

# The American Political Science Review

---

---

VOL. XXVII

FEBRUARY, 1933

NO. 1

---

---

## A PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH IN POLITICAL SCIENCE\*

WILLIAM F. WILLOUGHBY

*Washington, D. C.*

### I

There are probably few members of the learned professions who do not feel the urge to contribute, if they can, to the existing store of knowledge regarding their chosen field, or, more ambitious still, to advance yet further that body of thought constituting the fundamental principles by which it is sought to interpret the data dealt with, to trace relationships between cause and effect, to distinguish the essential from the non-essential, to evaluate action by results—in a word, to give philosophic coherence to what would otherwise be disconnected and unrelated thinking.

In the case of many, this urge is supplemented by a positive obligation. Those holding academic positions calling for the direction of students engaged in advanced or postgraduate work, and those at the head of institutions of research, not only have the desire themselves to engage in work of original research, but are under the responsibility of encouraging, if not compelling, work of a like character by others.

Undoubtedly the most important aspect of this responsibility is the determination of the direction that it is most desirable that such research work should take. Though there are notable exceptions, this determination, as a general rule, can best be made by those who have long worked in the field, who, by practical experience, have had brought home to them the *lacunæ* in the knowledge regarding the facts and forces operating in fields in which they are engaged, and who have reached a certain maturity of judgment.

\* Presidential address delivered before the American Political Science Association at its twenty-eighth annual meeting, Detroit, Michigan, December 28-30, 1932.

All who fall in any way in this category have, it is believed, been impressed with the fact that, while they had in mind scores of matters which they believed of importance to be made subjects of inquiry, and which they themselves would like to undertake were it practicable for them to do so, those just beginning their careers, and keenly anxious to engage in work of a research character, were at a loss as to the selection of topics to which to address their efforts. This condition of affairs gives rise to a real obligation on the part of the older to the younger generation. As one who is rapidly approaching, if he has not already reached, the period when his own work will slow down and before long cease, and who for years has had the responsibility of directing research work in political science, I feel that one of the greatest contributions now open to serve the cause to which I have devoted so much of my effort is to survey the field in which I have worked and to seek to make known, not only the general direction which, in my opinion, research in political science in the United States can most profitably take, but, within the limitations of time at my disposal, to indicate the specific topics of inquiry that it is thought desirable to have exploited and the reasons for so thinking. And such an undertaking would seem to be peculiarly appropriate to the circumstances under which the present address has been prepared and is now being delivered.

## II

In a report which I have prepared for the subcommittee on research of the Committee on Policy of the American Political Science Association, I have listed some eighty-odd distinct titles of studies in the field of political science that in my opinion it is desirable to have made. In this address, I can do little more than select from this list, for special consideration, those that are deemed to be of the most importance, at least from the standpoint of their broad appeal to the general student.

In entering upon this task, the desirable method would seem to be that of proceeding from the general to the particular. At the forefront of my program I have therefore placed two studies that are world-wide in their significance, *viz.*:

1. *Popular Government: A Reëxamination of Its Philosophy and Its Practical Operation in the United States*
2. *The Government of Backward Peoples: Some Fundamental Considerations*

Priority has been given to the first of these subjects for a number of reasons.

In the first place, it is believed that there is a real need for a reëxamination, in the light of modern thought and recent happenings, of the basic philosophy, or fundamental premises, underlying the acceptance by the United States of this form of government. It is a matter of significance that so many countries should in recent years have reversed a tendency that has been at work for several generations; that, after progressively modifying their political systems in the direction of the vesting of larger and larger political powers in the hands of the people, they should suddenly return to the principle of autocracy, and, in doing so, base their action not merely upon the necessity of resorting to unusual measures for meeting an emergency, but upon a flat denial of the validity of the arguments which had theretofore been accepted as justifying popular sovereignty. The action by these states has, in a way, put the doctrine of popular government upon the defensive.

Secondly, even had these events not taken place, a reëxamination of this doctrine would not be out of order. Popular government, in the United States at least, took its rise at a time when there was an almost unquestioned belief in the doctrine of natural law and natural rights. Government by the people was held to be not merely the form of organization that would best achieve the ends of political action, but the only form that had moral and philosophic justification. There are few students of politics and jurisprudence who now hold to this doctrine. This being so, popular government, if it is to be justified, must be justified by its results.

