

In Memoriam

G. Lowell Field

It is with much sadness that we report the death of G. Lowell Field on April 23, 1997. Lowell spent most of his academic career at the University of Connecticut. He arrived in 1952 to take the headship of the Department of Political Science and retired in 1978. Department head from 1952 to 1967, he was called back to that position for a year in 1977–78. He was born in Worcester, Massachusetts and did his undergraduate work at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut. He then went to Columbia University for graduate work, receiving his M.A. in 1933 and his Ph.D., in 1938. While working for his Ph.D. he was an instructor at Columbia. After finishing his Ph.D., he became an Assistant Professor at the University of Texas at Austin. After World War II he transferred to Wayne University in Detroit as an Associate Professor before accepting his appointment at the University of Connecticut as department head and full professor.

Lowell Field's original interests were in Fascist Italy; his doctoral dissertation was published as the *Syndical and Corporative Institutions of Italian Fascism* (1938). After the war he broadened his interests to the political dynamics of Western countries more generally. This resulted in his sparkling text *Governments in Modern Society* (1951).

During the heyday of the behaviorist movement in political science Lowell Field worked to develop a rigorous logical-deductive theory of comparative political development. He developed a new terminology to explain his concepts and after thirteen years' work he published the highly innovative book *Comparative Political Development: The Precedent of the West* (1967).

When it became apparent that his new terminology and concepts were not making headway within the profession, Field abandoned further work on his theory. In its place he,

along with his principal student John Higley, now at the University of Texas at Austin, developed a new approach, "neo-elitism," which they expounded in a series of monographs and articles over the next twenty years. The major statement of this position was *Elitism* (1980, published in German as *Eliten und Liberalismus* in 1983). Its thrust can be gleaned from a set of personal reflections written by Field and Higley at the end of the 1980s in which they characterized neo-elitism as holding that,

The internal workings, commitments, and actions of national elites constitute the basic distinctions to be made among the political systems of all independent states. The extent to which elites do or do not trust and cooperate with each other is logically and factually prior to constitutional and institutional arrangements, to the existence of political stability or instability, and to any practical degree of democratic politics. The existence and centrality of elites makes all utopias impossible to achieve, and major political change stems mainly from variations in elite interrelations which take place within very wide parameters set by mass political orientations. Accordingly, basic choices in politics pertain mainly to the desirability of some kinds of national elites over others and to the wisdom in any concrete situation of trying to modify or transform an existing elite (Field and Higley 1989).

Lowell was more than a scholar of politics. He was active in professional and local affairs. He served a term as President of the New England Political Science Association; he was a charter member of the University of Connecticut Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa; and he served for many years on the Library Board in Mansfield, Connecticut. He was one of the founders of the Mansfield Unitarian Fellowship. He became an active member of the local League of Women Voters after that organization accepted men as members.

References

- Field, G. Lowell, and John Higley. 1989. "Neo-Elitism in the Context of American and Australian Culture: Some Personal Reflections." *Political Theory Newsletter* 1(2):133–43.

Norman Kogan
University of Connecticut

Harold F. Gosnell

On 8 January 1997, the discipline lost one of the last true founders of modern American political science. Harold Foote Gosnell died at his home in Bethesda, Maryland. He was 100 years old.

In the 1920s and 1930s, Gosnell pioneered the application of experimental and statistical methods to the study of political behavior in the United States and abroad. He authored pathbreaking studies of voter turnout, black politics, and Chicago's Democratic machine. From the publication of his first book in 1924 until the publication of his last in 1980, Gosnell probed the interaction of political leadership, political parties, and voters in innovative and influential ways.

Harold F. Gosnell was born on Christmas Eve, 1896, in Lockport, New York, the son of a Methodist minister. He grew up in Rochester, New York, and attended the University of Rochester, taking his bachelor's degree in 1918. After a short stint in the Army, stateside, he matriculated at the University of Chicago as the only graduate fellow in the department of political science.

At Chicago, Gosnell pursued studies in political science, sociology, economics, and law, and he wrote his doctoral dissertation, published in 1924 as *Boss Platt and his New York machine*, under the direction of his mentor, Charles E. Merriam. Upon the award of his doctorate in 1922, Gosnell joined the Chicago Political Science faculty as an Instructor, rising to Assistant Professor

in 1926 and to Associate Professor in 1932. Gosnell was an important piece of the “Chicago school” Merriam assembled in the 1920s, a department that included Leonard D. White and Quincy Wright and later added Harold D. Lasswell and C. Herman Pritchett, both, like Gosnell, Chicago Ph.D.s.

