

relevant to this central topic. It is interested in every inquiry into specific promotional activities in society. This includes analyses of the work of such organizations as the Anti-Saloon League or the Chamber of Commerce; the study of movements like the Populist movement; the analysis of the use of such media as the press, moving picture, and radio; and the technique of measuring shifts in social attitudes. There is no doubt that those who are doing research in cultural history, political science, economics, sociology, advertising, journalism, and psychology are among those who have made, or can make, contributions to this field. The committee would be glad to be notified of research proposals under way or in prospect. Communications may be addressed to the chairman or to any member of the committee. The personnel consists of Professors Kimball Young, University of Wisconsin; Ralph D. Casey, University of Minnesota; Peter Odegard, Ohio State University; E. Pendleton Herring, Harvard University; Schuyler Wallace, Columbia University; Merle Curti, Smith College; Harold F. Gosnell, University of Chicago; and Harold D. Lasswell, University of Chicago, chairman.

Under the joint auspices of the Harvard-Yenching Institute, the Committee on the Promotion of Chinese Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Committee on Japanese Studies of the same organization, and the Society for the Promotion of Japanese Studies, a seminar on Far Eastern Studies will be held at Harvard University from July 6 to August 17. The aim of the seminar is to bring together a group of trained and mature scholars who, although their major preparation has been in other fields, find it necessary or desirable to offer instruction in Far Eastern civilizations and affairs, and to give them the benefit of six weeks of intensive work with experts in the field. These experts will include Dr. Arthur W. Hummel, chief of the division of Chinese and Japanese literature at the Library of Congress, Dr. Lucius C. Porter, professor of philosophy in Yenching University and visiting professor at Harvard University, and Mr. Langdon Warner, lecturer in fine arts at Harvard. Though directed by an independent committee, the seminar will be an integral part of the summer session of Harvard University. The committee of direction will be able to offer a limited number of persons (perhaps twenty) assistance in the amount of \$125 apiece toward the cost of attendance. Further information may be obtained from Dr. Mortimer Graves, American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth St., Washington, D.C.

Fourth Biennial Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The conference was held in the International Settlement at Shanghai from October 21 to November 2, 1931. Delegates numbered 124, of whom

nine came from Australia, ten from Canada, thirty-one from China, nineteen from Great Britain, nineteen from Japan, six from New Zealand, five from the Philippines (in an independent delegation), and twenty-five from the United States. There were six observers, who were seated with the delegates—one from the Netherlands, four from the International Labor Office, and one from the Secretariat of the League of Nations. The Pacific Committee of the Institute of Pacific Relations in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, which consists of representatives of important scientific, commercial, and literary organizations, was elected to membership in the Institute. University administrators and professors, bankers and business-men, social workers, publicists, journalists, lawyers, engineers, and others composed the conference membership.

Although floods, civil warfare, and foreign intervention caused doubts as to the feasibility of holding the conference until it actually got under way, the session was conducted according to program save for the change of meeting-place from Hangchow to Shanghai. Indeed, circumstances which threatened to weaken, if not disrupt, the Institute operated to strengthen it. Careful preparation, in which a considerable number of delegates participated during a fortnight prior to the conference, resulted in a program arrangement that introduced the burning issues of the Manchurian problem under general topics rather than as specific questions. Thus it was possible to spend two days in round-tables on diplomatic machinery in the Pacific and three days on China's foreign relations without arousing opposition to the discussion of the most highly controversial issues, and with but one incident in which interchanges of views caused uncomfortable tension. Special credit for the conduct of the conference is due its presiding officer, Dr. Hu Shih, leader in China's philosophical and literary renaissance. He was remarkably effective, whether presiding, giving an address, or participating in committee and round-table discussions.

The subjects dealt with ranged from China's economic development, through Oriental labor problems and standards of living, migration and race problems, Pacific dependencies and cultural relations, to trade and diplomatic relations and the machinery of diplomacy. Discussion was assisted by the presentation of data papers and syllabi numbering ninety-two, many of which are valuable contributions to knowledge. Members met in round-tables and general conferences presided over by chairmen selected *pro tempore* by the program committee. Discussions were informal and serious. Special interest was shown in the application of the various topics to China, and in suggestions for assisting toward solutions of China's domestic and international difficulties.