In no other country, with the possible exception of England, has there been such a general and long-continued test of this form of government as in the United States. This experience, notwithstanding the fact that it has been had under exceptionally favorable circumstances, has developed certain weaknesses which, if anything, tend to become more pronounced as time goes on. Among these are: the tendency of the voters, a majority of whom pay little or nothing in the form of direct taxes, to demand or approve the reckless incurrence of debt and extravagance in the expenditure of public funds; of minorities to make illegitimate use of their power, as is now being done by the veterans of the late war in their demands upon the public treasury; of *bloccs* in our legislative bodies

to put special or class interests above those of the general welfare. To these may be added the difficulty encountered in making popular government a reality, instead of merely a name, in the sense of preventing real political powers from becoming vested in self-seeking, and often corrupt, political rings, and in devising the ways and means by which the constantly increasing, varied, and technical work of government may be efficiently and economically performed.

These weaknesses, moreover, are not ones peculiar to popular government as operated in the United States. If one has any doubt on this subject, he should read the really notable article, "Democracy: A Realist View," contributed to the *Atlantic Monthly* for April, 1928, by Claud Mullins, in which he surveys the working of popular government in England. He writes:

True democracy presupposes two conditions: first, that the vast majority of the people have a genuine opinion upon public affairs; secondly, that electors will use their power for the public benefit. As regards England, I feel certain that neither condition is yet fulfilled. . . . Electoral appeals now are nearly always to the pocket and not to the conscience. We have reduced ourselves to a condition in which the mass of the voters is mainly concerned in extracting personal benefits from the public purse, and in which those who pay taxes directly have but an insignificant voice at public elections. Our politics are becoming a gigantic conspiracy to make the rich poorer, in the fond belief that thus the poor will become richer. All political parties vie with each other in offering bribes to the electors out of public funds.

In considering this matter, one should also reread the famous letter written by Macaulay in 1857 to an American friend in which he sought to set forth the impossibility of the American system of popular government proving a success for more than a limited period for the same reasons given in the quotation just reproduced; also the report made to the Institute International de Droit Public in 1928 by Joseph Barthélemy on "La Crise de la Démocratie Representative."

It is far from my intention to make an attack upon popular government. All that I seek to do is emphasize the fact that, notwithstanding the amount that has been written on this subject, the need has again risen for a study, or studies, that will deal with the validity of the principles underlying popular government; will seek to determine the extent to which the weaknesses of which this form of government has given evidence are inherent in the system, or mere failures properly to meet the conditions of its operation; and

the action required in order to correct or remove such weaknesses. Such a study is peculiarly one to be made by the American student who is sympathetic with the system and has a long experience with its workings to draw upon.

In suggesting the second subject—The Government of Backward Peoples: Some Fundamental Considerations—I have in mind the making of a study of a rather special character. It is the tendency of students of political science to relate their thinking primarily, if not exclusively, to conditions as they exist in the more advanced and politically developed communities. Viewed from the world, rather than a narrow nationalistic, standpoint, one of the most important tasks confronting political scientists and statesmen is that of working out the problems involved in making provision for the orderly and efficient conduct of the political affairs of communities which either have never had independent governments of their own and are now in a condition of political tutelage, or, having achieved independence, have not succeeded in organizing and operating governmental systems of the standard, as regards the maintenance of order, the protection of rights, the observance of financial obligations, and the promotion of the general welfare of their citizens, that is maintained, at least measurably, by the more advanced nations.

That this task presents phases and problems of a special character must be evident. It happens that while serving, first as treasurer and later as secretary and president of the executive council of Porto Rico, during the period immediately following the establishment of civil government in that island, and still later as political adviser to the Chinese government, I had some experience in handling problems presented in the conduct of governmental affairs in a community of this character. This experience, and my subsequent studies, have impressed me with the fact that much of the writing upon the government of colonies, dependencies, and backward communities has been inconclusive, due to the fact that adequate consideration has not been given to the fundamental principles involved. Especially is this true of the consideration that has been, and is now being, given to the response to be made to the demands by the people of the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico for political independence, to the similar demands upon Great Britain made by the inhabitants of India, to the justification of intervention by one power in the conduct of governmental affairs of

another as illustrated by the intervention of the United States in the affairs of Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua, and of Japan in the affairs of China.

All of these cases involve matters of principle as well as of expediency. No intelligent opinion can be formulated regarding the action that should be taken, or in respect of the justification of action had, except upon the acceptance or rejection of certain fundamental premises. These include such questions as the philosophical justification of the right of self-determination and the limitations, if any, that should exist in respect to its grant or exercise; the extent to which the so-called right of self-government may be deemed to be a natural, inherent, or moral right, or is one to be respected only under certain conditions, such as that reasonable grounds exist for believing that it will be exercised with a reasonable degree of wisdom; the criteria to be employed in determining what is self-government, and especially whether self-government can be said to be granted when there is a certainty, or a high degree of probability, that political powers will in fact be exercised by a small minority only of the population making politics, as it were, a profession; whether, as more than one student of public affairs has declared, self-government, no matter how bad, is preferable to political dependency, no matter how good the government characterizing it; whether the ultimate goal of good government can best be achieved by a people profiting from their own errors, under a régime of self-government that is sure to be abused at the outset, or under a régime of tutelage, under which control, as regards important matters at least, is vested in, and exercised by, another government; which of the two considerations—the interests of the people of a particular community, or those of a community of peoples, or of the world as a whole—should prevail when the two are in conflict.