In fact, Gosnell was the quintessential “Chicago school” scholar. Both directly and through Merriam, he was profoundly influenced by the other “Chicago schools” of social science, especially sociology. He studied and served with the leaders, acquiring knowledge of factor analysis from L. L. Thurstone, survey design from Samuel A. Stouffer, race relations from Robert E. Park, and statistical analysis of social and political data from William F. Ogburn.

Gosnell first applied the methods of the Chicago school in his study of New York’s “Easy Boss,” Thomas C. Platt. The best of the several examinations of political leadership that emerged under Merriam’s guidance, *Boss Platt* was an exhaustive analysis of the social forces and political strategies that made and unmade the Platt machine. The dissertation lacked the statistical analyses that later became the hallmark of Gosnell’s work. Instead, it drew its analytical power from a careful reconstruction of the means by which the Platt organization maintained itself atop the New York Republican Party, and it enhanced its analysis of leadership through an illuminating comparison of Platt and his nemesis, Theodore Roosevelt. Writing in the *American Political Science Review*, Robert C. Brooks pronounced it “truly pioneer work.” It was reprinted in 1969.

After completing the dissertation, Gosnell plunged into a study of voter participation in American elections, producing two books that stand as landmarks in the field of political behavior. *Non-voting: Causes and methods of control*, authored jointly with Merriam, appeared in 1924. *Getting out the vote: An experiment in the stimulation of voting* appeared in 1927.

In *Non-voting*, Merriam and Gosnell sought to discover the reasons why half of the eligible voters failed to turn out in the 1923 mayoral elec-

tion in Chicago. The design they employed was, on multiple counts, the first of its kind in political science. They interviewed some 300 party officials, officeholders, and election activists. They gathered data on sex, age, length of residence, and citizenship for 5000 voters from the records of the Election Commission. And, most novel, they drew a “representative sample” of 6000 non-voters, sent a small army of students to interview them, and punched the results into Hollerith cards. (For tabulations, they borrowed the use of a card reader from the City Comptroller’s Office.) The multiple methods of inquiry and the mix of quantitative and qualitative evidence produced a rich and compelling account of voter (non)turnout. Non-voting, they found, traced to “*indifference and inertia*,” to illness and absence, to legal and administrative obstacles, to disgust with politics, and to personal disbelief in the propriety of women’s participation in politics. Their survey, however, allowed them to probe deeper. They discovered, for one example, that black Chicagoans were disproportionately handicapped by legal residence requirements, either because of recent migration from the South or because of frequent relocation in the overcrowded Black Belt precincts. As Barry Karl (1974: 148) observed, *Non-voting* “was the public debut of what came to be known as the Chicago School. . . . The first major study in political science to use both random sampling and the statistics of attributes, the book combine[d] new methodology and familiar concern in a fashion which startled and delighted the profession.”

Gosnell’s follow-up study, *Getting out the vote*, was still more ingenious. It marked the first use—and for years virtually the only instance—of the experimental method in political science. Gosnell canvassed 6000 citizens living in twelve different Chicago neighborhoods, gathering information ranging from age to economic status to political preferences. Using place of residence, he divided the sample into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group received a variety of notices urging citizens to register and to vote; the control

group, naturally, did not. From official records and the reports of poll watchers, Gosnell then observed whether each individual in the sample registered and voted. The stimulus of the notices increased registration and voting, by a small increment in the 1924 presidential election, by a far larger increment in the 1925 aldermanic election. The notices had their greatest effect, he found, on the least educated and least informed segments of society, on blacks, foreign-born women, and poor native whites. The book’s chief contribution, however, was less its findings than its method. Even with the advances of the last seventy years, *Getting out the vote* still stands as one of the most elegant studies in all of political science.

Gosnell made one more investigation of voter turnout, an account of electoral participation in Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and Switzerland. Probably the first cross-national study of political behavior, the book established a link between proportional representation—a subject in which Gosnell took considerable interest—and voter participation. It was published under the title *Why Europe votes* in 1930.