A delegation of forty members was sent to Nanking to honor the

memory of Dr. Sun Yat-sen by laying a wreath upon his magnificent tomb. President Chiang Kai-shek received the delegation, and other members of the government extended courtesies. The conference spent a week-end in Hangchow, at the invitation of city and provincial officials. A number of members visited Peiping at the close of the conference, and individuals followed their own interests in trips to Canton, Hankow, Changsha, Mukden, Seoul, and Tokyo. Honolulu was a hospitable and interesting port of call for the majority of the delegates.

The Institute is an unofficial organization composed of councils in the states above named and governed by a Pacific Council representing the member councils. In addition to biennial conferences, it functions through a central secretariat at Honolulu and secretariats of the various member councils; also through international and national research and program committees. The object of the Institute, in the words of its constitution, is "to study the conditions of the Pacific peoples with a view to the improvement of their mutual relations." Founded in 1925 at Honolulu, it has held four conferences—two at Honolulu, one at Kyoto, and one at Shanghai—and is now planning a fifth for 1933 in which the general topic for discussion, as tentatively decided, will be "conflict and control in the economic, political, and cultural life of the Pacific." Fact-finding and research have been significant aspects of the Institute's work—so significant as to have raised a problem of presentation of the extensive data secured in a manner that will be helpful to conference delegates rather than confusing to them through its plenitude. A number of important works resulting from original research have been published under Institute auspices, a large item in its budget being devoted to research.

Institute conferences exhibit an interesting combination of motives. Speaking generally, these are two: to obtain information and to assist in ameliorating conditions of difficulty in the international relations of Pacific countries. Thus the scientific motive of the search for truth is yoke-fellow to the practical motive of assisting to better the world. The problem of discussions thus dually motivated is obvious: By what methods can the truth be stated and analyzed acceptably to political sensibilities? This problem, difficult enough in conferences composed of members of a single nationality, is intensified in an international conference.

Clearly, unless unpleasant facts are stated fully and frankly, there is danger of the perversion of high ideals to the assistance of ignoble state policies. The problem involves questions of personnel (members with adequate knowledge may be ineffective in presentation); of atmosphere (a single brow-beating member may stampede a round-table into excited, ill-considered rejoinder or resentful indifference, and intimations from a

steering committee that certain topics are taboo may discourage members in their treatment of permitted topics); of chairmanship competent to create a confidence that dispels national suspicions and individual timidity and promotes an easy interchange of opinion; of the proper use of "experts," so that exact knowledge shall be available but shall be restrained from suffocating discussion or antagonizing the "practical" men and women of affairs; of prior arrangement, calculated to stimulate preparedness on the part of all members; etc. For the student of international procedure, the opportunity to consider these aspects of an Institute conference is as profitable as that of participating in discussions of the profoundly difficult and important subjects which appear upon the conference agenda.

HAROLD S. QUIGLEY.

University of Minnesota.

Personnel of Republican and Democratic National Committees. The following analysis of the membership of the Republican and Democratic national committees for the term 1928-32 is intended as a preliminary statement of a detailed analysis which will portray American party organization in more definite terms than have hitherto been applied. The data were taken from *Who's Who in America*, *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress*, official state handbooks, and such specialized sources as the *Directory of Directors*, *Who's Who in Government*, and regional directories. It has been found necessary to exclude from the study the women members of the committees, since information concerning them could not be secured. Consequently, the analysis is confined to the 108 men, one from each state for each party and twelve additional "executive" members, who direct the national party organizations.

Age of committeemen. An average age of 58.1 years would seem to indicate that party managers represent greater experience, in terms of age at least, than most public officials. Republican committeemen average 58.4 years, while Democratic committeemen average 58 years. The oldest, a Democrat, is 86; the youngest, a Republican, is 43.

Education. Approximately thirty-eight per cent, or 41 members, have had educational training of college rank. Of these, 39 have degrees. LL.B. degrees head the list with 19; A.B., 8; M.A., 5; M.D., 3; B.S., 3; C.E., 1. The two parties are on essentially equal terms, the Republicans being represented by 21 members, the Democrats by 20.

Membership in Fraternal Orders. Fifty-three committeemen are recorded as members of fraternal orders. Of these, 34 are Republicans and 19 Democrats. The distribution of membership in the various orders is as follows: