

ich, of the Public Administration Clearing House; and Harvey Walker, of Ohio State University. Several sessions will be arranged and sponsored jointly by the Society and the American Political Science Association, which will be holding its annual meeting at the same time and place.

Committee on Research. President Mosher has appointed a committee on research which will report from time to time on research in progress and problems which need to be studied. Professor William Anderson, of the University of Minnesota, is chairman, and the other members are: Louis Drexler, New York State Department of Civil Service; Walter Gellhorn, Attorney-General's Committee on Administrative Procedure; Bernard Gladieux, U. S. Bureau of the Budget; Alonzo Grace, Connecticut State Department of Education; Joseph P. Harris, Northwestern University; Glen Leet, Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare; Albert Lepawsky, Federation of Tax Administrators; Herman C. Loeffler, Boston Municipal Research Bureau; Henry J. McFarland, California State Personnel Board; Ralph Ohmstead, Division of Organization and Management, U. S. Department of Agriculture; and Harold Seidman, New York City Department of Investigation. The secretary of this committee will be Charles S. Ascher, secretary of the Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council.—ROBERT M. PAIGE, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

The American Political Science Association and the Problem of Regionalism: A Summary of a Committee Report.* *A. Regional Associations and Groups of Political Scientists.* Under this head are considered all regional, metropolitan, and state associations and reasonably well defined groups of political scientists which have come to the attention of the Committee. Of these, there are eight, namely, the Connecticut Valley Political Science Association, the New York Metropolitan Group, the Pennsylvania Political Science Association, the Washington Group, the Midwest Conference of Political Scientists, the Southern Political Science Association, the Southwestern Social Science Association, and the West Coast Group. A brief statement concerning each of these associations and groups follows.

* In the late spring of 1939, President Charles Grove Haines of the American Political Science Association appointed a committee to study and to make recommendations concerning the relations between that Association and the various regional, metropolitan, and state associations or groups of political scientists in the United States. The Committee on Relations with Regional Societies included Professors Clarence A. Berdahl, William S. Carpenter, Francis W. Coker, Edwin A. Cottrell, W. Brooke Graves, James K. Pollock, Emmette S. Redford, and (as chairman) Roscoe C. Martin. The report of the Committee, which was presented at the December, 1939, meeting of the Executive Council, has been revised and condensed by the chairman for publication in the REVIEW.

The Connecticut Valley Political Science Association. This Association began in a meeting held at Amherst College in the spring of 1931, with political scientists attending from Amherst, Massachusetts State, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Wellesley, and Williams Colleges. Meetings have been held annually since, with as many as 20 institutions represented at various times. There are no regular institutional or individual members, nor are there officers, committees, dues, or constitution. In short, the Association is a quite informal group, and there appear to be no indications of any desire to change its character.

The New York Metropolitan Group. In the spring of 1939, a group of political scientists in the New York metropolitan area met at Columbia University to discuss plans for organizing a regional association. Interest in the venture seemed sufficient to warrant the group's proceeding, and arrangements for future meetings were placed in the hands of a president (or chairman) and an executive committee representing each institution in the area. Subsequently, the executive committee met and voted to keep the organization informal and to recommend that the association meet from two to four times a year. There is every reason to suppose that the young New York association will take hold and grow, though to date it is hardly past the formative stage.

Pennsylvania Political Science Association. The Pennsylvania Association, formally organized in the spring of 1939, is the outgrowth of a series of meetings and conferences extending back for a decade. Its officers include a president, vice-president, and treasurer, and an executive council of six members. Program and research committees are now in process of formation. The Association has a written, though brief, constitution. Its membership now numbers about 35, chiefly teachers of political science in the various colleges and universities of Pennsylvania.

The Washington Group. For two years, the teachers of political science in the Washington area, together with a few representatives of government agencies, have met for luncheon once a month. The group numbers perhaps 40 members; average attendance at the luncheon meetings has been around 20; and organization and procedure are quite informal. It may be characterized rather as a more or less spontaneous luncheon group than as a local or regional political science association.

