

A Guide to the
Social Science Research Council Archives
at the
Rockefeller Archive Center

Compiled by
Kenneth W. Rose

Copyright© 1999 The Rockefeller University/Rockefeller Archive Center

For additional copies or further information write:

Director
Rockefeller Archive Center
15 Dayton Avenue
Sleepy Hollow, New York 10591-1598
or contact the Center via e-mail at:
archive@rockvax.rockefeller.edu
Telephone: (914) 631-4505

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	1
<i>Part 1</i> <i>Kenton W. Worcester, “An Introduction to the Social Science Research Council Collection”</i>	2
<i>Part 2</i> <i>Arrangement of the Social Science Research Council Archives</i>	26
<i>Part 3</i> <i>Committee Projects Documented in the Social Science Research Council Archives</i>	29

PREFACE

When the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Archives were donated to the Rockefeller Archive Center in 1990, they significantly enhanced collections in which the development of the social sciences was a prominent theme. Funding and promotion of the social sciences already were documented in several of the Center's collections, especially in the records of the Russell Sage Foundation, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and the Rockefeller Foundation, which provided important funding in the early years of the SSRC. The Center was pleased to add to its collections the records of the organization most responsible for the growth of social science research in the United States in the 20th century.

The records of the Social Science Research Council consist of more than 440 cubic feet of material that documents the development of the social sciences over eight decades. So that researchers may have an overview of this immense volume of material, the Center has prepared this introductory guide to help in identifying particular parts of the collection that may be relevant to individual research projects.

In the first part of the guide, Kenton Worcester, Program Director of the Social Science Research Council, offers a narrative introduction to the SSRC archives. He discusses some of the highlights of the collection, relates particular parts of the collection to the history of the SSRC, and suggests many avenues of productive research within the collection.

Parts 2 and 3 of this guide present portions of the finding aid prepared by archivist Monica Blank. Part 2 offers a general overview of the arrangement of the collection, including descriptions of its various series. Part 3 lists the numerous committees that directed the SSRC's program areas, and whose work is documented in the Committee Projects series in Accessions 1 and 2. A complete finding aid may be consulted at the Archive Center and online at the Center's web site <www.rockefeller.edu/archive.ctr>.

Darwin H. Stapleton
Director

PART 1

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL COLLECTION

Kenton W. Worcester

The Social Science Research Council (SSRC) was barely five years old when economist Wesley Clair Mitchell, speaking to a group of colleagues, began a reflection on the heady early days of the Council. “The histories of the social sciences which will be published when our grandchildren are growing gray,” he forecast, “will record that in the late 1920’s a remarkable development took place. . . . At that time, these histories will say, for the first time in civilized society, liberal funds were put at the disposal of representatives of the social sciences to spend in research for the promotion of knowledge in any way these men saw fit. And scarcely less remarkable, the histories will go on, at the same time an effort was made to pool the intellectual resources of persons who represented the social sciences in their then meager state of development.” In Mitchell’s mind, the historians of the future would have to answer the question, “What followed from the remarkable opportunities that were granted these happy representatives of social science in that rosy dawn of endowed research?”¹

Now a substantial body of resource material is available that will allow researchers to tackle Mitchell’s seventy-year-old question. The Social Science Research Council collection at the Rockefeller Archive Center represents a significant new resource for students of the history of the social sciences, intellectual historians, biographers, and others interested in such varied fields as public policy development and the evolution of particular academic disciplines. The collection spans the period from SSRC’s founding in the early 1920s through the late 1980s, and consists of 443 cubic feet of documentary materials organized into more than 10,000 individual files. It offers a rich trove of letters, reports, publications, internal communications, committee minutes, funding proposals, and other memorabilia generated by Council committees and staff

¹ Hanover Conference Minutes, August 22, 1929, p. 53, in the Social Science Research Council Collection, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 330, Folder 1894, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York. Unless otherwise noted, citations of archival material refer to the SSRC collection at the Rockefeller Archive Center.

over a period of seven decades.²

This essay seeks to provide an accessible overview of the SSRC collection and its points of intersection with the growth and development of the modern social sciences. It will argue that the collection can usefully inform research not only, or even primarily, on the SSRC itself, but on the social sciences more generally and on areas of public, intellectual and social life that have been shaped by social-science inquiry and the professionalization of knowledge in the 20th century. It traces the growth of the organization from the early years, when SSRC leaders established a framework for promoting research in the social sciences, to more recent decades, when the Council expanded into new program areas, repositioned itself in the research environment and opened toward the international social sciences.

The introduction also aims to illustrate the relevance of the collection for work on a wide variety of topics, including the social sciences and the policy-making process; the emergence and evolution of area and international studies; the establishment of new, cross-disciplinary fields, such as Sociolinguistics, social indicators, law and society, and human development; the growth of a research infrastructure linking universities, disciplinary associations, agencies such as SSRC, and funding organizations; and the history of university intellectuals, both as groups and as individuals.

More particularly, scholars will find the collection useful for the formation of public policy regarding Social Security; the workings of the Census Bureau; the creation of the National Science Foundation; the use of social science research by federal agencies; the history of the behavioral revolution; the consolidation of African, Asian, Latin American, and other fields of area studies; the deepening of relations between scholars in the U.S. and China; the internationalization of research networks; the development of new quantitative and qualitative methods as well as field research techniques; the study of childhood, mid-life, and the life-course; the application of statistics in historical research; the analysis of television; the meaning of science for the social sciences; the development of comparative social psychology; the status of women in the social sciences; the nexus of ideology, the state, and the social

² The SSRC collection is by no means complete: inevitably, an indeterminate amount of material was discarded over the years, and other documents remain in storage, to be incorporated at a later date. Moreover, access to some files is restricted. Some files, such as fellowship applications that include confidential letters of recommendation, are closed for thirty years from the date of creation.

sciences; the construction of racial and ethnic categories in the social sciences; the reorganization of security studies; the insinuation of eugenics into the early social sciences; and relations among the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. The SSRC collection also permits researchers a glimpse into the intellectual networks of figures as diverse as Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Clifford Geertz, Eugene Genovese, Albert Hirschman, Henry Kissinger, Thomas Kuhn, Gardner Lindzey, Robert Lynd, Margaret Mead, Charles Merriam, Robert Merton, Wesley Clair Mitchell, Philip E. Mosely, Talcott Parsons, Beardsley Ruml, Herbert A. Simon, Theda Skocpol, and William Julius Wilson. This is, of course, only a partial list of the topics that might be examined within the SSRC collection.

