

- April 14: **Getting a New Constitution**
W. Y. Elliott, Professor of Government, Harvard University
- April 21: **The Constitution and the States**
Albert C. Ritchie, former Governor of Maryland
- April 28: **A Unified Economy and States Rights**
James Hart, Professor of Political Science, John Hopkins University
- May 5: **Regional Governments for Regional Problems**
William B. Munro, Professor of History and Government, California Institute of Technology
- May 12: **The Constitution and Social Security**
John G. Winant, Chairman, Social Security Board; former Governor of New Hampshire
- May 19: **The Rights Reserved to the States and the People**
William L. Ransom, President, American Bar Association
- May 26: **The Delegation of Powers**
John Dickinson, Assistant U. S. Attorney-General; Professor of Administrative Law, University of Pennsylvania
- June 2: **Personal Liberty**
John W. McCormack, Member of Congress, 12th Massachusetts District
Roger N. Baldwin, Director, American Civil Liberties Union
- June 9: **The Living Constitution**
Charles A. Beard, Author

The Historical Records Survey. In November, the President approved two projects of considerable importance to political scientists, as well as to students of law, economics, sociology, and history. One of these projects authorizes a survey of federal government archives located outside of the District of Columbia. The other is a survey of state and local historical records. For each of the surveys the sum of \$1,195,800 has been made available.

These two surveys have been made possible by a realization on the part of Mr. Harry L. Hopkins and his aides that governmental agencies have heretofore, with few exceptions, made very inadequate provision for the preservation, inventorying, and utilization of the records of their multifarious and important activities. Moreover, it has been felt that the existing treasures of manuscript collections should be made more widely known. Many manuscript sources important for an adequate record of our historical development are daily disappearing into trash bins and kitchen fires, or are being destroyed by moisture, mice, and young children. Much work needs to be done to inventory the records which are out of immediate danger of destruction; there is also a great need of education, to arouse public interest in the matter of rescuing records from the dangers which hound them. This is a work in which everyone can participate. There is hardly a family in the land without papers in its

possession which might some day be of importance to the interpretation of some phase of national or local history.

The Federal Archives survey is sponsored by the Works Progress Administration, and is administered by the National Archives, an establishment of the federal government recently created by Congress and endowed with authority over all archives of the United States government. The state and local survey is administered by the Works Progress Administration as part of the activities of the division of professional and service projects.

As national director of the Survey of State and Local Historical Records, I should like to set forth the purposes of the survey, and point out ways in which it may be useful to political scientists. The purposes of the Historical Records Survey, as we prefer to call it, may be stated as follows: (1) to list the records of state, county, and other local agencies of government in the forty-eight states, to the extent that such work has not already been done; (2) to issue a master inventory of such records as are listed by this Survey and as have been previously listed; (3) to obtain a general description of all public, semi-public, and private manuscript collections in the United States; (4) to publish such information concerning manuscript collections; (5) to copy the existing catalogues of manuscript collections, and to place such copies in the Library of Congress for future work in preparing a Union List of Manuscripts; (6) to copy a limited number of items found in public records and in manuscript collections, and to distribute them among research institutions; and (7) to stimulate widespread interest in placing family papers in historical society libraries and other places where they will be preserved and eventually made available to students.

It is obvious that not all of these objectives can be realized completely with the limited funds available. We intend to undertake some work in every state, but many factors which have come to my attention indicate that in some states we can expect to accomplish more of the work which needs badly to be done than in others. Naturally, existing local interests is a weighty factor in the setting up of projects for this work, as the period between now and June 30, when the projects are due to end, is insufficient to permit us to await the results of a campaign to arouse public interest.

Political scientists have a deep interest, I believe, in the work which our Survey is undertaking. The records, if we will read them aright, reveal the history of our political institutions and tell the dramatic story of the expansion of government functions.

I extend an invitation to political scientists, among others, to offer suggestions as to how our Survey can frame its detailed objectives to the advantage of the research in which they are interested. It is expected

that the greatest service which the Survey can render, in response to particular suggestions, is the collection of special types of information concerning the records of individual local communities. If researchers at the University of Chicago are interested in local population shifts, our workers in Cook county might pay particular attention to land tenure maps and records. It would require no effort to give many such hypothetical examples. Local contacts with Survey workers might also result in a better opportunity to carry on research in the records than would be offered at other times, when bundles of papers will be tied together and stacked in piles again, there to build up another accumulation of dust.

Suggestions addressed to my office at 1500 I St., N. W., Washington, D.C., will be handled directly or by reference to the proper local representative of the Survey.—LUTHER H. EVANS.

Thirty-first Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Accepting a cordial invitation from the Southern Political Science Association to hold the 1935 annual meeting in the South, and embracing the opportunity to join not only with the organization named but also with the American Historical Association in a number of sessions, the Association met in Atlanta on December 26–28 and participated in meetings with the historians at Chattanooga on December 29–30. The registered attendance was 315, as compared with 310 at Chicago in 1934, 360 at Philadelphia in 1933, and 200 at Detroit in 1932. The program, devoted largely, as in the more recent past, to round table discussions, was as follows:

Thursday Evening, December 26

GENERAL SESSION

(JOINT MEETING WITH THE SOUTHERN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION)

Presiding officers: Francis W. Coker, Yale University, President of the American Political Science Association; J. W. Manning, University of Kentucky, President of the Southern Political Science Association

General topic: "THE FUTURE OF THE SOUTH."

Speakers: Howard W. Odum, Kenan Professor of Sociology and Director of the Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina—"The Promise of the South: A Test of American Regionalism;" Peter Molyneux, Editor, *Texas Weekly*—"A Place in the Sun for the South."

Friday Morning, December 27

FIRST SESSIONS OF ROUND TABLES 1–6

(1) "CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM."

Chairman: W. Y. Elliott, Harvard University

Discussion leaders: Charles G. Haines, University of California at Los Angeles; Edward S. Corwin, Princeton University; Charles Aikin, University of Cali-