Midwest Conference of Political Scientists. Following meetings of interested persons at the Philadelphia and Columbus sessions of the American Political Science Association, the first conference of Midwestern political scientists was held in May, 1939. In attendance were 110 political scientists from eight states. At this initial meeting it was decided to hold a conference annually, and to keep the organization informal. The 1939 meeting was quite successful, and those who participated in it believe that there is a definite place for the Midwest Conference.

Southern Political Science Association. In 1929, a group meeting in Atlanta organized the Southern Political Science Association, which has met annually since. The Association has a written constitution and an organization consisting of a president, vice-president, and secretary, and an executive council. Its individual members number about 100, most of them residing in the Southeast; and its annual meetings are attended by from 60 to 75 persons. Since 1938 the Association has published a quarterly called *The Journal of Politics*.

Southwestern Social Science Association. This organization goes back to 1919, when the Southwestern Political Science Association was formed. The name of the original organization has been twice modified to produce that currently used. As indicated, the Association includes all of the social sciences. It meets in annual session, and publishes a quarterly called *The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*. The political science section now has some 50 members; and political science attendance at the annual convention ranges from 60 to 80.

The West Coast Group. As early as 1916 an effort was made to organize a West Coast political science association. The movement was abandoned when no widespread interest appeared. There is now in existence a Pacific Coast Social Science Research Council, which has 60 members scattered among the various social science fields on a proportional basis. The Council is neither exclusively political science in character nor adequately representative of the political scientists in the region. In recent months there has been some discussion of the feasibility of establishing a political science association. Inquiry reveals no widespread demand for such an organization, however, and it is therefore not likely that one will come into being in the near future.

B. Regional Organizations in Other Fields. The problem of national-regional association relations is, of course, neither new nor peculiar to political science. On the contrary, some learned societies have been beset by it for many years. Now and again the subject comes before the annual conference of the secretaries of societies holding membership in the American Council of Learned Societies. At the thirteenth annual conference of the secretaries of the constituent societies (January 28, 1937), the problem was discussed at some length. The discussion is of such pertinence as to warrant reproduction in full here. It follows:¹

"Mr Phelps of the American Sociological Society was called upon to open the discussion. He said that a difficulty had arisen when his society sought research funds, and found the Foundations hesitant or unwilling to grant them because they felt the society was not sufficiently coordinated; yet the Sociological Society is organized around a journal costing

¹ American Council of Learned Societies, Bulletin No. 26 (June, 1937), 131-2.

several thousand dollars per year. It must be admitted, however, that many small competing journals in the same discipline create local and regional complications. Thus a situation has arisen, involving the relation of the national society to local and regional societies, with which it is difficult to cope. Mr. Long (Modern Language Association) replied by citing the experience of the Modern Language Association, which has 43 specialized groups originating and administering projects. There are also many regional associations which the Association cultivates by meeting with them occasionally, since there is much overlapping of memberships. Mr. Phelps said that, in the case of the Sociological Society, many of the regional groups were in competition with the national society in the matter of publication; on account of the great quantity of material seeking publication, the growth in number of journals has been greatly stimulated. Mr. Long suggested that this problem might be taken care of by providing for book or monograph series. Mr. Read (American Historical Association) remarked that with most societies there is a broad basis of membership, but some are devoted to high scholarly pursuits; this creates the difficulty of smaller groups splitting off because they do not get what they want in the societies' journals. Mr. Setzler (American Anthropological Association) spoke of recent developments in the field of American Archaeology which have led to the founding of a new society to meet the interest in Mississippi Valley archaeology. The new society has its own journal, and its membership represents about a 75 per cent overlap with the American Anthropological Association; but cordial relations exist between the new society and the national organization. Mr. Read added that the American Historical Association encourages local organizations in its field, since local interests naturally stimulate such organization; thus far there has been no real conflict with the national society, but efforts to establish associate memberships for the national society have not met with favorable response on the part of local organizations; the national society has tended to abandon the policy of subsidizing regional organizations, since this seems to create more difficulties than it meets. Further discussion revealed that the problem of relations of national societies with regional and specialized societies had its peculiar difficulties, differing materially in the case of each society. No recommendation could therefore be formulated which would express a unanimous opinion of the secretaries present."