### III

From these two studies, which deal with matters of world-wide politics, I have next turned to those that are of special concern to our own country. Due regard to relative, as distinguished from absolute, importance has suggested that attention should first be given to those features of our political system that are fundamental in the sense of determining its essential character: the guaranty by express provisions of our written constitution of cer-

tain so-called individual rights; our federal, as opposed to the unitary, type of government; and our adherence to the doctrine of the separation of powers.

The decision to incorporate these basic principles into our political system was made when conditions, governmental and otherwise, were radically different from those now obtaining. Their adoption represented in a very real sense an experiment in government. Nearly a century and a half has elapsed since then, and the United States, in common with the world, has undergone revolutionary changes. The time, it is believed, has arrived when it is desirable to submit all three of these features to a reëxamination for the purpose of determining the manner in which they have actually worked in practice, and whether the experience had, and the changed conditions now existing, are such as to suggest any modification in, or departure from, them.

For the studies corresponding to these features, the following titles have been suggested:

3. *Our Constitutional Guarantees in the Light of Modern Conditions*
4. *Our Federal Form of Government in the Light of Modern Conditions*
5. *The Separation of Powers: A Reëxamination of an Old Question in the Light of Modern Conditions*

A few words further regarding the need for such studies and the general direction that they should take.

The prime purpose of the so-called guarantees in our constitutional documents is the limitation of the powers of government in respect to the control of individual action. These limitations were incorporated in our constitutions at a time when possible tyranny was the great evil to be guarded against; and the prevailing belief was that that government was best that governed least. Present conditions are radically different. The American people are now subject to a government all branches of which are, in the final analysis, subject to their control. The old idea that there were certain so-called essential functions of government, beyond which it was not desirable for governments to go, has been replaced by one which looks upon government as an agency to take positive action wherever it can effectively do so in the interest of the general welfare. In attempting to meet these new responsibilities, our governments have found their powers of action seriously restricted by

the limitations imposed upon them by these constitutional guarantees. Particularly is this so in respect of those guarantees which relate to property rights. Much of the legislation having for its purpose to accomplish social reform that has been enacted in response to overwhelming public demand has had to run the gauntlet of the courts, and, in not a few cases, has been nullified. And much legislation desired by the people has not been even attempted, as the result of the certainty that it would not pass judicial scrutiny. Intended for the protection of the people, these guarantees have become, to a certain extent, the means of defeating the will of the people. It is in view of these conditions that it is suggested that this whole subject of constitutional guarantees should be subjected to reëxamination. Such an examination not only should consider the substantive character of these guarantees, but should distinguish between those which should be limitations upon the executive and those which should be limitations upon the government as a whole. This is of importance, since, in most foreign governments, these limitations are either non-existent or effective only as against the executive, express power being granted to the legislature to determine their scope or to modify them as, in its opinion, is deemed desirable. Another feature deserving special attention is the extent to which, if at all, such guarantees should be subject to modification or suspension in times of stress resulting from war or otherwise.

In respect to the next study suggested, it is a significant fact that practically all countries which have in recent years adopted new constitutional systems have, after a careful study of the relative advantages and disadvantages of the unitary and federal types of government, decided in favor of the former. The difficulties that our country has had, as the result of its having a federal form of government, in the handling of such matters as the detection and prosecution of crime, the control of transportation, the securing of uniform legislation in respect to many matters in regard to which uniformity is desirable, and the coördination of the activities of the national government and the governments of the states when their operations are in the same field, are well known.

At the time that our government was established, there were relatively few matters that could not be satisfactorily handled by the constituent states, acting independently. Improved means of communication and other economic changes have steadily tended to

make matters which formerly were of local concern ones that can be effectively handled only by centralized action. The disadvantages inherent in the federal form of government have thus tended steadily to become more accentuated.

It may well be that the American people are not prepared to abandon their federal form of government. It is desirable, however, that they should have a clear knowledge of the disadvantages that this form of government presents. A dispassionate study is needed of the manner in which this form of government operates at the present time and of the means that have been resorted to to overcome its disadvantages. Such a study would be especially valuable in considering proposals constantly being made to amend the federal Constitution with a view to enlarging the powers of the national government, and in the further development of means for securing uniformity in legislation and coördination in the administrative work of the different governments where such uniformity and coördination are desirable.

