the Spanish War on the one hand and the new physics, which he began to study under the guidance of his friend Langley on the other. He knew, he remarked, that we would have to take Puerto Rico, but he wished we might escape the Philippines! And he noted, when he heard in Paris of the Boxer Rebellion, that while he realized that in the twentieth century the struggle for the control of China would be the major fact, in London and Paris the news was interpreted chiefly in terms of fall in the value of a Ming vase. But just as he had sensed in 1879 the importance of the work of his friends Hewitt and King in establishing a central agency for surveying our natural resources and formulating policies concerning them, so twenty years later he concluded that the North Atlantic had become an integral unit. "From Hammerfest to Cherbourg on one shore of the ocean—from Halifax to Norfolk on the other—one great empire was ruled by one great emperor—Coal. Political and human jealousies might tear it apart or divide it, but the power and the empire were one." And later, speaking of the fall of Port Arthur, he wrote: "For the first time in fifteen hundred years a true Roman *pax* was in sight."

The Pacific would have to be brought, at least in thought and policy-making, into relation with the Atlantic. For the new forms of application of energy were such that some guidance of the concentrated controls which they invited, and even compelled, had become the first task of domestic and international politics.

The same prophetic note was being struck by F. J. Turner in his address on the Frontier at the Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893, when he concluded that the next stage in American life would no longer be shaped by the frontier conditions; by John W. Burgess, who already had founded at Columbia University a Graduate School of Political Science in recognition of the new American situation and its needs; by John Bates Clark and other economists whose object in organizing the American Economic Association also reflected an interpretation of contemporary events and needs; and by Woodrow Wilson, in his paper on "The Study of Administration," published in the first volume of the *Political Science Quarterly*

that was one of the early fruits of Burgess' planning. Wilson, like Turner (and the two discussed together their country and its problems much in their Johns Hopkins days) realized that a new America had, in the post-Civil War period, come into existence, and that its administrative and legislative institutions should be re-appraised for the new tasks of government which he foresaw.

This effort to record and interpret one's times so that we may better order our work was illustrated again at the meeting of our Association in 1920 at which Secretary Baker spoke. I recall the paper which Charles E. Merriam read—I think the title was "Political Prudence"—in which the tasks to be undertaken and areas of thought to be invaded were presented. I recall, too, with gratitude its note of welcome and encouragement to the new apprentices.

Precedent at least, if not the possession of special insight, supports me when I emphasize our rôle in this postwar period, indicate difficulties, and make suggestions. The extent and rapidity of change in wartime create new situations to be interpreted. It is true that much of that change is physical, and sometimes highly technical. But much of the adjustment that men may make to such change must come through the use of government. Nor is that fact applicable only to such dramatic developments as the atomic bomb, radar, jet propulsion, or penicillin. I have spoken of the new—but long developing—problems of both urban and rural communities. I should underline the point, in returning to these illustrations of our job, that there is no clear separation, in the attack upon these problems, of physical or social research. The researches of botanist, biologist, or engineer that result in changes in farm management cannot be considered to have answered the problems of a farm and the life of those dependent on it. The new commodity, or breed, or machinery is only one part of an organism that is affected by forces beyond the fences of the farm—prices, roads, schools, consumer purchasing power. In the forest cut-over regions to be found now in so many parts of our country, the problem of family income and community life involves the nicest dovetailing of factors of production, market, and price with local, county, state, and national policies relating to land use, highways, schools, relief, money grants, and—perhaps most important of all—obtaining personnel experienced not only in various special substantive fields such as forestry or soils or recreational programs, but in the legislative and administrative integration of the different policies to each local unit and indeed each farm or forest. Similarly providing assistance

to some country in need requires not only the physical materials and transport, but a personnel with some awareness of the problems of formulating and administering an international policy; of the characteristic difficulties that have been encountered in such enterprises; of the devices and procedures that have been found useful; and of the culture of the area to be aided. I am impressed by the recognition, in the statements of many of the physical scientists who participated in the atomic bomb project, of the area of research and interpretation of institutional policy, organization, and procedure into which the physical research must be integrated. Similarly, the problems of the metropolitan area go beyond the application of engineering research techniques to roads, houses, sewers, and water supply; they are essential. But equally essential are a clearer theory of the metropolitan area as an organic unit requiring political expression; political devices, for the shaping of which studies in comparative government, public law, and public administration can contribute, whereby the local neighborhood, the historic municipalities, and the organic whole may be integrated; and a public reporting which will be capable of explaining to the citizen the nature of his community and conveying back what the citizen thinks and feels about it.

