

ence, in which the whole personality engages, as against a mere intellectual process of "learning about" something. In preparing for and working in model organs, students show an intensity of interest, an ability for research work, a realistic insight into problems, and an understanding of the uses and meanings of organs and procedures that are not easily attained in the normal work of the classroom. What has always most impressed the observer is the knowledge, realism and ability with which the student delegates to a Model Assembly play the characters of the nations they represent.

That under proper conditions there are advantages to be gained from allowing model international organs to take over the classroom itself has been shown by an interesting experiment conducted in recent years at New York University.<sup>5</sup> Three of the courses on the United Nations offered in the University's Graduate School are conducted throughout as model organs. One one-term course is conducted as a Model Security Council, while a second is conducted as a Model United Nations General Assembly. Finally, a full-year course is offered as a Model United Nations, in which the relations and work of all the or-

<sup>5</sup> New York University *Bulletin*, No. 28, June 2, 1952; also a personal communication from Professors Clyde Eagleton and Waldo Chamberlin to whom I am indebted for this information.

gans are demonstrated.

The method is exacting since it calls for a regular documentary service for each meeting, and therefore for more duplication and staff assistance. It also requires a good library of United Nations documents. The experiment at New York University is no doubt helped much by the proximity of the United Nations headquarters staffs and the permanent delegations. "We undertook this as an experiment," Professor Clyde Eagleton writes, "but are convinced now that it is a useful way of teaching." The judgments which New York University has gathered year by year directly from students emphasize the following advantages of the method: "A sense of practical, rather than abstract, study. A sense of participating, rather than merely listening to a lecturer. Compulsion to prepare, since participation may be called for at any moment. More actual preparation and participation. More activity and variety in the class, therefore more interest. The instructor has much more upon which to judge the student. Much more critical discussion than usual. Better training in research and its application. Thorough knowledge of use of documents (training for librarians). Training in drafting. Practical language training (bringing in Language departments). Practice in negotiation (good for Foreign Service training). Development of cooperative effort, rather than prideful maintenance of a personal viewpoint."

H. DUNCAN HALL.

## COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT ON CONVENTION DELEGATIONS

In accordance with plans indicated in the June issue of the *REVIEW*, pp. 621-623, the headquarters of the Cooperative Research Project was moved to Chicago on June 27 for the duration of the Republican and Democratic National Conventions. Office space and some equipment were provided by courtesy of the University of Chicago at its downtown center, 19 South LaSalle Street. Access to convention proceedings was greatly facilitated by accreditation of the *AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW* to the Periodical Press Gallery in both conventions.

Project activities at each convention consisted mainly of following the work of certain state delegations, most of which had previously been studied in the states where they originated. In some cases, the political scientists who had worked with delegations in their

home states were at Chicago and were able to continue their contacts with the same delegations. In other cases, political scientists who happened to be in Chicago for the conventions, or who were locally available, were prepared to take on specific assignments. Other available volunteers who were qualified and willing to participate on a somewhat experimental basis were recruited and put to work with full instructions.

At the Republican Convention, individual state delegations were assigned as follows:

California: Thomas S. Barclay, Stanford Univ.

Colorado: Henry M. Bain, Jr., Univ. of Chicago graduate student.

Connecticut: Roland Young, Northwestern Univ.

Delaware: Paul Dolan, Univ. of Del.

Idaho: Hobart Sturm, Idaho State Col.  
 Illinois: Mrs. Harold J. Monger, Chicago, Ill.

Iowa: William S. Shepherd, Beloit Col.  
 Kansas: Mrs. Harry P. Watson, Chicago, Ill.

Kentucky: Jasper Shannon, Univ. of Ky.  
 Louisiana: Jasper Shannon, Univ. of Ky.  
 Maryland: Malcolm Moos, Univ. of Md.  
 Michigan: James Miller, Mich. State Col.  
 Mississippi: Mrs. June Duncan, Evanston, Ill.

Montana: Rosanna Shanks, Terre Haute, Ind.

Nebraska: Morris Cohen, Clark Univ.  
 New Mexico: Mrs. Claudia Wright, Vinita, Okla.

New York: George Watson, Roosevelt Col., and Edward L. Sherman, Roosevelt Col. graduate student.

North Dakota: Jacqueline Prince, Wilmette, Ill.

Ohio: Dale Pontius, Roosevelt Col., and Howard Taslitz, Northwestern Univ. graduate student.

Oregon: Hobart Sturm, Idaho State Col.  
 Pennsylvania: Paul Dolan, Univ. of Del.

South Dakota: Mrs. Eugene Hotchkiss, Highland Park, Ill.

Tennessee: T. W. Goodman, Univ. of Tenn.  
 Texas: Charles Clapp, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, graduate student.

Utah: Harold Blostein, Roosevelt Col. graduate student.

Vermont: Robert Babcock, Univ. of Vt.  
 Washington: William S. Shepherd, Beloit Col.

Wisconsin: William Young, Univ. of Wis.

At the Democratic Convention, working plans were revised in the direction of greater concentration on a smaller number of delegations. The assignments were as follows:

California: Thomas Barclay, Stanford Univ.  
 Florida: Robert Wright, Cooperative Research Project, and James A. Ball, Fla. State Univ. graduate student.

Idaho: Hobart Sturm, Idaho State Col.  
 Illinois: Clarence Berdahl, Univ. of Ill.; Robert Friedman, Univ. of Ill. graduate student; Mrs. Harold J. Monger, Chicago, Ill.; and Carl Wimberly, Univ. of Ill. graduate student.

Michigan: James Miller, Mich. State Col.  
 Minnesota: Arthur Naftalin, Univ. of Minn.  
 Missouri: Mrs. Harry P. Watson, Chicago, Ill.

New York: Harold Stein, Public Administration Clearing House and Henry M. Bain, Jr., Univ. of Chicago graduate student.

North Carolina: Preston Edsall, N. C. State Col.

Ohio: Dale Pontius, Roosevelt Col., and Mrs. Eugene Hotchkiss, Highland Park, Ill.

South Carolina: Douglas Carlisle, Univ. of S. C.

Tennessee: T. W. Goodman, Univ. of Tenn.

Texas: Charles Clapp, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, graduate student, and Mrs. Claudia Wright, Vinita, Okla.

Utah: Harold Blostein, Roosevelt Col. graduate student.

Washington: Harry R. Davis, Beloit Col.  
 Wisconsin: William Shepherd, Beloit Col.

Matthew Holden, a student at Roosevelt College, volunteered to make a study of Negro participation in the Republican National Convention; and at the Democratic Convention, he repeated the activity in association with Nathaniel P. Tillman, Jr., a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin.

Television monitoring of both conventions for project purposes was conducted by Edward Sherman, a graduate student at Roosevelt College, and Howard Taslitz, a graduate student at Northwestern University.

George Watson, Roosevelt College, undertook a special study of participation in the Democratic National Convention by the Americans For Democratic Action.

Samuel J. Eldersveld of the University of Michigan, assisted by Daniel McHargue and Dwaine Marvick, directed a cooperating activity under the auspices of that institution. As a part of the University's Political Behavior Research Project, he brought a group of graduate students to Chicago to interview delegation chairmen on the basis of an extensive questionnaire. The group succeeded in interviewing most of the delegation chairmen at each convention.

The Cooperative Research Project, up to July 25, 1952, had received reports prepared in the field on 35 delegations to the Republican National Convention of 1952 and 30 delegations to the Democratic National Convention of 1952. Reports varied in length from 4 pages to 110. It is clear that the initial phase of the project has been more successful than seemed possible when it originated in March.