An even stronger case can, it is believed, be made out for the need of a thorough reëxamination of the doctrine of the separation of powers which constitutes such an important feature of our political system. Such a study should embrace an examination of this doctrine from the theoretical standpoint as well as from that of the manner in which it has worked, and is now working, in the United States. This is desirable since, notwithstanding the attention that has been given to the subject over a long period of years, not a little confusion of thought in regard to it still exists, even among those who follow political science as a profession. In some degree, this confusion was pointed out by the writer of the present paper in the little book published by him some thirteen years ago entitled *An Introduction to the Study of the Government of Modern States*. He there pointed out that, notwithstanding the fact that the three-fold division of governmental powers into the legislative, the executive, and the judicial had received such general recognition as to give to it almost the character of a political verity, such a division could neither stand the test of scientific analysis nor be made the basis for any effective distribution of powers in a working government. Its inadequacy lay in its failure to make any provision for the electoral function, or to distinguish between the executive and the administrative function. In the second place, he drew attention to the distinction, which up to that time had received little

or no attention, between the separation of powers which is secured when the exercise of the several powers is vested in distinct organs, each of which is manned by a distinct set of officials, and that resulting where use is made of separate organs but these organs are, in part at least, in charge of the same persons. The first may be designated as a personal and the second as an organic separation of powers. The failure to make this distinction, and to appreciate the consequences flowing from it, more than anything else, is responsible for the vast amount of misconception that exists in respect to the relative merits of the two systems.

Much the most important need for a study of this subject consists, however, in the desirability of determining, as a matter of fact, how the system of separation of powers, as embedded in our federal and state constitutions, has worked in practice; whether it has or has not achieved the ends motivating its adoption; whether it has brought with it collateral results, such as the diffusion of responsibility, the interposition of obstacles in the way of the development of effective leadership, or other consequences, that might raise the question of the desirability of its abandonment or material modification.

#### IV

The foregoing five suggested studies may be of a more ambitious character than many would like to undertake. Where this is so, certain phases of them may be selected for a more specialized and intensive examination. Separate studies might thus be made of each of the several constitutional guarantees, or of each of the several categories into which such guarantees may be classified, such as those having to do with purely personal liberties, those having for their purpose the protection of property rights, those throwing safeguards around judicial procedure, and the like. As regards the last subject mentioned—the separation of powers—there are three special matters of practical importance that it would be of great value to have made the subject of inquiry. These, with the titles that might be given to them, are:

6. *Administration and the Legislature: A Study in the Separation of Powers*
7. *Administration and the Courts: A Study in the Separation of Powers*
8. *Administrative Law and Its Enforcement*

All studies in the problems of public administration must start with a recognition that the source of all administrative authority is the legislature. The legislature is the organ that determines what the government shall do, what the organization by which the activities decided upon shall be performed, how this organization shall be manned, the rules of procedure to be followed, and the money that shall be made available for meeting the expenditures involved. In reaching these determinations, the legislature acts, in effect, as the board of directors of the government corporation. One of the most important considerations involved in the whole conduct of the administrative affairs of a government is that of the extent to which the legislature, in acting in this capacity, will seek by statutory enactment to regulate in detail the organization, activities, procedure, and expenditure of funds by the several administrative services, or will leave with the administration broad discretionary powers in respect to these matters. There is a real need for a philosophical consideration of this subject, combined with a comparative study of the actual policies pursued by different governments, in Europe as well as the United States, and their results. The struggle that has just taken place between the Congress and the President in respect to which branch should undertake the reorganization of the administrative departments and independent establishments, with a view to reducing expenditures and increasing efficiency, is an illustration of the need for an inquiry of this character. A somewhat similar issue is presented in respect to the relative parts to be played by the administration and the courts in reaching final decision regarding matters of controversy arising in the conduct of governmental affairs.

One of the most striking developments of recent years in the field of politics has been the growth of what the student of jurisprudence designates as administrative law; that is, law embodied in administrative orders and regulations rather than legislative enactments, and the vesting of the adjudication of controversies arising in connection with the application of these orders, and, indeed a considerable body of statutory law as well, in officers or tribunals other than the regular courts of law. This development gives rise to a sharp conflict between those who are interested primarily in the protection and enforcement of individual rights and those whose primary concern is the efficient dispatch of public business. By the lawyer, who represents the first class, the growth

of this vast body of law, and the instrumentalities which have been set up for its enunciation and application, are deemed to be fraught with dangerous possibilities. To those concerned with the practical operations of government, this new development offers the most effective, if not the only feasible, method for the efficient conduct of public affairs.