At the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies of January 28 and 29, 1938, Mr. G. W. Cottrell, Jr., executive secretary of the Mediaeval Academy of America, reported on a study of American learned societies then in progress under his direction.² His report dealt

² *Ibid.*, Bulletin No. 27 (November, 1938), 67-68.

with procedure rather than substance, but the project he described seemed to hold much promise for this Committee.

Correspondence with Mr. Cottrell and with Mr. Mortimer Graves, administrative secretary of the American Council of Learned Societies, produced some information and a number of leads. Mr. Cottrell wrote, in part: "The matter of the relation of regional and local societies to the national body is a very interesting and important one, and I hope to be able to deal with it at some length in the survey of learned societies which I have under way. I have not, however, at the present time much material on the subject available in any sort of coherent form." He suggested, as did Mr. Graves, that letters of inquiry be addressed directly to the secretaries of half a dozen of the societies whose experience with regional associations might prove helpful to the Committee.

These suggestions were followed, and the inquiries brought replies from the secretaries or executive officers of the American Oriental Society, the American Philological Association, the American Philosophical Society, the Archaeological Institute of America, and the Modern Language Association of America. These replies provide a basis for almost any finding; for other learned societies run the gamut from those which recognize no regional associations to those which are nothing more than confederations of such associations. Small wonder that the secretaries of the organizations constituent to the American Council of Learned Societies found it impossible to reach unanimous agreement on the problem of national-regional association relations! The only general conclusion which seems warranted is that in most fields the national organization recognizes the existence of regional societies and makes a conscious effort to work with them.

This segment of the inquiry is worthy of much more attention than it has received. The Committee respectfully suggests to Mr. Cottrell that he go into this problem at some length, with the thought that his report on national-regional association relations will be not only significant *per se* but also highly useful to the constituent societies.

C. Findings and Recommendations: (a) *Findings:* 1. There are at the present time eight regional associations and groups of political scientists in the United States, of which seven are active. Five are regional in character. These are the Connecticut Valley Association, the Midwest Conference, the Southern Association, the Southwestern Association, and the West Coast Group. Two, the New York Group and the Washington Group, are metropolitan in scope; and one, the Pennsylvania Association, is limited to a single state.

2. All save one are independent of other like associations and groups. Of these seven, two—the Pennsylvania Association and the Southern Association—are organized formally; four—the Connecticut Valley Association, the New York Group, the Washington Group, and the Mid-

west Conference—have very informal organizations; and one—the West Coast Group—at present has no organization. The eighth, the South-western Social Science Association, contains a political science section along with several other social science divisions. There is, in short, a great deal of variety among the several associations and groups in organizational set-up.

3. Such associations seem to have sprung uniformly from the need for media for the consideration of regional problems, and from desire on the part of the political scientists of given areas to become better acquainted among themselves. The regional associations and groups appear to serve their purposes satisfactorily.

4. No conflict has been discovered between the American Political Science Association and any of the regional associations or groups. On the contrary, all signs point to the performance by the local organizations of functions which are largely outside the scope of the American Political Science Association; while on its part the national association serves needs quite beyond the purview of the regional societies.

5. The regional associations are unanimous in expressing their desire to coöperate with the American Political Science Association in all matters of mutual interest and concern.

6. Other learned societies have found it necessary to take cognizance of the problem of national-regional association relations. The study of their experience deserves more time and thought than this Committee has been able to give it.

(b) *Recommendations.* 1. The Committee feels that the course of wisdom on the part of the American Political Science Association is to coöperate in fullest measure with the regional associations and groups, and to seek their support of its own program.

2. The Committee recommends that, as an immediate minimum earnest of its interest, the American Political Science Association send a representative to each annual regional meeting, or where an association or group meets more than once a year, to one meeting annually. Such representative should be a prominent member of the Association who does not reside in the region in question. His expenses should be borne by the national association if it is at all possible to find money for the purpose.

3. While the problem of relations with regional associations and groups is not yet a serious one for the American Political Science Association, it certainly is a very important one. Further, it is not unlikely that functional associations of political scientists on a national scale will grow up within the next few years. In view of its own findings and in view of these probable developments, the Committee recommends the appointment of a continuing committee to study further the problem of national-regional relations and to consider the incipient problem occasioned by the prospective rise of functional associations.