The decade of the thirties was Gosnell’s peak, the time in which he produced his greatest and most enduring work. *Negro politicians: The rise of Negro politics in Chicago* appeared in 1935 followed by *Machine politics: Chicago model* in 1937. Both books featured the analytical incisiveness and the deft use of evidence that had graced Gosnell’s previous work. (Both books also included portraits, sketched by Gosnell himself, of their principal figures.) *Negro politicians* was innovative primarily in its subject matter: it was the first scholarly study of African American politics. *Machine politics* was innovative in its methodology: it was the first book to apply correlation, regression, and factor analysis to political science. *Negro politicians* and *Machine politics* secured Gosnell’s reputation as an innovator in his own right, well beyond Merriam’s shadow. Both were immediately influential, both were republished (in 1967 and 1968), and both remain on course syllabi, sixty years after their initial publication.

Negro politicians was an expansive study of the place of African Americans in the politics of Chicago. Gosnell limned the political organization and leadership of Chicago's black community. He traced its relationship with the Democratic machine and with the two factions of the city's Republican organization. He chronicled the experience of blacks in local public employment. He profiled Edward H. Wright, Chicago's first black ward committeeman, and Oscar DePriest, the city's first black alderman and the nation's first black congressman from outside the Reconstruction South. He drew upon government statistics, election returns, reports in the black and white press, and extensive interviews with black Chicagoans ranging from aldermen and precinct captains to police officers and postal workers. The book brimmed with insights. Gosnell discovered the centrality of group solidarity as a political resource in the impoverished black community. He found a rise in the racial consciousness of white Chicagoans in parallel with the rise in the political importance of black voters. He noted the large symbolic but smaller material benefits of African Americans' loyalty to the Republican Party, and the slow, difficult transfer of their allegiance to the Democracy. Acutely but sympathetically, Gosnell identified what was similar and what distinct in African American politics, bringing into focus a subject that was hitherto neglected by American political science. In 1935, *Negro politicians* received the John Anisfield Prize for the best book in the field of race relations, and it remains a classic. It was Gosnell's own favorite from among all his works.

Machine politics bore a close relationship to *Negro politicians*, and to *Boss Platt* more than a decade before. Like those two works, *Machine politics* was concerned with political leadership and party organization, in this case with the Democratic organization that rose to dominate Chicago during the Depression, the political machine of Chicago mayor Edward J. Kelly and Cook County Democratic Committee chair Patrick A. Nash. Like those two works, it traced the ways in which Democratic Party organized, the means by which

the machine came to power, and the methods by which the Kelly-Nash organization maintained its control. Gosnell's additional, revolutionary step came in his analysis of "the voters' response." Gosnell examined the statistical relationships between the machine and reform votes and such social characteristics as gender, education, religion, foreign origin, economic status, and unemployment, applying the methods of partial correlation and factor analysis. (Gosnell calculated the regression estimates, with as many as five regressors, by hand, and he supplied two methodological appendices for the interested—and mathematically adept.) In the volume's introduction, the Chicago School sociologist William F. Ogburn captured both the import of Gosnell's undertaking and the dexterity of Gosnell's execution:

The essence of scientific method is to hold constant all factors except the one whose influence is to be measured. This is what the chemist does in his laboratory and what the psychologist does with his guinea pigs. The author does the same thing with partial correlation. Social science, unlike mathematics, is not an arm-chair science. That the author knows his data, as well as his method, is evident from his apparent wide acquaintance with Chicago political leaders, big and little, with ward boundaries, locales of operations, and services of precinct captains and ward bosses. This orientation with the realities of everyday politics makes his book more readable than others dealing with less concrete material.

The modern scientific methods of trend lines, variance, multiple correlation, and factorial analysis have in recent years made much of economics, sociology, and psychology exact science. But for some reason their advance in political science has been slow. Perhaps Dr. Gosnell's work is a signal for a general forward movement which is surely inevitable some time in the distinguished field of political science (Gosnell 1937/1968: xxiv).

In *Machine politics: Chicago model*, the opening move in the behavioral revolution was cloaked in an absorbing account of party bosses, ward heelers, mob aldermen, political fixers, and intense interest in seats on the Sanitary District board.