The harmonizing of these two conflicting interests constitutes a problem of the first magnitude. There is urgent need for an examination of the whole philosophy or principle underlying this practice, and of the practical provisions that should be made for ensuring that these powers, which are of a quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial character, are properly exercised. An essential feature of such a study should be a contrasting of the system of orders in council of the English government, and the system of administrative courts distinct from the ordinary courts that obtains in France, Germany, and other countries of continental Europe, with the system that obtains in the United States.

## v

The subjects of inquiry that have just been mentioned fall in the field of what may be termed the functional distribution of powers. Scarcely less important problems are present in respect to the distribution of powers territorially. The government of a country, properly viewed, consists of the totality of agencies, national, provincial, state, or local, made use of for the conduct of public affairs. One of the most important features of a government, and one materially affecting its cost, is the manner in which the territory to be ruled over is divided into political divisions and a distribution of political powers made among them. No one can study the government of the United States without reaching the conclusion that this problem of the distribution of governmental functions territorially has not been solved satisfactorily. No systematic plan or principle has been followed in making this distribution. The primary division of the country into states has been almost wholly a matter of historical accident. The same is true of the division of the states into counties. Only as a result of accident do these divisions correspond to geographical or economic conditions; and there is the widest variation among them as regards area and population. The relation between cities and the counties in which they are located is, in most cases, one of confusion. No satisfactory

provision exists for the handling of the common interests of metropolitan areas. There is a multiplicity of special areas such as school districts, irrigation districts, and the like. On no rational grounds, as regards meeting local needs or efficiency in operation, can the existence of states of the disproportionate size and population of Texas and Rhode Island, New York and Nevada, nor the existence within the same state of counties some of which have ten times the area or population of others, be justified.

A complete exploration of this field would require a multiplicity of studies. Mention here, however, is made of but three which, on account of their general character, have a special importance. These are:

9. *Political Divisions of the United States: A Study of the Territorial Distribution of Powers*
10. *The Coördination of the Administrative Organization and Work of the National and State Governments*
11. *The Coördination of the Administrative Organization and Work of the State Governments and Their Political Subdivisions*

In respect to the first of these, it is recognized that, for sentimental reasons, great difficulty will be encountered in making any change in existing political boundaries. It is none the less desirable that this whole problem should be subjected to careful study, to the end that the people may at least know the disadvantages and cost that their illogical system entails, and the lines along which action should proceed in bringing about improvement. In point of fact, a great movement has been at work during recent years for the modification of this system. Beginning at the bottom, students of government and those responsible for the prosecution of special surveys in the field of state and local government have united in recommending the abolition of many, if not most, of the political subdivisions of the county and the making of the county the smallest general territorial unit for the administration of public affairs. From this point, the movement has extended to that of raising the question whether the number of counties should not be greatly reduced, through a process of consolidation, and even whether the time has not arrived when we should look forward to—using the expression employed by me in the report made by the Institute for Government Research, of which I was the director, on county government in North Carolina—the progressive liquidation of the

county and its final abolition as a political subdivision of the state. The study suggested is thus one of peculiar interest and timeliness, both as a contribution to the principles involved, and as a survey of a movement now under way.

The need for the second study mentioned is due to the fact that our federal form of government gives rise to certain problems which either are not present or can more readily be met in a unitary government such as that of England or France. Among these, the most important is that of coördination of the administrative work of the central government with that of the constituent states. This problem would not arise were the fields of activities of the two governments distinct. This condition, however, does not obtain in the United States. Both the national and state governments to a large extent engage in work in the same fields and having the same general purposes in view. Both seek to promote education, public health, agriculture, fishing, mining, and industry generally. Both undertake to control transportation and banking. Both have before them the problem of the regulation of power companies. Even in respect to such an important function as that of national defense, both are concerned. Both to an increasing extent recognize the desirability of promoting, or themselves engaging in, scientific research.

This joint occupancy of the same fields of endeavor raises in an acute form the problem of the means by which effective coöperation between the two classes of governments may be secured and unnecessary duplication and work avoided. Almost without exception, federal agencies have sought, in one way or another, to establish coöperative relations with state agencies engaged in the same lines of work. The system under which the national government makes grants of money to the states for certain work, provided the latter make corresponding appropriations and observe certain conditions, is but one phase of this effort. If this system were abolished, the problem of securing coöperation between the national government and the states would remain, and efforts in this direction would have to take other forms. Though, as stated, much has been, and is being, done to meet this problem, much yet remains to be done to put conditions upon a satisfactory basis. Illustrating possibilities in this way is the proposal that the state railroad commissions be made, in effect, the tribunals of original jurisdiction in respect to most matters coming before the Inter-

state Commerce Commission, and the latter function as an appellate tribunal, while retaining its original jurisdiction in respect to certain matters of national importance.