In a memorandum on "The Atomic Bomb and American Security" by Bernard Brodie published by the Institute of International Studies of Yale University, there is a relevant example of a political scientist attacking the substantive problem created by the recent work in atomic physics as applied to the waging of war. At one point in his diagnosis, his treatment of what he terms "vulnerability control" leads him to the topic of urban planning. My own first reaction to the fact of the atomic bomb as related to city planning had been to reject outright, in view of its apparently cataclysmic influence on the methods of war, the usefulness of exploring changes in urban design. Dr. Brodie's suggestion of the possible value, in any total program, of the dispersal of certain types of industry, of the reduction of density of population, and of the danger of concentrating all political and administrative decision-making in a single urban center, not of course as the single response to the new threat, has led me to change my opinion. For in the attack upon war itself from which, as the author concludes, "the problem of the atomic bomb is inseparable," every measure which makes the war-maker hesitate because of the increased difficulty and cost of his aggression plays its part. My point is that there is

a further need for the political scientist, confronted as we are by this new source of change in our environment, as interpreter and appraiser and inventor, and that in all these rôles he will be most useful if he builds cumulatively on the research he has been doing on already known institutions. I found myself, for example, turning again to materials on regional centers, on the future rôle of state governments, on state capitals as contrasted with regional centers, on the experience of Great Britain during the war with regional commissioners, and a plexus of problems in political geography, comparative government, and administration. We have all, perhaps, been too inclined to leave the atomic bomb problem to our colleagues who work chiefly in the field of international relations. Certainly they have a great task and opportunity; but second thought convinces me that we must continue to cultivate our other gardens, and integrate our work generally with the institution-invention that must be done on the international level.

For we are confronted here by problems not only of organization and procedure, but of political behavior, of the relation described by Harold Lasswell in his phrase "World Conflict and Personal Insecurity." We confront the tasks of a new Hellenistic period which, like the old, experiences the failure of its chief political institution, and the necessity of reaching some working relationship of East and West; and, like the old Hellenistic period, has been experiencing so much human evil that it may despair of reason and retreat to cults and drugs. For those committed to reason, as our very title commits us, we cannot retreat; we must push the application of science further into the analysis of human behavior and institutions as the next step in the physical research which has brought the literally explosive new knowledge into its first application.

A science of materials and of plants and animals, of the landscape and the city-scape, is incomplete to man living in them if he does not complete it with a science of the institutions of the community whereby man may live at peace in that community and realize more nearly what he is capable of being as a man. The converse is also true; and perhaps its application to our work is that we each should familiarize ourselves with some substantive problem with which our governmental institutions are created to deal, so that we more clearly see for ourselves, and interpret to others, the incompleteness of one approach without the other; and see the importance, too, not only of social invention or physical

invention, but of new sensitiveness to design, to standards of living, to wider human sympathies and richer insights into what makes a community a better place in which to live.

I relate these to you obvious facts because apparently they are not so obvious to some others. I am impressed, in reading the testimony before the Kilgore Committee concerning the question of national policy of aid to research, by the dismissal of the social sciences as unworthy of or inappropriate for consideration in comparison with the natural sciences, and of the almost complete ignoring of the arts and literature. To enter our educational institutions with public assistance and prestige for one part only of our program of studies would in my judgment tend to distort the minds of students concerning the nature of the problems that confront this country and the interdependence everywhere of fields of knowledge itself. It is significant, I think, that the policy of aid to agricultural research through the experiment stations which was instituted in the 1880's was broadened forty-five years later from the physical sciences to include the social sciences and the problems of the farm as a home and as a civic and economic as well as a physical unit.

