

financial aid in getting the work done; but the character of the information to be collected and the organization of it for publication will be in the hands of the committee of historical scholars of which Professor W. E. Lingelbach of the University of Pennsylvania is chairman. Both the investigation and the report will be limited to objective information collected in a scientific spirit. Such an inquiry will naturally consider to some extent the status of other social studies as well as history. Those who are interested in such an undertaking are invited to send information, suggestions or inquiries to Mr. Dawson, 425 West 123d St., New York City.

**The Institute of Politics.** Two years ago, Professor James T. Shotwell of Columbia University wrote, under the title of "Intelligence and Politics"<sup>1</sup> a brief essay of uncommon suggestiveness and force. He recalled the bewilderment of great numbers of the American people when, in 1917, they found themselves a responsible element in a struggle of seemingly remote and complicated origins and yet which threatened, so they were told, the political institutions to which the century and a half of national existence had been dedicated. With whatever clarity the issues had been resolved for those in authority at Washington or for the informed and educated minority, there were yet vast numbers of our people who lacked sufficient data to reach satisfactory conclusions on the questions involved. Thousands of letters came to Washington from these people "wanting to know just why they might be called upon to serve and just what would make the world safe for democracy."

Pending the statement by the government of the ideals and purpose of the war and the subsequent attempts at popular enlightenment, the immediate and vigorous response of the nation was due, not so much to a rational and understanding public will, as to the emotional impulses and sentiments commonly designated as patriotism. "Simple pure loyalty to 'Uncle Sam' . . . ," says Prof. Shotwell, "so far as any one can see, saved the day, rather than a clarified idea of the reasons for the war." And yet, he continues, "valuable as such a sentiment may be, it is not as sound an element of national life to rely upon in a crisis as the experience might lead one to suppose. If the loyalty is unquestioning, it may be deceived; if it questions, it may falter. Disaster may front either alternative."

<sup>1</sup> James T. Shotwell, *Intelligence and Politics*, New York, 1921, The Century Co.

There is much in the post-war temperament of America to warrant this conclusion that we lacked adequate popular convictions concerning the issues of the war, with respect, at least, to those elements of the war program that had to do with the establishment of a constructive international peace. Loyalty and patriotism may be sufficient to safeguard immediate interests but action beyond this range requires the more thorough-going process of political education.<sup>2</sup>

In his analysis of this problem of the intellectual preparedness of a democracy, Professor Shotwell holds that there must be, first of all, a change in the methods through which political questions are presented to the public mind. "What we need," he says, "is applied social science." . . . "We must work at the data of national problems in the same spirit as that which Pasteur applied to the investigations which changed the study of medicine from quackery to science." It is not sufficient that this temperament prevails already in the isolation of academic life. New agencies and devices must be created which will project it into the life of the world at large. "Facts must be supplied where the need for them is greatest; and a scientific spirit must be developed where its operation will be most effective." Democracy has a promising and insatiable appetite for facts and only in proportion as these are supplied will reason and conviction dictate the course of public affairs. The concrete proposal made by Professor Shotwell in this connection relates to the possibility of informing opinion through the medium of political parties. If parties, instead of making their appeal through prejudice and emotion, were to work out authoritative data on national problems, through the medium of expert research committees, and wage campaigns upon a structure of facts, the political thought of the country would be enormously elevated. The effectiveness of such methods in practical politics has been adequately demonstrated by the Labor Research Department of the British Labor movement. In no small measure the rise of the Labor party to its present position of power and esteem has been due to its scientific assemblage of data on national problems and to the superiority enjoyed by its debators in the presentation of these facts. And in one field of political thought especially—that of international relations—the pronouncements of its Research Department have had a wide and influential hearing.

It would be inappropriate, perhaps, to say that in the organization of the Institute of Politics three years ago at Williamstown there was the

<sup>2</sup> Cf. The article by Herbert Croly on, "American Withdrawal from Europe—How and Why," *The New Republic*, Sept. 12, 1923.

conscious purpose of innovation in the method of approach to the study of politics, or that extensive hopes were entertained of a wide dissemination of facts upon international affairs. More likely there was merely the conviction that there were sources of thought and information in the country that should be coördinated; that experience would gradually reveal the methods through which the Institute could most effectively proceed and would indicate the promise of its future usefulness. Now after three somewhat experimental sessions the work of the institute has become more clearly defined and it seems, in fact, to have made a distinctive contribution to the method of studying political affairs.