The problem of the coördination of the organization and work of the state governments and their political subdivisions is analogous to that of the coördination of federal and state organization and activities, but presents itself under different conditions owing to the fact that the state government is, as regards its relations to its political subdivisions, a unitary government and, as such, can determine both its own organization and activities and those of its political subdivisions as well. It is thus in a position to give orders to, and to exercise the function of supervision and control over, the latter, a power not possessed by the national government in respect to the states. The essence of the study here suggested is thus that of determining what principles, if any, should govern the states in apportioning the field between their own distinct agencies and their political subdivisions; in providing for the correlation of the latter's organization and work with their own, so as to ensure a unity of program and a minimum of duplication or conflict of jurisdiction and responsibilities; in distinguishing the extent to, and manner in, which they shall direct, supervise, and control their political subdivisions in the performance of their administrative activities; and of setting forth the conditions actually obtaining in the several states in respect to these important matters.

## VI

Before leaving this subject of the study of government from a functional standpoint, it is desired to mention yet another study which is believed to be of surpassing importance, from the standpoint of both theory and practice. The title suggested for this study is:

*12. The Doctrine of Industries Affected with a Public Interest:  
A Political and Legal Study*

There is, of course, now in existence a vast body of literature bearing upon the jurisprudence of this question. What is urgently needed is a study that will have as its primary objective, not merely a statement of the law as it exists, but the law, or practice, that it is in the interest of society to have formulated by the legislatures and applied by the courts. As is well known, one of the present problems of jurisprudence is to keep the law in adjustment to

changing conditions. At the time that the American doctrine of industries affected with a public interest took form, conditions were radically different from those now obtaining. There are many features of our social and economic life which formerly were matters of purely individual concern, but which now are ones affecting the general interest of the entire community in a very vital way, and only possible of effective handling on the basis of the general, as distinguished from the individual, interest. This conflict between the interest of the individual and the general community may be illustrated by the situation now existing in respect to the conservation of the natural resources of the country. It is undoubtedly to the interest, in many cases, of the individual owner of forest land entirely to denude such land of its growing timber and to make no provision for protection against fire hazards through the disposal of the slash. From the standpoint of society, however, it may be, and usually is, of the utmost importance that the owner, in cutting his timber, shall leave standing, for reproduction purposes, a certain proportion of its growing trees and lessen the danger of fire through the proper disposal of his slash. Until forestry is recognized as an industry affected with a public interest, and thus brought under the regulatory powers of government, society is helpless to impose those limitations upon its operations that are of so great importance to it. To take another case, agricultural economists are a unit in holding that the greatest waste of natural resources now taking place is the loss of soil fertility and adaptability to agricultural operations resulting from erosion. Here again, it may correspond to the individual's interest, or at least desires, to farm his land as he sees fit, while the community's interest may dictate a different use, or a method of cultivation that will set up safeguards against the wasting away of the soil or the creation of gulleys. The conflict between the use by the landowner of his land for the erection of disfiguring wayside advertising stands and that of the community in preserving rural beauty is well known.

These few illustrations, which might be materially extended, serve to show that there is here an issue of great importance which is deserving of most careful study by political scientists. In making such a study, it would be desirable that attention be given to the historical evolution of the doctrine, and to the extent to which this doctrine is accepted and acted upon in England and other European countries.

## VII

All, or practically all, of the topics of inquiry that have been suggested up to the present point fall in the field of what may be termed general political science in the sense that they have to do with the organization and operation of government as a whole. Following the plan of proceeding from the general to the particular, I have next sought to enumerate those studies which have to do with each of the several grand branches of government: the electoral, the legislative, the judicial, the executive, and the administrative. Naturally, as one pushes his inquiries into these more specialized fields, the number of subjects that it is desirable to have subjected to study becomes greater and greater. My report for the subcommittee on research thus contains several score of suggested studies. Of these, limitations of time make it possible to mention and comment upon but a few.

In the field of the legislative branch, much the most important studies that, in my opinion, are needed are:

13. *The Working of the Bicameral System in the United States*

14. *The Veto Power in the United States*

The use of a two-chambered legislature is one of the most striking features of modern governments. On its face, the use of such a system, which is in such marked contrast with the practice of private corporations, and presents such evident disadvantages in the way of added complexity, expense, diffusion of responsibility, and difficulty in securing action, requires defense. It is significant that the adoption of this system was largely the result of historical accident in the case of England, where it originated, and from which it has been copied by other countries. It is also significant that practically all countries, other than the United States, and particularly those which have recently adopted new constitutions, while making provision for two chambers, have not made these chambers coördinate in powers, final authority being vested in one of the chambers. And England herself, as the result of her Parliament Act of 1911, has likewise reformed her two-chambered system in this way.