And so we must not suffer a failure of nerve from any doubting of the urgency and importance of our job. It is to record, to explain, to invent, as carefully, as honestly, and as responsibly as we can, the significance of physical, social, and intellectual change upon government as an instrument by means of which people first may live at all, and live better. Therein all our special fields, whether the study of comparative government, of public law, of political theory, of administration, of public opinion or international relations or any other of our special points of beginning, have a tremendous job to do. In concluding his book on "Education for Public Administration" a few years ago, George Graham stressed the importance to training of research, and remarked that in public administration we were now teaching all that we know, and probably beyond it. That is true in all our fields. And since we work in the larger field of government, perhaps we have a special challenge in this new Hellenistic age to prevent the disintegration of confidence of people to govern themselves, to find in reason and inquiry and peaceful processes of discussion and debate a method of problem-solving superior to political hatred, suppression, and sadism. For an interdependent society, a large part of which the world over has become urban and metropolitan, whatever its local economic programs, is dependent upon government, and takes up

force, as our generation has twice witnessed, at an appalling cost.

This attempt at a job analysis of political science in our time should include, perhaps, a more overt recognition of and emphasis upon a phase that interests many. How can the knowledge of the expert be made more available to the layman? I think we shall not contribute much to an answer if we consider this a one-way process. My suggestion that, in addition to our concern for organization and process, the techniques of legislation or of adjudication, we acquaint ourselves with a substantive problem was made partly with this problem in mind. In such a study—perhaps in some civic activity in his local community, for example, the political scientist will learn as much as he teaches. He will better know how much time and energy and knowledge of what proportion of his neighbors are available for a political problem; of the distractions and apparent irrelevancies that intervene; of the special resources of knowledge and wisdom or liabilities of suspicion and hatred that must be envisaged in formulating a political problem or attempting its solution. If the political scientist has something to give, he will probably find that it wins respect. The incident may be local and petty, but the general truths it conveys may be widely applicable in his work. One does not need to sentimentalize about popular participation in affairs to recognize that the expert is more likely to be an expert if he knows better what people are concerned about, and how to explain the meaning, hitherto hidden to them, of events and institutions bound to affect them. His very research and teaching will have become another item of weight, however tiny, against a failure of nerve and faith in human effort. It was a nice compliment—and also practically successful—when Sidney Webb waged a parliamentary campaign in a Durham mining district by publishing a history of the Durham miners.

Probably most of our institutions of learning and the departments of political science within them are discussing, and have already acted or will act on, proposals for curricular change. The experiments in training instituted during the war need to be appraised, such as the idea of regional focus of studies, for example. The financing of research and the relation of public research needs to available personnel and the educational and research institutions are recognized as important questions. The education and recruitment of personnel for government administration and the clarifying to students of their civic obligations and opportunities will require a fresh appraisal. We have a special responsibility in working with

our colleagues in the high schools and teacher training colleges, and in adult education, in determining the place of political science in these programs, and also in the increasing number of programs in the field of industrial relations.

In these and related questions, our Association can serve us all through committee study and reporting; and perhaps on some questions, such as the conduct and support of government research and the qualifications for some positions in the public service, the Association will need to present some formulation of professional views.

The program of your meetings for tomorrow reflects these challenges and opportunities of our time. There is some skepticism of the value to the scholar of collective efforts; and yet while it is true that the individual scholar is the basic creative unit, it is also true that a corporative spirit and sense of fellowship may be useful and even essential to him, especially in periods of strife and confusion. If we survey our ground and take counsel together, there may be both substantial advantages to our personal plans for research and instruction, and professional and civic advantages in a cumulative advance in our science. And so a day is set aside, as we meet again after the break of the war years. We may draw upon the work done during those years by our Presidents, Program Committee Chairmen, our Secretary, and our Editor, and by Committees whom they appointed and put to work. Presidents Anderson, Cushman, and White, and Program Chairmen Stoke, Dimock, and Fesler provided for meetings during the war years which could only partially be realized. The Association can now express its gratitude to them for their trusteeship. At the meeting of the Executive Council in February, 1945, in receiving the report of the Committee on Research by its chairman, Ernest Griffith, the Council expressed the view that its findings should be widely disseminated among our members. When we learned last September that we might hold an Association meeting this winter, after the peak of troop movements in the holiday season, it seemed appropriate to carry out the wishes of the Council, to give a fresh start to the discussion and planning of research in political science, and to give greater opportunity than usual for the consideration of Association committee activities, by devoting most of one day of our meetings to the work of the Research Committee. We shall have, in addition to open panel sessions, a report from the Committee as a whole, and reports from the Committee on the Social Studies, which has served us well in coöperation with the National Council of the