A TABULAR ANALYSIS

Implicit in the relations between the American Political Science Association and the regional associations and groups is the broader problem of regionalism as it affects the national association. The tables which follow comprise an analysis of this problem. Prepared in connection with the work of the Committee on Relations with Regional Societies, they are presented without comment or recommendation.

The regions are those delimited by Howard W. Odum in his study, *American Regionalism*. They are:

<i>Northeast</i>	<i>Middle States</i>	<i>Southeast</i>	<i>Northwest</i>
Maine	Ohio	Virginia	North Dakota
New Hampshire	Indiana	North Carolina	South Dakota
Vermont	Illinois	South Carolina	Nebraska
Massachusetts	Michigan	Georgia	Kansas
Rhode Island	Wisconsin	Florida	Montana
Connecticut	Minnesota	Kentucky	Idaho
New York	Iowa	Tennessee	Wyoming
New Jersey	Missouri	Alabama	Colorado
Delaware		Mississippi	Utah
Pennsylvania	<i>Southwest</i>	Arkansas	
Maryland	Oklahoma	Louisiana	<i>Far West</i>
West Virginia	Texas		Nevada
	New Mexico		Washington
	Arizona		Oregon
			California

In all calculations, the District of Columbia is included with the Northeast. The membership norm employed was established by taking the average figures of the membership lists of July, 1934, July, 1936, February, 1938, and July, 1939, which were the four lists conveniently available.

The principal tables are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Tables 2A, 3A, etc., develop in more detail the data of their respective principal tables.

TABLE 1

*Regional Distribution of Individual Members of the American Political Science Association**

Region	July, 1934		July, 1936		February, 1938		July, 1939		Four-Year Average	
	Num-ber	Per Cent	Num-ber	Per Cent	Num-ber	Per Cent	Num-ber	Per Cent	Num-ber	Per Cent
Northeast	499	48.35	503	46.36	545	46.23	626	47.04	543	46.92
Middle States	311	30.00	320	29.49	330	28.00	373	28.02	333	28.79
Southeast	69	6.67	88	8.11	102	8.65	120	9.01	95	8.21
Southwest	28	2.70	30	2.76	40	3.39	38	2.86	34	2.93
Northwest	45	4.35	49	4.52	49	4.15	47	3.53	48	4.15
Far West	82	7.93	95	8.76	113	9.58	127	9.54	104	9.00
Total	1034	100.00	1085	100.00	1179	100.00	1331	100.00	1157	100.00

* The figures used here do not take into account (1) foreign members, (2) institutional members, or (3) librarians, who are presumed to be more interested in receiving the *Review* than in holding membership in the Association (such persons form a very small percentage of the total membership).

TABLE 2
*Regional Percentage Distribution of Officers and of Individual Members of the
 American Political Science Association*

Region	Officers, Ten-Year Summary, 1930-1939			Individual Members, Four-Year Average, 1934-1939
	President	Vice-Presidents	Members of the Executive Council	
Northeast	50.00	46.67	34.67	46.92
Middle States	40.00	36.67	28.00	28.79
Southeast			13.33	8.21
Southwest			6.67	2.93
Northwest			5.33	4.15
Far West	10.00	16.66	12.00	9.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 2A
*Regions of Residence by Years of the Presidents of the American Political Science
 Association, 1930-1939*

Region	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Total	Percentage Distribution
Northeast		1	1			1	1	1			5	50.00
Middle States	1			1	1				1		4	40.00
Southeast												
Southwest												
Northwest												
Far West										1	1	10.00
Total	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00

TABLE 2B
*Regional Distribution by Years of the Vice-Presidents of the
 American Political Science Association, 1930-1939*

Region	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Total	Percentage Distribution
Northeast	1		1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	14	46.67
Middle States	2	3	1		1		1	1	1	1	11	36.67
Southeast												
Southwest												
Northwest												
Far West			1	1		1		1	1		5	16.66
Total	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	100.00