If we are seeking a medium through which the study of politics may become less cloistered and ineffectual and which yet preserves a scientific and dispassionate spirit, a satisfactory approximation to this ideal has been afforded by the three sessions of the Institute of Politics. The basis of such an estimate is to be found, chiefly, in the work of the round-table conferences at Williamstown. Not that as yet, in every case, have these round-tables reflected a standard of highly capable and systematic study of the problem at hand. But the feasibility of such aims becomes increasingly apparent and the ways and means of their attainment are revealed in each successive session.

It is by no means difficult to visualize these round-table conferences as research committees inaugurating a distinctive era in what may be called applied political science. This would require, of course, something more than assembling for a month at Williamstown and engaging in discussion, which, however stimulating and informing in itself, would be only one element in a program of this character. It would mean the selection considerably in advance of the sessions, not only of round-table leaders, but of a nucleus of members, as well, who, through preliminary study of the topic or experience in practical affairs, would be able to bring to the conference a body of material ready for examination and discussion. Under these circumstances there could consciously be brought to bear upon the particular subject a body of expert information obtained from sources so diverse that these conferences would reflect a breadth of view unparalleled in the present range of political study. Such a procedure, indeed, has had already a substantial beginning in many of the round-tables, and their work generally throughout the sessions of the Institute has been of an extremely able character. It is their present success which supports the belief that groups of this order, carefully selected and organized, may be the beginning of a far-reaching change in the method of political research.

Given, however, these round-table conferences as research committees working out data and facts on national or international affairs, there yet remains the problem of introducing their findings into the political thought and action of the day. It is not easy, of course, to estimate the positive influence of a gathering such as the Institute of Politics. It has attracted each session a large number of representative men and women who, in their respective walks of life, are undoubtedly forces in the processes of molding opinion. Its proceedings have received a considerable amount of publicity and discussion in the daily press and its sessions are attracting an increasing number of special writers from the more thoughtful reviews. However considerable this influence has been, there is yet reason to believe that it can be substantially increased, when the institute develops some means of presenting in more adequate and permanent form the results of its round-table studies. Consider, for instance, the subject-matter of certain round-table conferences of the past three sessions, noted here by reason of the particular widespread interest in the questions discussed. Among the topics may be found, the Treaty of Versailles; Reparations and Inter-Allied Debts; the League of Nations; the International Problems of the Pacific; the Conduct of Foreign Relations under Democratic Conditions; the Outstanding International Problems of the American Continent. There is undoubtedly, in the country at large, an active demand for information upon these questions, which would have welcomed investigations under the auspices of the Institute of Politics. Such studies, incorporated in some form less transitory than newspaper and magazine reviews, yet suitable for widespread use, would be an immensely important factor in the political education of the country. With progress in the methods and organization of these round-tables, it is difficult to conceive of surroundings from which truth on questions of this nature would be more likely to emerge.

The third annual session of the Institute which convened this summer showed conclusively the essential vitality of the undertaking. There was a substantial increase in enrollment which indicates an early problem of limitation of numbers. The diverse and representative character of the membership was maintained and included this year many members of the two former sessions. The most noteworthy change in the organization of the institute was the limitation placed upon attendance at the round-tables and the restriction of members to a choice of one only of these groups. In addition to the regular round-tables, two open conferences were conducted which held afternoon sessions and to which all members of the institute were privileged to come.

The lecture courses this year enjoyed a popularity and esteem which demonstrated the high value they may serve on the program of the institute. Five regular courses were given by lecturers from foreign countries: Sir Edward Grigg from England; Canon Ernest Dimnet from France; Count Harry Kessler from Germany; and Dr. Estanislao Zeballos from Argentina. Special addresses were delivered by General Tasker H. Bliss, Sir Paul Vinogradoff, Baron Sergius A. Korff and Viscount Birkenhead. The speakers from the foreign countries are, in a sense, the expositors of the international policies of their respective states and the lecture courses afford an opportunity for the statement of these nationalist viewpoints. The addresses, however, are never presented in a temper of intense nationalism and they form the basis of wide discussion and analysis on the part of the members of the institute. In an atmosphere as discerning and highly critical as that which obtains at Williamstown, special pleading does not flourish and there is small chance for a misstatement of fact to go unchallenged.