Social Studies in exploring secondary school and teacher training questions, and from the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction. At our luncheon meeting there will be discussions of our rôle in the work of the Social Science Research Council. Let me here express the appreciation of our Association of the leadership which the Council has taken through its staff in aiding its constituent members to follow the question of national aid to research now before Congress. Saturday noon, we shall hear from the chairman and vice-chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Organization of Congress. The establishment of this study by Congress of its own organization is welcome to us in view of the stimulating and preparatory work of a committee of this Association, whose chairman, George Galloway, has been serving as a chief of staff to the Joint Committee of Congress.

I hope that the Association will take a further step in facilitating its planning of research and committee studies. A meeting annually of the Executive Council in early or late summer would make possible a better consideration of Association policy than the usual meeting at the time of the Association meeting permits. Since the membership of the Council is widely representative and the terms are overlapping, it can, given more opportunity for discussion, supply a more broadly based and continuous survey of committee activities, and formulate a balanced program and budget for the consideration of the annual meeting of the Association.

There is much to learn from the example of coöperation which marked the work of the physical scientists engaged in the atomic bomb project. Dr. Henry Smyth has described this coöperation in a recent article:<sup>1</sup>

“The development of the atomic bomb in the last five years was not a scientific experiment carried on under perfectly controlled conditions in a remote laboratory. It was the combined effort of thousands of men and women of varying nationalities and backgrounds, freely joining their knowledge and their abilities for a common objective. I believe we have something of value to learn from their experience.

“The purpose for which they worked, and to which they gave their full moral support, was the rapid ending of this war; the ending of all wars, they hoped. That is why the associations of scientists who worked on the atomic bomb have been so anxious to make clear the implications of atomic energy. . . .

<sup>1</sup> *The Survey Graphic*, Jan., 1946, p. 20.

“The men who developed the atomic bomb were willing to try radical ideas. They were willing to think in new ways, for in one section after another of the project they were doing things that had never been done before. It is interesting that, again and again, as they faced what seemed insuperable difficulties, they found that the so-called visionary idea proved in the end to be the practical one. I saw this happen many times in our work between 1940 and 1945.

“Now we stand at the beginning of the atomic age. I would suggest that we learn some lessons from the methods that brought it to birth. We must think in new ways to meet this new age. We have always been an adaptable people, with the saving heritage of common sense.

“Let us now be willing to delegate our national sovereignty to the larger sovereignty of world law—for nationalism will be suicide in the world we have created.

“Let us ask the suggestions of other nations about our common problems, and not attempt to use our momentarily powerful position to force our ideas on them.

“Let us be as anxious to find the weaknesses in our policies and conduct as we are to find them in the policies and conduct of our fellow-nations. Let us not expect too much too soon, but act like wise and reasonable men. In the revealing light of the atomic bomb, *our objective must be enduring peace.*”

The political scientist may well share this attitude toward methods of his colleagues in the physical sciences, and the work of both has become a more integrated enterprise. While at first sight the new physical forces would seem to create an entirely new setting, sober reconsideration reveals a new emphasis on older problems of international order, on the creation of a metropolitan political organism, of rural government, that better reflects natural resources and their wiser use, of better procedures in the formulation of public policy and reporting, of gaining more sympathetic insight into individuals and the making of communities. Some years ago, a contemporary poet suggested that the end of the world would come “not with a bang, but a whimper.” Since last summer, many have accepted fatalistically the “bang” alternative. The political scientist can help in the avoidance of both by doing his job. For any achievement of gains, however slight, toward a reasonable solution of the problems of government contributes toward a renewal of confidence in reason itself and a strengthening of nerve.