Gosnell's interest in political lead-

ership and party organization was an old one, as the subject of his dissertation indicated. Like Merriam and many other political scientists of the time, Gosnell was a progressive, a congenital Republican who crossed party lines more often than he kept them. In the thirties, tenured at last, Gosnell made his own forays into reform politics. As he wrote in the preface to *Machine politics*, "As a participant observer the writer has aided in the publicity work of several aldermanic campaigns, and in 1935 undertook to manage an aldermanic campaign for an independent candidate. His success as a campaign manager was not flattering, but he learned a great deal about Chicago politics" (Gosnell 1937/1968: xix). Gosnell's candidate, an independent Republican running in the historically independent Fifth Ward, lost to the machine Democratic incumbent by nearly three to one (Gosnell 1935). When Gosnell wrote that "You can't lick a ward boss," he knew whereof he spoke. The next time out he was more successful. In 1939, Gosnell played a role in the election of his colleague, the economist (and later senator) Paul H. Douglas, an independent Democrat, to the Board of Aldermen from the Fifth Ward. All the while, Gosnell was a GOP precinct captain. When Gosnell wrote of the Chicago Republican's need for pragmatism, he also knew whereof he spoke.

Gosnell's successes in *Negro politicians* and *Machine politics* established him as a leading figure in the Chicago Political Science Department, at least in the estimation of his graduate students (see Almond, Martin, and Pritchett in Baer et al. 1991). In the 1930s, the department produced a sextet of PhDs who went on to illustrious careers and (for five) the presidency of the American Political Science Association: Gabriel A. Almond, V. O. Key Jr., Avery Leiserson, C. Herman Pritchett, Herbert A. Simon, and David B. Truman. Each studied with Gosnell, and each helped to advance the behavioral revolution in political science in the 1950s. At least one student came expressly to work with Gosnell. "I enrolled at Chicago," Robert E. Martin recalled, "because it had the only teacher-scholar in the

United States who had expressed long term interest in black politics. He was Harold F. Gosnell” (Martin in Baer et al. 1991: 159).

The 1930s, however, also brought a chain of events that eventually prompted Gosnell’s exit from Chicago and the academy. Robert M. Hutchins became the president of the University of Chicago in 1929. Unsympathetic to the behaviorism of the Chicago school, Hutchins regarded the Political Science faculty, populated by Merriam’s students, as “monuments to [Merriam’s] passing whims” (quoted in Karl 1974: 286). With Merriam’s influence on the wane, and with Harold Lasswell’s departure for Yale, Gosnell was attracted to Washington. In 1941, he took a leave of absence from his teaching post to assume a position in the Office of Price Administration. A year later, he joined the staff of the Bureau of the Budget and resigned from the Chicago faculty. Gosnell served in the Budget Bureau until 1946, when he moved to the Division of Historical Policy Research in the Department of State. He remained at State until 1960.

Throughout his government service, Gosnell maintained an active, if decelerating, research agenda. In the first few years, he stayed close to his intellectual origins. *Grass roots politics* (1942) was the product of his last years at Chicago, a correlational analysis of the socioeconomic foundations of voter preferences in five states that presages V. O. Key’s *Southern politics*. While written in Washington, *Democracy: The threshold of freedom* (1948) was his valedictory on the work he did at Chicago, a normatively-flavored examination of suffrage and representation. As his distance from the Chicago years increased, however, Gosnell moved away from behaviorism. The last period of Gosnell’s career in political science yielded two studies of presidential leadership, *Champion campaigner: Franklin D. Roosevelt* (1952) and *Truman’s crises: A political biography of Harry S. Truman* (1980), both admiring biographies that placed primary emphasis on the two presidents’ relations with their constituents, the voters.

Through the years of his government service, Gosnell also main-

tained his ties to the academy. From 1946 until 1962, he was Adjunct Professor of Political Science at American University, serving as well as Senior Research Scientist in its Special Operations Research Office, which conducted studies of the Soviet Union. In 1955, he was Visiting Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington.