It is believed that the time has come when a careful study should be made of the advantages and disadvantages of this system, both from the theoretical standpoint and from that of the manner in which the system has actually worked in the United States. Such a study would be of great practical importance to the states as

they, from time to time, give consideration to the revision of their constitutional systems. The arguments in favor of such a system, in the case of the states, are quite different from those in the case of the federal government. Originally, a considerable number of the cities of the United States made provision for a two-chambered municipal council. Practically all of them have now abandoned this system in favor of a single chamber. It may well be that a great improvement in the organization of the political systems of the states can be made by the states following the example of their political subdivisions. The subject is at least one well worth careful study.

A study of the veto power in the United States is suggested for various reasons. In the first place, it is not only one of the characteristic political institutions of our country, but one which, so far as its use is concerned, has undergone a radical transformation within comparatively recent years. As is well known, the primary motive dictating the incorporation of this feature in our political system was the desire to provide means through which the chief executive might, in a measure, protect his office from aggression on the part of the legislature and, if need be, keep the legislature from the assumption of powers not intended to be exercised by it. In point of fact, these original motives have been almost wholly lost sight of. Not only do chief executives freely use this power to defeat proposed legislation of all kinds of which they do not approve, but the general public expects them to use this power in this way. The result is that the office of chief executive has become, to all intents and purposes, a third branch of the legislature. In the second place, it is not so well known that the conditions governing the exercise of this power as contained in the state constitutions are by no means identical in all cases. In some cases the power applies to the disapproval of particular items in appropriation bills, or even to the reduction of such items. Thirdly, and most important of all, there is little or no information regarding the manner in which this institution has actually operated in the United States, the extent to which it has prevented the enactment of unwise legislation, or placed obstacles in the way of desirable legislation; the extent to which the power has been indirectly used through a threat to use it if certain modifications were not made in legislative proposals under consideration; the influence that the exercise of this power has had upon the development of executive

leadership; the legal questions to which its use has given rise, such as those having to do with what is known as the pocket veto, etc. It is in view of these questions that it is thought that the time has arrived when a thorough reëxamination should be made of this institution from the standpoint both of the principles involved in it and of its practical operations in the past and at the present time.

#### VIII

As regards the executive branch, there is at least one study that it is highly desirable to have made, and which may be entitled:

15. *The Office of Chief Executive in the United States: A Study in Political Evolution*

Few, if any, political institutions of the United States have undergone such important changes in recent years as the office of chief executive. Originally conceived of as an officer who would be little more than the titular head of the government, exercising a limited number of powers carefully enumerated in the Constitution, the chief executive has tended to become the dominant authority, not only in all matters of administration, but even in the field of legislation. To these powers are added the increased influence which he exercises as the head of his political party. In some respects, the most important feature of the modern movements for the adoption of budget systems and the reorganization of the administrative branches of the state governments is the extent to which increased responsibilities and powers have been thrown upon the chief executive. The relations of this officer to the electorate, to the legislature, and to the administrative services are radically different from what they were in the past. A study of this evolutionary process would be of great interest in itself, and would assist in the settlement of the new questions of the distribution of governmental powers that are constantly arising.

#### IX

It is in the judicial branch, however, that the American student will find the broadest field for original research. Of the several branches of public administration in the United States, that of the administration of the law is much the most unsatisfactory. Though constituting a primary function of government, and affecting the welfare of the people in a more direct way than almost any other

activity of the government, there is probably no single thing that our governments do with less efficiency and economy. Both our system of courts and their methods of procedure are almost universally recognized as defective. The same is true of the agencies of the executive branch having to do with the enforcement of the criminal law, the offices of prosecuting attorney, the police, the coroner's office, etc. In their practical operations, the courts and the administrative agencies are expensive both to the government and to litigants. They perform their work with great dilatoriness; and miscarriages of justice are frequent.

If the student of politics and jurisprudence has any obligation, it is, therefore, that of subjecting every phase of this branch of government to intensive study for the purpose of determining wherein its defects lie and the action required for their correction. This obligation is all the greater since this field has been so generally neglected in the past.

To attempt to enumerate even the specific studies that it is desirable to have made would require the preparation, in effect, of an outline of the whole field of judicial administration. Here, I will have to content myself therefore with only these general remarks.

X

Turning now to the administrative branch, we have to do with a field in which an enormous amount of research work has been done in recent years. Some two-score permanent agencies, in the form of institutes and bureaus of governmental research, have been set up having as their sole, or primary, function the prosecution of work in this field. A score or more of the states have had made comprehensive surveys of their entire administrative machinery and procedures, not to speak of the many more that they have had made of particular branches of their administrative systems. These special surveys have been supplemented by others carried on, or sponsored, by such organizations as the National Education Association, the General Education Board, and certain of the endowments. Finally, the universities have very widely adopted the policy of creating bureaus, or institutes, of governmental research as a part of their systems for the instruction and training of their students.