TABLE 2C
*Regional Distribution by Years of the Members of the Executive Council of the
 American Political Science Association, 1930-1939*

Region	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Total*	Percentage Distribution
Northeast	6	5	5	4	4	5	6	7	6	4	52	34.67
Middle States	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	3	3	5	42	28.00
Southeast	1	1	1	1	2	3	4	3	2	2	20	13.33
Southwest			1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	10	6.67
Northwest	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	8	5.33
Far West	2	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	18	12.00
Total	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	150	100.00

* This is the total number of places on the Executive Council from 1930 to 1939. Since the Council is a continuing body, it contained only 60 individual members during that period. The percentage distribution figures for the 60 separate members approximate those for the 150 places listed in the table.

TABLE 3

Regional Percentage Distribution of the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, of Contributors to the REVIEW, and of Individual Members of the American Political Science Association

Region	Members of the Board of Editors, 1930-1939	Contributors to the REVIEW, 1930-1939			Individual Members, Four-Year Average, 1934-1939
		Authors of Leading Articles	Authors of Sectional Articles	Authors of Book Reviews	
Northeast	45.00	46.94	43.71	51.64	46.92
Middle States	41.00	32.65	35.14	34.07	28.79
Southeast	6.00	3.40	4.86	2.75	8.21
Southwest		.68	2.86	.22	2.93
Northwest		1.36	4.29	1.76	4.15
Far West	8.00	14.97	9.14	9.56	9.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 3A

Regional Distribution by Years of the Members of the Board of Editors of the REVIEW, 1930-1939

Region	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Total*	Percentage
												Distribution
Northeast	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	45	45.00
Middle States	4	3	3	4	5	4	6	5	4	3	41	41.00
Southeast		1	1	1				1	1	1	6	6.00
Southwest												
Northwest												
Far West	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	8	8.00
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	100.00

* This is the total number of places on the Board of Editors from 1930 to 1939. Since the Board is a continuing body, and since frequently members are reappointed, it contained only 30 individual members during that period. The percentage distribution figures for the 30 separate members approximate those for the 100 places listed in the table.

TABLE 3B

Regional Distribution by Years of the Authors of Leading Articles† in the REVIEW, 1930-1939

Region	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939*	Total	Percentage
												Distribution
Northeast	5	5	9	6	12	4	5	9	8	6	69	46.94
Middle States	3	6	5	6	4	8	5	6	4	1	48	32.65
Southeast					1	1	2		1		5	3.40
Southwest	1										1	.68
Northwest		1							1		2	1.36
Far West	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	3	2	4	22	14.97
Total	11	14	15	15	19	14	14	18	16	11	147	100.00

† Excepting authors resident in foreign countries.

* First four issues only.

TABLE 3C

Regional Distribution by Years of the Authors of Secondary (Sectional) Articles† in the REVIEW, 1930-1939

Region	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939*	Total	Percentage Distribution
Northeast	13	14	13	17	18	21	17	18	13	9	153	43.71
Middle States	14	15	17	10	12	12	18	10	8	7	123	35.14
Southeast		3		2	4	1		2	5		17	4.86
Southwest	3	2	1	1	1			2			10	2.86
Northwest	4	2	1	2	2	2	1			1	15	4.29
Far West	2	4	6	1	5	4	3	3	2	2	32	9.14
Total	36	40	38	33	42	40	39	35	28	19	350	100.00

† Excepting authors resident in foreign countries.

* First four issues only.

TABLE 3D

Regional Distribution by Years of the Authors of Book Reviews† in the REVIEW, 1930-1939

Region	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939*	Total	Percentage Distribution
Northeast	41	44	49	43	44	52	55	54	50	38	470	51.64
Middle States	21	24	15	46	35	38	32	30	47	22	310	34.07
Southeast	3	1	1	1	4	2	2	5	3	3	25	2.75
Southwest		1			1						2	.22
Northwest	2		2	2		2		4	1	3	16	1.76
Far West	9	5	6	4	13	8	10	11	10	11	87	9.56
Total	76	75	73	96	97	102	99	104	111	77	910	100.00

† Excepting authors resident in foreign countries.

* First four issues only.

TABLE 4

Regional Percentage Distribution of Participants in the Program of the Annual Meeting and of Individual Members of the American Political Science Association

Region	Participants in Programs, 1929-1938*			Individual Members, Four-Year Average, 1934-1939
	Presiding Officers, Directors, and Chairmen	Readers of Papers	Discussion Leaders	
Northeast	35.56	47.94	42.11	46.92
Middle States	48.33	34.58	35.25	28.79
Southeast	7.77	8.90	11.97	8.21
Southwest	.56	2.05	2.56	2.93
Northwest	1.67	.34	1.44	4.15
Far West	6.11	6.19	6.67	9.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

* Here are omitted some persons from the newer Federal agencies (as the AAA) where it was not possible to tell their place of residence. All persons from the permanent Washington offices are included!

TABLE 4A

Regional Distribution by Years of the Presiding Officers, Directors, and Chairmen on the Program of the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1929-1938*

Region	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	Total	Percentage Distribution
Northeast	4	7	3	2	8	6	10	10	9	5	64	35.56
Middle States	14	11	2	5	7	19	4	8	8	9	87	48.33
Southeast	1			1	1	1	7		2	1	14	7.77
Southwest							1				1	.56
Northwest	1			1						1	3	1.67
Far West		4		2			2	2		1	11	6.11
Total	20	22	5	11	16	26	24	20	19	17	180	100.00

* Excepting two or three whose place of residence could not be determined.

TABLE 4B

Regional Distribution by Years of the Readers of Papers on the Program of the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1929-1938*

Region	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	Total	Percentage Distribution
Northeast	4	16	23	5	37		3	6	29	17	140	47.94
Middle States	5	21	17	6	27	5		1	9	10	101	34.58
Southeast	1	2	2	2	9	1	3	1	3	2	26	8.90
Southwest	2	1	1				1			1	6	2.05
Northwest										1	1	.34
Far West	1	4	2		5			1	1	4	18	6.19
Total	13	44	45	13	78	6	7	9	42	35	292	100.00

* Excepting two or three whose place of residence could not be determined.

TABLE 4C

Regional Distribution by Years of the Discussion Leaders on the Program of the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1929-1938*

Region	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	Total	Percentage Distribution
Northeast	22	18	12	20	16	31	52	37	21	35	264	42.11
Middle States	15	19	13	13	6	41	32	35	20	27	221	35.25
Southeast	6	1	2	4	11	5	19	8	6	13	75	11.97
Southwest	6				2	1	3	3	1		16	2.56
Northwest			2	1	2	2		2			9	1.44
Far West	3	3		3	1	5	9	6	5	7	42	6.67
Total	52	41	29	41	38	85	115	91	53	82	627	100.00

* Excepting not more than half a dozen whose place of residence could not be determined.

TABLE 5

Regional Percentage Distribution of Attendants at the Annual Meeting and of Individual Members of the American Political Science Association

Region	Attendants, Annual Meeting of December, 1937 (Philadelphia)	Individual Members, February, 1938	Attendants, Annual Meeting of December, 1938 (Columbus)	Individual Members, July, 1939
Northeast	64.94	46.23	32.17	47.04
Middle States	19.35	28.00	49.13	28.02
Southeast	8.81	8.65	10.21	9.01
Southwest	1.72	3.39	1.74	2.86
Northwest	2.11	4.15	3.48	3.53
Far West	3.07	9.58	3.27	9.54
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 6

Percentage by Regions of the Individual Members of the American Political Science Association in Attendance at the Annual Meeting

Region	1937 (Philadelphia) Meeting			1938 (Columbus) Meeting		
	Number of Members	Number Attending Meeting	Percentage Attending Meeting	Number of Members	Number Attending Meeting	Percentage Attending Meeting
Northeast	545	339	62.20	626	167	26.67
Middle States	330	101	30.60	373	255	68.36
Southeast	102	46	45.10	120	53	44.16
Southwest	40	9	22.50	38	9	23.58
Northwest	49	11	22.45	47	18	38.30
Far West	113	16	14.16	127	17	13.38
Total	1179	522	44.28	1331	519	38.99