In 1962, at the age of 65, Harold Gosnell began the last phase of his academic career, as Professor of Political Science at Howard University. The invitation to teach at Howard, Gosnell recalled, was indirectly the consequence of his study of African American politics, *Negro politicians*. That book attracted Robert E. Martin to graduate school at Chicago. Twenty-five years later, Martin recruited Gosnell to the faculty at Howard. At Howard, Gosnell inspired a new generation of scholarship in African American politics. “At the beginning of every class,” Hanes Walton Jr. recalled,

Gosnell would start off with a discussion of all the research that had not been done in the area. No other professor that I had devoted so much time and effort trying to tell his students about potential research avenues and topics. Needless to say, he was one of my dissertation advisors and member of my defense committee. After my defense, he called me in the next morning and suggested a research agenda for me at Savannah State. . . . Over the years he sent me books from his own collection that were rare and hard to find. . . . But there is more to this scholar than his personal influences on my work and analyses. Finally there is the matter of his overall contribution to African American Politics. . . . Both then and now, Gosnell is the only one of the “Great Men” of the discipline to have devoted his talents to the study of black politics. . . . He helped to pioneer the subject, wrote an enduring classic on the subject, and it is a model of multidimensional methodology. Gosnell’s legacy in this fledgling subfield is a body of balanced scholarship to succeeding generations (Walton 1997).

Gosnell retired from Howard in 1970.

The period of his retirement brought Gosnell much recognition for the role he had played in the development of the discipline. In

1981, the American Political Science Association named him the recipient of the Charles E. Merriam Award, given to a person whose published work and career represent a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research. “Gosnell focused on the actualities of politics,” the citation explained, “and applied the light of social science research to the often dark and artful ways of governance.” In 1980, the Political Science Department at his undergraduate alma mater, the University of Rochester, named a graduate fellowship in his honor. And in 1995, the Political Methodology section of the APSA created the Harold F. Gosnell Prize of Excellence, given annually for the best methodological work presented at a political science conference. Although Gosnell was not the first to study political subjects statistically (see Gow 1985), today he is generally acknowledged as the scholar most responsible for making quantitative analysis part of the mainstream of the discipline.

Gosnell’s wife, Florence L. Fake Gosnell, died in 1991. He is survived by two sons, David and John, and five grandchildren.

In addition, he leaves his work and his many hundred admirers, students, and students of students—the intellectual progeny of Harold F. Gosnell.

John Mark Hansen,
University of Chicago

References

- Baer, Michael A., Malcolm E. Jewell, and Lee Sigelman, eds. 1991. *Political Science in America: Oral Histories of a Discipline* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky).
- Gosnell, Harold F. 1935. “Fighting Corruption in Chicago,” *Polity* 3 (July/August): 133–38.
- Gow, David John. 1985. “Quantification and Statistics in the Early Years of American Political Science,” *Political Methodology* 11(1/2):1–18.
- Karl, Barry D. 1974. *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Walton, Hanes, Jr. 1997. “Remembering Professor Harold F. Gosnell,” typescript, University of Michigan.
1923. “Some Practical Applications of Psychology in Government,” *American Journal of Sociology* 28(May):735–43.