Great as is the volume of work done in this way, the field has, however, by no means been fully exploited. There still remain

many states, almost the totality of our cities, and an untold number of other political subdivisions whose administrative systems it is in the highest degree desirable to have subjected to similar study.

Valuable, however, as is the extensive literature resulting from these surveys, as throwing light upon the problems of public administration in the United States, it has the serious limitation that it deals with particular conditions as existing in particular governments. Only incidentally does it seek to set forth general principles. While it may be that public administration is not entitled to the designation of a science, as that term is employed in respect to the natural sciences, studies in this field have gone far enough to establish that there are at least fundamental principles, of more or less general application, analogous to those characterizing any science, which must be observed if the end of administration, efficiency in operation, is to be secured. One of the most important tasks confronting political scientists is the determination of these principles and their statement in proper form, accompanied by the supporting explanations and arguments that will lead to their acceptance.

In my volume, *The Principles of Public Administration*, in the other volumes in the series, "Principles of Administration," published by the Institute for Government Research, and in such other volumes as *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, by Professor Leonard D. White, a beginning in this direction has been made. These volumes, however, deal only with what may be termed general administration, broadly viewed. They give almost no consideration to the special problems of administration as presented by the individual services corresponding to the grand functions of government. The public health administrator, the public works administrator, and the like, while they should find much of profit in consulting these volumes, will search them in vain for instructions as to how they should handle their special technical problems of organization and procedure. Nor will they find any such information in satisfactory form in other works. There are few greater services to be rendered to the cause of efficient administration than the preparation of a series of volumes that will supplement the ones just enumerated by taking for their subjects the consideration of the principles of administration of these special branches of administrative work.

Among studies of this character of which there is believed to be urgent need, mention may be made of the following:

16. *Principles of Public Education Administration*
17. *Principles of Public Health Administration*
18. *Principles of Public Works Administration*
19. *Principles of Welfare Administration*
20. *Principles of Penal Administration*
21. *Principles of Pardon, Parole, and Probation Administration*
22. *Principles of Property Tax Administration*
23. *Principles of Inheritance Tax Administration*
24. *Principles of Public Debt Administration*
25. *Principles of Workmen's Compensation Administration*
26. *Principles of Statistical Administration*
27. *Principles of Hospital Administration*
28. *Principles of Property Accounting*
29. *Principles of Administrative Coöperation.*

These studies should seek to do two things: first, to make a comprehensive survey of existing conditions as regards the organization and procedure of the national, state, and local governments for the handling of the several subjects with which they have to deal, the special provisions, if any, for their financing, the relations, coöperative or otherwise, existing between the organizations of the several governments of which they are a part; and, second, on the basis of this information, to formulate and state the principles that it is believed should govern in handling these matters. Fundamentally, the effort should be made to produce treatises that would be of maximum usefulness to all officials having to do with the conduct of the affairs to which they relate.

## XI

In the foregoing, I have had the time to mention only a comparatively few studies having to do with matters of general political science or that relate to the more fundamental features of our own political system. In doing so, my primary purpose has been to bring home to the younger student a realization of the fact that political science is one having to do with constantly changing conditions, and that there is hardly a political institution or principle, no matter how firmly it may seem to be sanctioned by past thought and practice, that does not need periodically to be subjected to reëxamination in the light of changed conditions.

It is when one turns from this broad, to the narrower, field of the problems presented by particular classes of government, or particular governments within a class, or to the special subdivisions of our subject—international law, constitutional law, administrative law, the organization and operation of political parties, and the like—that the number of studies that it is desirable to have made becomes almost too extensive for mention. In my report for the subcommittee on research, to which I have alluded, I have, nevertheless, listed and commented upon some fifty or more topics having to do with our national and state governments that seem to be of special importance and urgency. And this report, it is understood, will be supplemented by other reports by the other members of the committee, and others whose collaboration has been sought, dealing in like manner with our municipal and local governments and the other fields of political science that have been mentioned. And it is to these reports that the student, seeking for guidance in respect to how he can best dedicate his time to the advancement of his chosen profession, should turn.

In conclusion, may I say that it is only too fully recognized that what has been presented here and in my subcommittee report is but the thought of a single individual, and one whose active work has had to do with but a limited number of the branches collectively constituting the broad domain of political science. It is his hope, however, that other political science elders, whose work and thoughts have been in other fields, and whose viewpoint is different, may be tempted by his example to undertake a similar exposition. That a great service to political science would be rendered by their doing so would seem certain.