Genesis and Development

The SSRC was the world's first national organization of the social sciences, and from the outset its stated goal has been to improve the quality of, and infrastructure for, research in the social sciences. The idea of a council of the social sciences was first proposed by Charles E. Merriam (1874-1953), a professor of political science at the University of Chicago, who saw a need for greater cooperation and coordination among researchers interested in empirical and policy-oriented analysis. "Science," he maintained, "is a great cooperative enterprise in which many intelligences must labor together. There must always be wide scope for the spontaneous and unregimented activity of the individual, but the success of the expedition is conditioned upon some general plan of organization."³ Representatives from seven major disciplinary associations concurred with Merriam's assessment of the need for comprehensive research planning,⁴ and after many months of meetings and informal deliberations the Council was officially constituted in 1923 and legally incorporated in the State of Illinois in December 1924.⁵ The seven founding associations were the American Anthropological Association, the American Economic

³ Quoted in Barry D. Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 107.

⁴ On the Council's relationship to the disciplines, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 9, Box 346; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Boxes 1-2, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 39, Boxes 176-177; Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Boxes 700-702; and the minutes of SSRC governance committees, *in passim*.

⁵ Sources on the Council's early history are sprinkled throughout the collection; e.g., Robert Lynd, "Prehistoric Development of the Social Science Research Council," and Wesley Clair Mitchell, "The Research Fellowships of the Social Science Research Council," Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8474; and various documents

Association, the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Association, and the American Statistical Association. Representatives of these associations have sat on governance committees from the time of the Council's founding, and, remarkably, no other disciplinary associations have been added in the intervening years.

The decision to launch a new coordinating body proved timely in at least two respects. First, many academicians were receptive to the idea that social research required an independent home base. Since universities, departments, and disciplinary associations were preoccupied with other matters, they were unlikely to make the research process their highest priority. An independent association of professional social researchers could more reliably coordinate efforts and press the case for fellowships, workshops, conferences, publications, networks, and other means that would facilitate the acquisition and dissemination of social knowledge. As staff member Donald Young explained in a subsequent internal memorandum, "voluntary professional associations have been created by groups of scientific workers in all fields to serve all varieties of common purposes ever since science has been a recognized calling. So men in the various social disciplines organized themselves as their number and product became too great for more casual interchange and cooperation. Because the boundaries of all disciplines are arbitrary, if convenient, creations of men, associations limited in interest to areas of investigation so defined tend to neglect questions of over-all strategy and tactics."⁶

in Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Boxes 329-330, and in Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Boxes 704-705 and 715. Secondary sources include Heinz Eulau, *Micro-Macro Dilemmas in Political Science: Personal Pathways Through Complexity* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996); Donald Fisher, *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993); Robert Lynd, *Knowledge for What? The Place of Social Science in American Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939), Charles E. Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970, third edition); Kenneth Prewitt, *Social Sciences and Private Philanthropy: The Quest for Social Relevance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, 1995); Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); and Elbridge Sibley, *The Social Science Research Council: The First Fifty Years* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1974).

⁶ Donald Young, "Comments on Future Council Policy in Accordance with P&P Instructions," 1944, p. 1, Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8465.

Second, the new organization offered a convenient intermediary for foundations and individuals interested in lending their support to the burgeoning social sciences with the hope that a rigorous approach to the study of social conditions and relations could enhance public awareness and shape government policy. As one foundation officer noted in the early 1920s, “a more complete knowledge of social forms and social processes is bound to be indispensable. Science has penetrated far into the ways of the world of nature; it still stands on the frontier of the world of man. Objective, realistic, far-sighted studies of social phenomena are essential if the insights are to be gained which social planning requires.”⁷ Program staff at the Carnegie Corporation, the Commonwealth Fund, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, the Rockefeller Foundation, and other agencies welcomed the prospect of a coordinating apparatus for assessing research priorities and disbursing research funds. The support provided by these and other funders lent institutional legitimacy and enabled the Council to hire staff and develop new programs in the interwar and postwar periods. It also reflected the foundations’ interest in what Francis Sutton has described as “rational philanthropy, getting at the roots of human ills and deprivations,” which requires “the kind of specialized knowledge that the social sciences supply. . . . [Foundations] need some orderly analysis . . . to proceed in the confidence that they are doing something sensible.”⁸

During the early period the governance committees paid special attention to the means by which the organization would implement its broad mandate.⁹ Charles Merriam, Wesley Clair Mitchell, political scientist Robert Crane, sociologist William Ogburn, historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, and other SSRC officers in the 1920s and 1930s often returned to the challenge of assessing the work of an intermediary organization with an unusually open-ended agenda. They

⁷ Quoted in Olivier Zunz, *Why the American Century?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), p. 39.

⁸ Francis X. Sutton, “American Foundations and the Social Sciences,” *Items*, Vol. 39, no. 4 (December 1985), p. 57. Sutton worked as a program officer at the Ford Foundation from 1954-1983 and served as interim SSRC president in 1985-1986. *Items*, the Council’s quarterly publication, has been published continuously since 1947. An incomplete set of back issues may be found in Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 2, Boxes 712-713.

⁹ The collection features the records of the Board of Directors, which has overall responsibility for the organization; the Executive Committee, which is concerned with personnel and budgetary issues; and the Committee on Problems and Policy, more often known as P&P, which was established in 1925 to “oversee the intellectual program of the Council between infrequent board meetings.” In 1996 P&P was dissolved and its mandate transferred to the Board. See David L. Sills, “A Requiem for P&P: Notes on the Council’s Late Committee on Problems and Policy,” *Items*, Vol. 50, no. 4 (December 1996), p. 94.

identified seven main tasks for the Council: to improve research organization; develop personnel; preserve materials; improve research methods; disseminate materials; facilitate research projects; and contribute to “the public appreciation of the significance of the social sciences.”¹⁰ But their list of objectives left a number of critical issues unresolved, such as establishing a sense of priority among these tasks, and determining the extent to which the Council was making strides in these areas. These issues would resurface time and again, often in the context of governance-level discussions about winding down past initiatives or launching new ones.¹¹

In establishing guidelines for the organization, Merriam and his colleagues relied on three central but often unstated organizing principles.¹² First, they assumed the SSRC would bring together scholars from a spectrum of intellectual and disciplinary perspectives. By concentrating on projects involving “two or more disciplines,” the Council could promote “new insights into social phenomena, new problems, new methods leading to advances in the scientific quality of social investigations.”¹³ Second, to take advantage of changing social conditions and research methods, the internal organization of the Council was designed to be as elastic as possible. No

¹⁰ “Definition of Council Objectives,” n.d., Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8465.