1924. *Boss Platt and his New York Machine: A Study of the Political Leadership of Thomas C. Platt, Theodore Roosevelt, and Others* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press). Reissue 1969 (New York: Russell & Russell).
Non-voting: Causes and Methods of Control (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), with Charles E. Merriam.
1925. "A New Method for Counting Proportional Representation Ballots," *National Municipal Review* 14(July):397–98.
1926. "An Irish Free State Senate Election," *American Political Science Review* 20(February):117–20.
 "An Experiment in the Stimulation of Voting," *American Political Science Review* 20(November):869–74.
1927. *Getting Out the Vote: An Experiment in the Stimulation of Voting* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
1928. "Non-naturalization: A Study in Political Assimilation," *American Journal of Sociology* 33(May):930–39.
1929. "Characteristics of the Non-naturalized," *American Journal of Sociology* 34(March):847–55.
1930. "Popular Participation in Swiss National Council Elections," *American Political Science Review* 24(May):426–38.
 "Motives for Voting as Shown by the Cincinnati P.R. Election of 1929," *National Municipal Review* 19(July):471–76.
Why Europe votes (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
1933. "Statisticians and Political Scientists," *American Political Science Review* 27(June):392–403.
 "The Political Party Versus the Political Machine," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 169(September):21–28.
 "The Chicago 'Black Belt' as a Political Battleground," *American Journal of Sociology* 39(November):329–41.
1934. "Political Meetings in the Chicago 'Black Belt,'" *American Political Science Review* 28(April):254–58.
 "Proportional Representation," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* 12(February):541–45.
1935. "A Factor Analysis of the 1932 Presidential Vote in Chicago," *American Political Science Review* 29(December):967–84, with Norman N. Gill.
Negro Politicians: The Rise of Negro Politics in Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press). Reissue 1967 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
1936. "Factorial and Correlational Analysis of the 1934 Vote in Chicago," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 31(September):507–18, with Margaret J. Schmidt.
 "Factorial Analysis of the Relation of the Press to Voting in Chicago," *Journal of Social Psychology* 7(November):375–85, with Margaret J. Schmidt.
1937. "How Accurate Were the Polls?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 1(January):97–105.
Machine Politics: Chicago Model (Chicago: University of Chicago Press). Reissue 1968 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press); reissue 1969 (New York: AMS Press).
1939. "Proportional Representation: Its Operation in Cincinnati," *Public Affairs* 2(March):133–35.
 "A List System With Single Candidate Preference," *American Political Science Review* 33(August):645–50.
 "The Study of Voting Behavior by Correlational Techniques," *American Sociological Review* 4(December):809–15, with Norman Pearson.
1940. "Political Trends in Industrial America: Pennsylvania an Example," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 4(September):473–86, with William G. Colman.
 "Progressive Politics: Wisconsin an Example," *American Political Science Review* 34(October):920–35, with Morris H. Cohen.
1941. "The Negro Vote in Northern Cities," *National Municipal Review* 30(May):264–67.
1942. "A Critique of Polling Methods," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 6(Fall):378–90, with Sebastian De Grazia.
Grass Roots Politics (Washington, D.C.: American Council of Public Affairs).
1948. *Democracy: The Threshold of Freedom* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).
1949. "Public Opinion Research in Government," *American Political Science Review* 43(June):564–72, with Moyca C. David.
1952. *Champion Campaigner: Franklin D. Roosevelt* (New York: The Macmillan Company).
1954. "An Interpretation of the Philippine Election of 1953," *American Political Science Review* 48(December):1128–38.
1980. *Truman's Crises: A Political Biography of Harry S. Truman* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press).

The papers of Harold F. Gosnell are in the collection of the University of Chicago Library.

Ernest S. Griffith

Ernest S. Griffith, the founding Dean of American University's School of International Service, former director of what is now the Congressional Research Service, and officer of the American Political Science Association, died in Portland, Oregon, on January 17, 1997. He was 100 years old.

Ernest Griffith's vision and energy laid the foundation for the School of International Service, now the largest school of international affairs in the United States. The School's mission to train men and women from all over the world to "wage peace" and to confront basic political, economic, and ethical issues in an in-

creasingly complex world were central to Ernest Griffith's concepts at the school's founding in 1957. As director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress (now the Congressional Research Service), Ernest Griffith masterminded its growth as a vital conduit of information and expert analysis for members of Congress and their staff. During his tenure as the director of the Service, steps were taken to enable it to function as a source of information for Congress without reliance on the executive branch or on special interest groups.

A Rhodes Scholar and graduate of Hamilton College (B.A.) and Oxford University (Ph.D.), Ernest Griffith published many scholarly works on state government, congress, and the presidency. His book *The American System of Government*, first published in 1954, was translated into more than twenty-five languages. While completing his doctoral studies at Oxford, Ernest Griffith was warden of the Liverpool England Settlement House. Returning to the United States in 1929, he served as lecturer in Harvard's Department of Government and was Undergraduate Dean at Syracuse University before moving to Washington, DC, to serve as Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Political Science at American University in 1935. Griffith assumed the directorship of the Legislative Research Service in 1940 and continued in that position until 1958 when he became the founding Dean of the School of International Service, a position he held until 1968.

Ernest Griffith's emphasis on service to others is reflected in his lifetime activities. He was a founder of the Pioneers, a forerunner of today's Cub Scouts. From 1944–58 he taught Sunday School for senior high school boys at Washington, DC's Metropolitan Methodist Church. He was president of the Washington Council of Social Agencies, a predecessor of the United Way; a member-at-large of the Council of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; a member of the board of Missions of the United Methodist Church; a member of the Washington, DC Planning Commission; President of the National Academy of Economics and Political Science;