The open conferences, inaugurated this session, were held on alternate afternoons. The conference on "The Problem of Raw Materials and Foodstuffs in the Commercial Policies of Nations" was conducted by Mr. William S. Culbertson of Washington, D. C., and Mr. Philip Kerr of London was leader of the other conference which dealt with "World Problems." Each afternoon practically the entire membership of the institute gathered at these sessions, which consisted in considerable measure of addresses given by experts in the subject-matter of the round-tables. Some fifteen special speakers were invited to the institute to address the conference conducted by Mr. Culbertson, and its sessions impressed the members generally as being one of the most productive features of the entire program. A similar method was followed in the conference conducted by Mr. Kerr. During the first week, its discussions centered around the function of diplomacy, international law, and force in international relations. The second week was devoted to problems connected with Asia and Africa—the growth of nationalism in Asia; the relation between advanced and backward peoples; the mandatory system and questions of migration. Europe and the treaties of peace was the general topic of the third week, which led to a consideration of such problems as nationality and self-determination; Democracy, Bolshevism, and Fascism; The Ruhr and reparations. The concluding week brought the conference to a consideration of the peace plans of today, which embraced: the League of Nations; the World Court, Disarmament; the Outlawry of War; the British Commonwealth, and the Monroe Doctrine.

These two open conferences placed before the members of the Institute, in broad outline at least, many of the major political and economic problems in the world today. In the general scheme of the work of the Institute, their inauguration marks an exceedingly valuable addition. There has been need of some means, in addition to the lecture courses, of bringing members of the Institute together for the presentation of topics beyond the range of those studies in the specialized groups. It was desirable, also, that all the members of the institute should have the opportunity of hearing the various round-table leaders and other authorities at the institute discuss, if only in summary fashion, topics upon which such speakers would be authoritatively informed. The open conferences afford the occasion for this and, although they carry forward a distinct and separate program, they serve in a number of ways to coordinate and relate the work of the various round-tables. The program of the round-table conferences for the third session was as follows:

ROUND-TABLE CONFERENCES, INSTITUTE OF POLITICS, 1923

1. The International Aspects of the Russian Question  
Boris A. Bakhmeteff, Former Russian Ambassador at Washington, D. C.
2. International Problems of the Pacific  
George H. Blakeslee, Professor of History and International Relations, Clark University.
3. Race as a Factor in World Politics  
William McDougall, Professor of Psychology, Harvard University.
4. The League of Nations  
Royal Meeker, Commissioner, Department of Labor and Industry, Harrisburg.
5. The Conduct of Foreign Relations Under Modern Democratic Conditions  
DeWitt Clinton Poole, Chief, Division of Eastern European Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C.
6. Law of the Air  
Jesse Siddall Reeves, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan.
7. The Outstanding International Problems of the American Continent  
Leo S. Rowe, Director-General Pan-American Union.
8. The Near East. War-time Diplomacy and Post-war Problems  
William Linn Westermann, Professor of Ancient History, Cornell University.

"History has no surer generalization to offer," says Professor Shotwell, in the essay referred to above, "than that war leaves the gravest issues still to be fought for." There will be no reason for history to modify this generalization in the light of the events of the past few years. A war which excelled in mobilizing the forces of democratic nations leaves those democracies unable to sustain coöperative effort and the

international principles proclaimed in their name far from actual realization. But whatever may be the convictions of scholars relating to the unwon issues of the war or concerning the proper relations of states in general, there yet remains the problem of introducing to the masses of men a wider knowledge and insight into international affairs. With respect to this problem and the means of meeting it, General Bliss, in the course of an address at Williamstown this summer, said:

“I think that the faculties of our colleges and universities have an opportunity of elaborating and teaching a modern system of political philosophy in which a cardinal doctrine shall be: ‘The duty of the citizen to do all he can to assist the state in determining its true and wise relations to other states, and then to help his state to do all it can to bring those relations into living force.’ Why should this not be begun under the auspices of an institute like this? It would soon play a great part in the creation of a sane, conservative and practical sentiment in the nation and would be bound to influence that in other nations.”

BRUCE WILLIAMS.

*University of Virginia.*