¹¹ The most sustained assessment of the Council’s early activities was prepared in 1937, under the aegis of the Committee on Review of Council Policy. In a book-length report to the Committee, University of Chicago sociologist Louis Wirth praised the Council’s fellowships and its programs on agricultural economics, industry and trade, immigration, and scientific methods, but warned that the organization must learn to “distinguish between work that can be fairly objective and scientific and work that proceeds on the basis of pre-suppositions. . . . It is the Council’s obligation to restore and accentuate the primacy of its intellectual function.” Wirth’s report seems to have reinforced the view that the Council should “encourage ways of working toward more rigorous induction from data, more rigorous verification of hypotheses, greater coherence and continuity of knowledge.” The main concern raised by staff about an early draft had to do with the author’s apparently incautious treatment of the Council’s relationship to the foundations: “the Council is certainly not going to want to issue a report which criticises [sic] the setup of the foundation[s] and their staffs in the social fields, nor certainly to specify too intimate a relationship between members of the foundation staff and some of our committees.” See Louis Wirth, “Report on the History, Activities and Policies of the Social Science Research Council,” pp. 150-155, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 5, Folder 29; “Support of Work in the Social Sciences,” pp. 1-2, n.d. [1930s] Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 705, Folder 8476; and Robert Crane [SSRC Executive Director], Letter to Louis Wirth [1937], p. 2, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 5, Folder 30.

¹² This paragraph draws on Kenton Worcester, “The Social Science Research Council: Plus Ça Change,” in *Social Science Research Council Biennial Report, 1996-1998* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1999).

¹³ “A Decade of Council History,” *The Social Science Research Council: Decennial Report, 1923-33* (New York: SSRC, 1933), p. 10. As it happens, the term “interdisciplinary” “seems to have begun life in the corridors and meeting rooms of the Social Science Research Council as a kind of bureaucratic shorthand for what the Council saw as its chief function, the promotion of research that involved two or more of its seven constituent societies.” See Roberta Frank, “‘Interdisciplinary’: The First Half Century,” *Items*, Vol. 42, no. 3 (September 1988), p. 73; and David L. Sills, “A Note on the Origin of ‘Interdisciplinary’,” *Items*, Vol. 40, no. 1 (March 1986).

single model of committee development or individual scholarly involvement was imposed on the organization as a whole, and since the organization sought to provide a framework for research, rather than advance a specific research agenda, it was up to each generation to make use of this apparatus as it saw fit. Finally, it was recognized that the committees making up the Council would focus on “the planning exercise,” or what later became known as research planning. While training fellowships would enable researchers to undertake independent projects, committees would guide and stimulate research in a given area, rather than carry out an entire research agenda. The research planning mandate enabled committees to evaluate topics, marshal resources, identify obstacles, and announce strategies for effective research; in other words, to exercise leadership.

One of the most innovative of the Council’s early activities was a series of annual summer meetings held in Hanover, New Hampshire between 1925 and 1930. The Hanover meetings effectively translated the concept of research planning into reality. They allowed board members, committee members, staff, and invited guests to contemplate research priorities, allocate training funds, and formulate plans for new committee activities. Scholars could bring their families to this rustic setting, and participants came from as far away as California and Europe.¹⁴ Informal decisions taken at a leisurely pace in New Hampshire and subsequent meeting sites routinely shaped the Council’s organizing program for the year.

Transcripts of the meetings during 1926-1930 make for extraordinary reading.¹⁵ The 1926 meeting featured talks on “Anthropology as a Social Science” (by Bronislaw Malinowski); “Pioneer Belts” (i.e., European settlement in colonial countries); “Labor Policies and Industrial Output”; “The Measurement of Opinion”; “Problems Involved in Studying the Mechanization of Industry”; and “The Pluralistic Measurement of Human Behavior and Attitudes as a Basis of Political Science”. The following year brought presentations on “Research and the Law”; “Psychiatry and Its Relation to the Social Sciences”; “The Problem of Fuel Power”; “Problems,

¹⁴ Summer meetings made particular sense at a time when, as David Sills has noted, professors had “far fewer opportunities to leave their campuses than they have today.” After 1930 the Council held summer meetings in “such splendid resort communities as Nantucket Island; Franconia, New Hampshire; and Lake George, New York. The entire New York staff of the Council also attended, so in effect the Council itself moved out of town for this period. Eventually, Sky Top in the Poconos turned out to be judged the ideal spot and the annual meetings were held there for three decades.” Sills, “A Requiem for P&P,” p. 94.

¹⁵ The relevant documents may be found in Accession 2, Series 6, Subseries 9, Boxes 329-330.

Methods, and Some Results in Race Testing”; “Biological Methods in Human Problems”; and other interesting and often provocative subjects. A talk by Robert Yerkes, of Yale University, on “The Relation of Anthropoid Research to Social Science” sparked an exceptionally lively discussion of the study of great ape behavior and its utility for the social science disciplines. His was one of several presentations that offers insights into the unguarded sensibilities of an earlier age. “The anthropoid apes are available for scientific study in larger degree and in more varied ways than are human infants and children,” Yerkes explained. “They may be used more economically. It is not easy, of course, to get or keep the great apes, but it is less expensive from every point of view than it is to keep human subjects. . . . Studies of the functions of the nervous system, for example, which can be carried on only incidentally in the human subject can be carried on outright and under as well-controlled conditions with the anthropoid ape as with any other type of lower organism. We can in them, if you like, induce or produce mental defects, mental diseases, or any other condition which it is desired to study experimentally. In ourselves, of course, it would have to be done secretly.”¹⁶

The “Reflections” of historian Charles Beard, who spoke at the 1926 conference, provoked robust sparring over what Beard termed the study of “economic motives in politics.” “Some people think that the economic motive has been overworked in the study of history and sociology and current politics,” Beard argued, “but I am inclined to think that it not only is not overworked but has never been systematically and thoroughly and intelligently applied as it might be.” Beard’s main argument was received skeptically by other participants.¹⁷

A flavor of the Hanover meetings is conveyed in a series of letters written by a young anthropologist, Robert Redfield, to his wife, Margaret Park Redfield. The letters portray the 1930 conference as a networking bonanza for university intellectuals and foundation personnel interested in displaying the social sciences in the best possible light. “The place is overrun with pedants and potentates,” Redfield wrote. “The potentates are the executive secretaries of the big foundations -- collectively they represent huge -- staggering -- amounts of money that has been

¹⁶ Robert Yerkes, “Relation of Anthropoid Research to Social Science,” in Hanover Conference Minutes, August 15-30, 1927, pp. 10 & 15, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 329, Folder 1891.

¹⁷ See Hanover Conference Minutes, August 9-20, 1926, p. 492, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 329, Folder 1892.

set aside for research. The pedants have invited the potentates so that the potentates may see how pedants do their most effective thinking, and how they arrange to spend that money. But no one mentions money, one speaks of ‘research’, ‘set-up’, and ‘significant results’. Golly, it’s awful. There are about seventy here in all. The Social Science Research Council pays their fares, and boards them, and feeds them and washes their clothes, and gives them cards to go to the golf club, and then expects them to produce Significant Results.”¹⁸

Committees launched in the 1920s and 1930s largely reflected the domestic, policy, and empirical priorities of the generation that founded the SSRC. These included committees on Agriculture (1925-42); Crime (1925-32); Industrial Relations (1926-30); Business Research (1928-31); Pressure Groups and Propaganda (1931-34); Government Statistics and Information Services (1933-37); and Social Security (1935-43).¹⁹ Between 1940 and 1970, the Council continued to develop projects on public policy, methodology, and scholarly infrastructure, and it launched new initiatives on Political Behavior (1945-64); Economic Growth and Stability (1949-68); Mathematical Training of Social Scientists (1952-58); Comparative Politics (1954-72); Genetics and Behavior, followed by Biological Bases of Social Behavior (1961-66; 1966-79); Sociolinguistics (1963-79); Transnational Social Psychology (1964-74); and a host of other promising subjects.²⁰ The diversification of the Council’s activities in this period

¹⁸ Quoted in David L. Sills, “50th Anniversary of the 1930 Hanover Conference: The Letters of Robert Redfield to his Wife Keep the Past Alive,” *Items*, Vol. 34, no. 2 (June 1980), p. 36.

¹⁹ Files for the committee on Agriculture are located in Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Boxes 1 16-117 and Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 154 and 197. For Crime, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Boxes 135-137. For Industrial Relations, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 8, Box 59 and Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 166-168. For Business Research, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Box 123. For Pressure Groups and Propaganda, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Box 192. For Government Statistics and Information Services, see Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 42, Box 189. For Social Security, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Box 128, and Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 159 and 261-263. The avid researcher should bear in mind that relevant materials are often stored in other areas of the collection, such as governance committee minutes and so on.

²⁰ For the committee on Political Behavior, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 189-190 and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 76, Boxes 470-473. For Economic Growth and Stability, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 4, Boxes 52-53, and Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Boxes 143-145, and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 23, Boxes 150-153. For Mathematical Training of Social Scientists, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 180-181 and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 71, Boxes 377-378. For Comparative Politics, see Accession 2, Series 5, Subseries 74, Boxes 729-740. For Genetics and Behavior, and Biological Bases of Social Behavior, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Boxes 121-122, and Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Box 157. For Sociolinguistics, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 215-218 and 264-265 and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 96, Boxes 572-579. For Transnational Social Psychology, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 223 and 304-305 and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 74, Boxes 435-437.

coincided with a broader expansion of research infrastructure in higher education. As Thomas Bender has pointed out, it “is difficult to grasp the magnitude of the infusion of new funds into the university, especially the most select research universities, in the quarter-century following World War II.” Not only did the growth in resources and human capital provide the SSRC with new opportunities for enlarging the status and reach of the social sciences, but the eagerness of government agencies and foundations to invest in social research also reflected the fact that, as Bender notes, the “social sciences seemed to hold special promise for addressing the challenges of the postwar era.”²¹

In the early 1970s the general consensus over the purpose of, and audience for, the social sciences began to fray,²² but during this time the Council persevered in promoting research planning and training activities while instigating new forms of international collaboration. As before, the committees introduced in this period addressed a wide span of social science preoccupations, from Cognitive Research (1972-83); Social Indicators (1972-85); Law and Social Science (1974-84); Life-Course Perspectives on Human Development (1977-87); International Peace and Security Studies (1984-); Research on the Urban Underclass (1988-94); and International Migration (1994-).²³ Area-based programs, such as those on Africa (1960-96);

²¹ Thomas Bender, “Politics, Intellect and the American University, 1945-1995,” in Thomas Bender and Carl E. Schorske, eds., *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), pp. 23 and 31. From 1946 to 1958, “foundation support for academic social science amounted to more than \$85 million”; between “1959 and 1964, the big three foundations (Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie) bestowed nearly \$100 million on political science departments.” (pp. 23-24)

²² Despite enormous scholarly and popular interest in “the sixties,” the impact of the anti-Vietnam War and postwar civil rights movements on the social sciences in general and on the SSRC in particular remains to be examined. For a sample of the radical critiques of mainstream social science that surfaced in the 1970s, see Benjamin Smith, “Some Notes on the Social Science Research Council and the Governing Class Theory of American Politics,” American Political Science Association annual meeting, September 1970, in Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 39, Box 177, Folder 1991.

²³ For the Cognition Research committee see Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 14, Boxes 115-122. For Social Indicators, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 209 and 260; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 87, Boxes 519-565 and Accession 2, Series 5, Subseries 1, Boxes 716-728. For Law and Social Science, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries IS, Boxes 108-110 and Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Box 269. For Life-Course Perspectives on Human Development, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 16, Box 111; Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 229-232; and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 66, Boxes 333-358. The high-profile Committee on International Peace and Security is barely represented but see Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Boxes 323-324; Accession 2, Series 3, Subseries 4, Boxes 675-676; and Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 707. Files for the Urban Underclass program are housed at the University of Minnesota Social Welfare Archives. The Committee on International Migration was formed too recently to be included in the collection.

Latin America (1942-47; 1947-48; 1959-1996); South Asia (1949-53; 1970-96); and the Soviet Union (1971-77; 1983-96) rode at the crest of the area studies wave and acquired greater weight inside the organization as the 1970s wore on.²⁴ The collection also includes documents amassed on behalf of Faculty Research Fellowships (1950-64); Research Training (1939-42; 1955-59); Social Science Personnel (1933-81); Statistical Training (1967-71); and other fellowship programs.²⁵ In all, slightly over 250 committees were formed in the seventy-five year interval between 1923 and 1998. While some dealt with administrative issues (such as presidential transitions), most focused on thematic research, area research and/or training, sometimes in partnership with other institutions, such as the American Council of Learned Societies and the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. The collection includes files for a substantial majority of committees created between the early 1920s and the late 1980s.²⁶

The Changing Dimensions of the Council

The Council's postwar expansion was made possible by the participation of numerous researchers who collaborated on a voluntary basis to design and implement projects through steering committees, research networks, advisory and screening panels, and working groups. The growth of the organization also required successive infusions from foundations, and to a far lesser extent public sources, which in turn depended on a broader confidence in the maturing analytic capacity of the social sciences. Even in its early years the Council was able to attract considerable financial backing, although the general funding situation would never compare to the climate of support for the physical and natural sciences. According to Louis Wirth's 1937 report, the SSRC had \$20,500 in funds on hand in 1924, \$241,454 in 1927, and \$925,371 in

²⁴ Given that the area committees represent at least 30-40% of the collection, it seems redundant to try to list all the relevant files here.

²⁵ For Faculty Research Fellowships, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Box 152, and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 33, Box 167; for Research Training, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 197-198, and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 78, Boxes 473-492; for Social Science Personnel, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Box 21 1; Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 9, Boxes 338-341; and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 92, Boxes 567-569; for Statistical Training, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Box 221.

²⁶ While the collection largely consists of committee files, many records are listed under unrelated committee titles. In particular, Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, "Committee on South Asia," includes files on the Family (1928-32); National Security Policy (1956-64); States and Social Structures (1983-90); Work and Personality in the Middle Years (1972-79); and numerous other committees.

1935, at the depth of the Great Depression.²⁷ A substantial portion of the initial funding came from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, whose research director, Beardsley Ruml, assiduously mobilized foundation resources to bolster the status and cachet of the social sciences within both the research universities and the policy-making apparatus.

The funding situation improved most significantly from the 1940s onwards, partly as a consequence of the Ford Foundation's commitment to building international studies, which made possible the establishment of an active network of "world area" committees.²⁸ Although SSRC staff member Bryce Wood insisted that "the major foundations -- Rockefeller, Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Ford Foundation -- have since 1924 (Ford since 1948) provided from 75% to 100% of the funds available to SSRC," by the 1980s and 1990s the funding base had diversified considerably.²⁹ Sustaining a broad funding base has been a long-standing goal and is consistent with the policy that "funding is not accepted from any source that would compromise the independence of the Council's scholars or its international stature as an open forum of exchange."³⁰

Shifts in the scope and activities of the SSRC are reflected in the growth in the number of committees and the steady rise in the number of committees with an international focus (see Table 1). The number of fellowships offered by committees, for both domestic and international

²⁷ Wirth, "Report on the History, Activities and Policies of the Social Science Research Council," p. 55.

²⁸ A recent Ford Foundation report notes that "From 1951 to 1966 the Foundation was the major philanthropic force between the creation and institutionalization of [area studies]. . . . Under the auspices of the Foundation's International Training and Research Program (ITR), we awarded more than \$270 million in grant funds, which supported the training of over 1,500 graduate students and the building of 'centers of excellence' Alongside this work, since the inception of area studies in the United States, the Foundation has also supported the international scholarly research programs of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS)." Susan V. Beresford, "Preface," *Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1999), p. v.

²⁹ Bryce Wood, "The SSRC as a Political System," p. 1, Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 5, Folder 31. Someone should take the time to calculate the actual figure. Wood was no doubt aware that the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial was folded into the Rockefeller Foundation in 1927. Major funders in the late 1990s included the Ford Foundation, the German American Academic Council, the Japan Center for Global Partnership, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, and the United States Information Agency.

³⁰ *An Introduction to the Social Science Research Council* (New York: SSRC, 1999), p. 5.

research, also increased, from 19 in 1925, 79 in 1935, 164 in 1945, 299 in 1955, 291 in 1975, and 365 in 1995.³¹ A growing number of fellowships offered not only financial support but fellows’

Table 1. GROWTH OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

Number of:	1925	1935	1945	1955	1965	1975	1985	1995
Committees	6	21	32	31	32	32	32	32
Committees with an international focus	2	2	6	12	19	18	24	23
Research fellowships offered by committees	19	79	164	299	217	291	279	365
Institutions providing support	4	5	4	5	10	13	23	23

conferences and other activities. As an article in *Items* noted, “[during] the 1998 calendar year, some 14 different fellowship competitions awarded approximately 400 fellowships, with an associated 35 fellows’ events.”³² Each of these figures is significantly higher than they would have been in 1978, let alone 1948, when the Council offered fewer fellowships with fewer bells and whistles. At the same time, the funding environment also underwent important changes. The number of institutions providing support rose from 4 in 1925, to 5 in 1935, 10 in 1965, 13 in 1975, and 23 in both 1985 and 1995. Whereas in 1925 none of the Council’s funders were international donors, roughly one-quarter of the 1995 funders were based outside of the U.S. Meanwhile, the size of the professional staff grew from one in 1927 (sociologist Robert Lynd, the first staff member), to 6 in 1945 and 1955, 8 in 1965, 17 in 1975, and 20 in 1995. A sizable portion of staff hired after the 1970s assumed responsibility for training programs, which is reflected in the rise in total fellowship awards.

The publications that have resulted from committee projects are another indicator of the Council’s evolving role inside the social science community. The familiar titles of some of the better-known SSRC-sponsored volumes reflects the organization’s diverse contributions to twentieth-century social science and the broad sweep of its research interests. Council committees have been responsible for *The Negro Family in Chicago* (E. Franklin Frazier, 1932);

³¹ These figures were calculated on the basis of information provided in successive annual reports.

³² Sheri Ranis, Beverlee Bruce, Ellen Perecman, and Diane di Mauro, “Good Fellowship: Fellows’ Conferences at the Council,” *Items*, Vol. 53, no. I (March 1999), p. 16.

The Modern Corporation and Private Property (A.A. Berle, Jr. and Gardiner Means, 1932); *The Idea of National Interest* (Charles Beard, 1934); *Cooperation and Competition Among Primitive Peoples* (Margaret Mead, ed., 1937); *More Security for Old Age: A Report and Program* (Margaret Grant Schneider, 1937); *The American Soldier* (Samuel Stouffer et al., two volumes, 1949); *The Social Sciences in Historical Study* (Committee on Historiography, 1954); *The Voter Decides* (Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, Warren Miller, 1954); *Explorations in Social Psychiatry* (Alexander Leighton, John Clausen, Robert Wilson, eds., 1958); *The Politics of Developing Areas* (Gabriel Almond and James Coleman, 1960); *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes* (Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, eds., 1978); *Bringing the State Back In* (Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, eds., 1985); *Life Course Dynamics* (Glen Elder, Jr., ed., 1985); *Law and the Social Sciences* (Leon Lipson and Stanton Wheeler, eds., 1986); *The Political Power of Economic Ideas* (Peter A. Hall, ed., 1989); and *The "Underclass" Debate* (Michael Katz, ed., 1993). Between 1930 and 1954 the Council issued sixty-five book-length "research bulletins" which emphasized questions of research methodology. More recently, completed projects have mostly taken the form of university press volumes, although occasionally the Council issued reports and other scholarly materials under its own banner. SSRC committees sponsored a grand total of 1,173 books, reports and other publications in the period from 1929 to 1990, not including books or articles stemming from grants to individual scholars.³³

Even as the Council experienced institutional and programmatic growth, the environment within which the SSRC operated underwent significant changes. As an intermediary organization, the Council was expected to accumulate a thick layer of relationships with disciplinary associations, research centers, government agencies, foundations, international bodies, and other knowledge-based organizations.³⁴ Ties with the research-sponsoring

³³ See *Social Science Research Council Publications, 1929-1975* (New York: SSRC, 1975), and *Social Science Research Council Publications, 1975-1990* (New York: SSRC, 1990).

³⁴ The kinds of organizations with which the Council was expected to develop ties would undergo subtle change over the years. A 1929 document refers to the "Council's relationship to other organizations -- government bureaus, private bureaus, institutes, university and business organizations, agencies for social work, etc." See "Development of Present Council Policy," p. 1, Accession 2, Series 4, Sub-Series 1, Box 704, Folder 8465. In the intervening years collaborations with social work agencies have played a less obvious role while a greater emphasis has been placed on developing contacts with international bodies.

foundations were of particular importance, of course, and linkages with the humanities, via arrangements with the American Council of Learned Societies, proved especially durable.

It was generally assumed that the contribution of the SSRC in this broader environment lay in its principled commitment to empirical and comparative research in the context of the research planning process. The emphasis on research planning initially offered the Council a distinctive niche in the world of social knowledge construction, allowing the organization to complement, rather than compete with, work undertaken in the research universities and academic disciplines. Pendleton Herring, a Harvard political scientist who served as Council president during 1948-68, described the SSRC as “partner and adjunct to the universities and other research institutions in facilitating communication among specialists and helping to implement research and training ventures that cannot be encompassed within a given institution because of their exploratory or experimental character.”³⁵

The issue of the Council’s position within a larger research environment acquired a new level of saliency in the postwar era as a growing number of think tanks, research centers, and even federal agencies intersected with the Council’s areas of interest and moved onto the turf of research planning in the social sciences. For this reason Nobel Prize winner Herbert A. Simon questioned whether there was still a compelling *raison d’etre* for the Council when he retired from the Board of Directors in 1971. It is likely that the Council’s identity as a forum of scholarly communication and exchange was to some extent eroded as well as complicated by changes in the U.S. research environment.³⁶

Measures taken to internationalize the work of the Council — to recruit non-U.S. scholars onto SSRC committees, promote research on areas outside the United States, situate the organization into international networks, and recognize the growing diversity and vitality of social research in various areas and regions of the world --- represented a *de facto* strategic response to this changing institutional environment. If Council staff and committees could no longer assume that only the SSRC could undertake the leadership role that many identified with

³⁵ E. Pendleton Herring, “Introduction by the President,” *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1965-66* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1966), p. 9.

³⁶ On Simon’s concerns, see the Committee on Program and Policy Minutes, March 21-22, 1975, Accession 1, Series 6, Subseries 9, Box 364, File 2145.

the research planning process, they could take steps to nurture ties with the outside world that flowed from the Council's reputation and status as a leading organization of the social sciences. While the dynamic of internationalization no doubt reflected an increasing density of interactions among U.S. scholars and international scholars in the postwar and post-Cold War periods, in the context of the development of the SSRC it also was informed by the movement toward "foreign area studies" and by the Council's specific role in bringing together social scientists and humanists onto region and country-specific committees. For the postwar SSRC, area studies was a synonym for internationalization, and it would take some time before international engagement would be defined more broadly than research by Americans on areas outside the United States.

Thematic Research

The relationship of the social sciences to government institutions and the policy-making process is an important theme represented in the SSRC collection. The organization's founders assumed that as the social sciences adopted a more thoroughly disinterested and scientific character they would be have more influence upon the formulation and evaluation of public policy. Rather than locking the social sciences in an ivory tower, the organization would operate on the principle that the move toward a greater level of methodological awareness and sophistication would simultaneously benefit society as a whole. Indeed, from the standpoint of Charles Merriam and his collaborators, the plethora of real world problems represented an opportunity for the social sciences. The path toward enhanced scientific rigor would point social scientists toward, rather than away from, actual social conditions, as they evaluated their approaches and data sets in relation to major societal issues. "What the SSRC sought to do," explained David Featherman, who served as Council president from 1989-95, "was to use contemporary social problems as a research laboratory. The laboratory would provide the testing ground for theories and hypotheses and in the course of doing so, generate new knowledge about fundamental features of human behavior and social institutions. The generated scientific knowledge would provide the basis in facts and in legitimacy for informed policy-making."³⁷

³⁷ David Featherman, "SSRC, Then and Now: A Commentary on Recent Historical Analysis," *Items*, Vol. 48, no. 1 (March 1994), p. 15.

In seeking to apply scientific knowledge to pressing social needs, the Council's founders assumed that state institutions, and most importantly the U.S. federal government, represented the most suitable conduit for social and institutional change. Rather than pitching their tent on the terrain of individual values, local communities, or civil society, Merriam and the others believed that government action was central to the task of reforming society. In part, this reflected the impact of Progressive Era notions of good government open access to information, and the importance of objective social analysis on the generation that established the SSRC.³⁸ It also, perhaps, sprang from the recognition that informed participation in the larger community could solidify the legitimacy of the social sciences, which were still in the process of entrenching their position within the research universities.

For these reasons, contacts among government officials, politicians, corporate officers, and SSRC leaders began to develop and deepen by the mid-to-late-1920s. Both President Herbert Hoover and his successor, Franklin Roosevelt, were more than intrigued by the prospect that social knowledge could be applied to social concerns. On the eve of the 1929 stock market crash Hoover convened a President's Research Committee on Social Trends that produced a two-volume book, *Recent Social Trends in the United States*, which was published to wide acclaim by a commercial publisher in 1933. Mitchell and Merriam served as chair and vice-chair, respectively, of the Research Committee, and their colleague William Ogburn was appointed director of research. Reportedly the page proof of this two-volume study was "the major serious reading" that Roosevelt took with him on his cruise on Vincent Astor's yacht in the month prior to his inauguration. Roosevelt later called on Council leaders to make "suggestions for immediate research relating to urgent problems confronting the Federal Administration in the current national emergency." This paved the way for a highly productive set of collaborations between the administration, sections of the business community, and Council networks, which in particular accompanied the creation and implementation of Social Security.³⁹

³⁸ On the relationship of Progressivism and allied currents on the Council see, inter alia, Barry Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics*, chapter eleven; and Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science*, chapter ten.

³⁹ See David L. Sills, "Council Marks the 50th Anniversary of its Committee on Social Security," *Items*, Vol, 39, no. 3 (September 1985), pp. 39-40.

While the Council's involvement in the development of a national system of old-age insurance may have represented a high-water mark of its influence on federal-level decision making, it was only one of many instances where SSRC committees incorporated an explicit commitment to the policy-making process into their research agendas. The collection houses a vast compendium of documents testifying to the close involvement of the Council in various spheres of governmental action, from committees on Census Bureau issues and government record-keeping to public libraries and national security.⁴⁰ The collection also highlights periodic efforts to lobby government agencies on behalf of international exchanges, a national foundation for the sciences, the preservation of federal funding for social science research, and other matters of compelling concern to the SSRC.⁴¹

For the most part, the Council's relationship to the government centered around three arenas. The first two -- social welfare provision, broadly defined, and the creation and elaboration of a system of national statistics -- were integral to the initial conception of the SSRC, and both represent contexts where social scientists achieved a measurable impact on public policy, at least on the margins. The third arena -- area and international studies -- emerged as a significant concern during and after World War II, when scholars and government officials began to focus their attention on the state of knowledge about the world outside the United States.

The first SSRC committee with an exclusively international focus, albeit informed by domestic considerations, was the committee on Latin American Studies (1942-47). It was intended to "make substantial contributions to the furtherance of research on Latin American problems." For the duration of the war, the "committee's main emphasis was upon assisting the

⁴⁰ On the Census, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 19, Box 124; Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 191-192 and 197; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 16, Box 129; and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 74, Box 420. For government records see Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 41, Box 189. For public libraries see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Box 195; and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 74, Boxes 422-423. For national security policy see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 182-183; and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 74, Boxes 414-415.

⁴¹ On international exchanges, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 169-170; and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 56, Boxes 198-200. On the development of a national foundation for the sciences see Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 37, Box 168. On Council interventions in debates over funding for the social sciences in the early years of the 1980s see Accession 2, Series 3, Subseries 4, Boxes 673-676; and the relevant issues of *Items*.

government as much as possible in carrying on essential activities in the Latin American field.”⁴² This committee, and others formed after the war, responded to shared concerns about the need for greater attention to developing expertise on “foreign areas.” A key moment arrived with the 1947 publication of Robert Hall’s *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences*. Sponsored by the committee on World Area Research, Hall’s short book identified a serious deficit of specialized knowledge about most world areas and the need for a decisive educational initiative that could help provide intensive training in unfamiliar languages, histories, and cultures.⁴³

From their inception, the ACLS-SSRC jointly sponsored area committees were part of a larger endeavor, that of area studies. Area studies has been described as “an arena of both scholarship and pedagogy, one which brought together all those persons -- primarily from the various social sciences, but often from the humanities as well, and occasionally even from some natural sciences - on the basis of a shared interest in doing work in their discipline about the given ‘area’ (or a part of it).”⁴⁴ “At their best,” wrote Kenneth Prewitt in 1982, “area studies investigate an interdependent whole rather than unconnected fragments arbitrarily labeled politics or history or language or economics. This is the celebrated whole-culture approach, difficult to achieve but powerful in its explanatory potential.”⁴⁵

The area committees became central players in the maturation of area studies, allowing small teams of scholars to shape research agendas, allocate fellowships and travel funds, and establish journals and other avenues for advancing knowledge on different countries and regions of the world. As Robert Hall had anticipated, area studies and, more specifically, the area committees offered an unusually ambitious and productive model for collaboration across the divide between the social sciences and the humanities. As a small indication of the scale of area-related activities, a document prepared for the Board of Directors listed an impressive 194

⁴² *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1945-46* (New York: SSRC, 1946), p. 37.

⁴³ Robert B. Hall, *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences* (New York: SSRC, 1947).

⁴⁴ Immanuel Wallerstein et al., *Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1996), p. 37.

⁴⁵ Kenneth Prewitt, “Annual Report of the President,” *Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1981-82* (New York: SSRC, 1982). Prewitt served as SSRC president during 1979-85 and 1995-98.

area committee meetings, conferences, seminars, and workshops held between August 1980 and January 1983, on topics as varied as film in Eastern Europe, capitalism in Ivory Coast and Kenya, religion in Latin America, and legal reform in Indonesia and Malaysia.⁴⁶ As the SSRC's portfolio evolved, the area committees became an increasingly visible part of the mix. For some, the identity of the postwar and particularly the post-1973 Council would overlap extensively with the area studies enterprises. Given the Council's identification with area studies, the decision in 1996 to close down the joint area committee structure in favor of a reorganized program with stronger thematic, cross-regional, and cross-cultural elements came for some as a bolt from the blue.⁴⁷

Generally speaking, the area committees of the 1940s probably enjoyed a more intimate relationship to considerations of national interest than the committees of the 1970s, when the struggle for objectivity necessitated a stronger sense of detachment from centers of political and military power. At the same time, committees that traversed the so-called East-West divide (mostly notably committees on China, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe) faced special challenges in promoting research on countries that were often closed to academics from the United States. The issue of scholarly communication with China emerged as an especially sensitive one in the early 1970s, in the aftermath of the anti-intellectualism of the Cultural Revolution. On a number of occasions during the 1970s and 1980s delegates from the SSRC and the American Council of Learned Societies met to negotiate closer bilateral scholarly relations with senior dignitaries from the People's Republic. While Council leaders were involved from

⁴⁶ "Meetings of the Joint Committees, 1980-83" (unsigned document), Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 322, Folder 1826.

⁴⁷ Contributions to the debate over the area studies approach may be found in back issues of *Items*; see also Gabriel Almond, "The Future of Comparative and Area Studies in the United States" (paper delivered at the 1997 International Political Science Association annual meeting); Bruce Cummings, "Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies During and After the Cold War," in Christopher Simpson, ed., *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences During the Cold War* (New York: New Press, 1998); Peter A. Hall and Sidney Tarrow, "Globalization and Area Studies: When Is Too Wide Too Narrow?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 23, 1998; Jacob Heilbrunn, "The News from Everywhere: Does Global Thinking Threaten Local Knowledge? The Social Science Research Council Debates the Future of Area Studies," *Lingua Franca*, May/June 1996; and Christopher Shea, "Political Scientists Clash Over the Value of Area Studies," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 10, 1997.

time to time with negotiations with Soviet counterparts, the collection's files on relations with China are voluminous.⁴⁸

Another context for thematic research drawing on the SSRC collection are the work of committees in one way or another associated with the creation of new fields at the crossroads of two or more disciplines. Sociolinguistics, for example, along with law and society, are two fields that are often cited in this regard.⁴⁹ Another is social indicators, which attracted wide interest in the 1960s and 1970s as a means of using the national statistical system to capture and represent social considerations in leading statistical indicators. The SSRC was involved in the social indicators movement to an extent that was atypical, although the same could also be said of its role in area studies. Sociologist Eleanor Sheldon, the Council's president from 1972 to 1978, was a leading voice in the field of social indicators, and, uniquely, the relevant committee could boast of having its own office in Washington, D.C. for a period of nearly a decade.⁵⁰ The emergence of the field of human development was also facilitated in part through SSRC committee activities. Systematic inquiry into the life course brought psychology and sociology into unusually close contact, but drew on contributions from other disciplines as well. Human development shows up across the collection, in committee files on childhood, family, adolescence, mid-life, and old age.⁵¹

One potentially productive way of interpreting and locating the Council is in the context of the growth and consolidation of a research infrastructure that has come to assume gargantuan proportions. The trend toward greater emphasis on research in higher education, and greater faculty autonomy within the research university, was given a major boost by the formation of

⁴⁸ For scholarly relations with China, see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 202-203; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 14, Boxes 91-112; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 24, Box 153; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 28, Boxes 165-166; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 74, Boxes 397-398; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 79, Box 426; and Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 79, Boxes 492-494. On scholarly relations with the Soviet Academy of Science, see Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 30, Box 166.

⁴⁹ For Sociolinguistics see footnote 21. For law and the social sciences see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 15, Boxes 108-110, and Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 320.

⁵⁰ For social indicators see footnote 24.

⁵¹ For human development see Accession 1, Series 1, Subseries 30, Boxes 203-207; Accession 1, Series 2, Subseries 30, Box 187; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 3; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 74, Boxes 416-419; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 82, Boxes 499-514; Accession 2, Series 1, Subseries 106, Boxes 647-661.

SSRC and other organizations in the early 20th century, such as think tanks and research centers. To a great extent the history of the Council has been tied to the fate of research within academic departments, disciplinary associations, foundations, government agencies, and institutions of university governance. The emergence of a powerful research infrastructure also spotlights familiar questions of state-academic relations and the status of the social sciences in relation to other modes and systems of inquiry.

Over the years thousands of scholars have participated in one Council-sponsored activity or another. Most had already achieved a discernable level of recognition within their disciplines or within the social sciences as a whole. A handful would go on to become household names. While committee files are unlikely to contain any scandalous information about, say, a famous former national security advisor or the president of a major Latin American country, they could be of considerable interest to biographers and others interested in questions of intellectual history and the ways in which Council-sponsored committees and networks have shaped intellectual agendas as well as individual career paths.

In addition to the material in the Social Science Research Council collection, students of the history of the social sciences also should be aware that other collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center contain rich material about the SSRC in particular and the development of the social sciences in general. These collections include the records of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Russell Sage Foundation. Each of these collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center includes materials pertaining to the history of the Social Science Research Council and its role in the development of the broader social sciences.⁵²

In more than seventy years of stitching together committees, awarding fellowships, laying out research agendas, and speaking on behalf of the social sciences, the SSRC has offered a critical interface between social science scholarship and broader social, intellectual, and

⁵² For example, see the SSRC-related files in the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial collection, Series III, Appropriations, Subseries 6, Boxes 52-53 and 64-68; the Rockefeller Foundation archives, Record Group 1.1, Series 200, Boxes 59 and Series 200S, Boxes 394-408, and Record Group 1.2, Series 200, Box 85 and Series 200S, Boxes 553-555; and the Russell Sage Foundation archives, Series 5, Boxes 52-54.

institutional forces. The SSRC's ample paper trail at the Rockefeller Archive Center should accommodate ambitious research agendas for many years to come.⁵³

⁵³ However, research is unlikely to confirm a prediction made in 1927 that "the invention and founding of the Social Science Research Council will some day go down into history as one of the significant contributions to human progress, on a par with the discovery of the atomic or the germ theories [sic]." This unlikely forecast is taken from a presentation to members of Alpha Phi Zeta, a social science fraternity at the University of Missouri. See A.F. Kuhlman, "The Social Science Research Council," p. 16, in Accession 2, Series 4, Subseries 1, Box 704, Folder 8473.

PART 2

ARRANGEMENT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL ARCHIVES

The Social Science Research Council Archives were donated to the Rockefeller Archive Center in 1990. The collection is arranged into two record groups distinguished by the date of their arrival at the Archive Center. Accession 1 (Record Group 1) consists of the documents received by the Archive Center in 1990; Accession 2 (Record Group 2) contains the second and larger bulk of material that was transferred to the Archive Center in 1994. These record groups and their component series are described below.

ACCESSION 1

Accession 1 (Record Group 1) is arranged in nine series comprising 146.8 cu. ft.

Series 1. Committee Projects, 1924-1990, 122.4 cu. ft. This series is divided into thirty-five subseries and consists of files concerning the Committee's research planning activities in regional studies and social sciences. Each subseries represents a different committee and contains conference papers and annual minutes of that committee. See Part 3 for a list of Committee subseries.

Series 2. Committee on Problems and Policy, 1925-1985, 7.2 cu. ft. The Committee on Problems and Policy, formed in 1925, is the Council's central planning body. The committee is a group of elected scholars who review the programs of the working committees that carry out SSRC programs. Members of the Committee on Problems and Policy are drawn primarily from college and university faculties. This series consists of the minutes of the committee.

Series 3. Executive Committee Minutes, 1924-1984, 1.2 cu. ft. This series includes the original by-laws and articles of incorporation from 1924 and the minutes of this committee, which is responsible for the financial and operational aspects of the Council.

Series 4. Financial Reports (Investment Committee), 1937-1972, 0.8 cu. ft. This series contains the files of the Council's financial reports and expenditures from conferences and fellowships.

Series 5. Hanover Conference, 1926-1930, 0.8 cu. ft. The Hanover Conference, held in Hanover, New Hampshire, from 1926-1930, was the first national conference on the social sciences. This series contains the proceedings from these meetings, at which the concept of social security was discussed.

Series 6. Housekeeping Reports (Fellowship Files), 1960-1980, 2.0 cu. ft. The Housekeeping reports are fellowship diaries that were written by SSRC fellows during their research overseas from 1960 to 1980. Many of these reports contain information on research facilities, food, clothing needed, housing, and language requirements. This series is closed for research until January 1, 2025.

Series 7. Personnel Committee (Fellowships), 1927-1981, 2.0 cu. ft. This series includes the minutes of the Personnel Committee, which reviews applications for research training fellowships and was originally called the Committee on Fellowships.

Series 8. Projects Not from Committees, 1923-1982, 2.4 cu. ft. These records consist of excerpts from minutes relating to proposed projects that were not formally undertaken. They are arranged in alphabetical order and deal with topics such as child welfare, labor migration, and the family.

Series 9. (SSRC) Council Minutes, 1923-1984, 6.8 cu. ft. This series contains the minutes of the Council's Board of Directors, which elects the Council's presidents and reviews and approves its programs and budgets.

ACCESSION 2

Accession 2 (Record Group 2) is arranged into five series and consists of 296 cu. ft. of material, the bulk of which are fellowship files and correspondence relating to the committees.

Series 1. Committee Projects, 1924-1990, 264.4 cu. ft. This series is divided into 106 subseries, each representing a different SSRC committee, and includes files concerning the Committee's research planning activities in regional studies and social sciences. This series consists mostly of conference papers and the correspondence of each committee. See Part 3 for a list of Committee subseries.

Series 2. Committee on Problems and Policy, 1971-1981, 1.2 cu. ft. The Committee on Problems and Policy, formed in 1925, is the Council's central planning body. This series contains the minutes from 1977 to 1980 and general correspondence and miscellaneous files from 1971 to 1981.

Series 3. Committee on Personnel, 1958-1986, 14 cu. ft. This series contains correspondence, drafts, manuscripts, and chronological files from the records of past SSRC committee members Nikiforos Diamondoros, William H. Kruskal, Kenneth Prewitt, Richard Rockwell, Eleanor Sheldon, and David Sills.

Series 4. (SSRC) Council, General Files, 1923-1985, 6 cu. ft. This series contains the bulk of the Council's general files (1923-1985); *Items* (1950-1985); miscellaneous publications (1929-1982); subcommittee members' correspondence (1967-1982); and meeting correspondence (1958-1980).

Series 5. Washington, D.C. Office, 1973-1983, 5.2 cu. ft. This series consists of material on the Committee on Social Indicators, a committee established in 1972 to promote social reporting, the development of data bases, and the fostering of communication. This office was closed in 1983.

PART 3

COMMITTEE PROJECTS DOCUMENTED IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL ARCHIVES

Much of the work of the SSRC was conducted by committees, a fact which is reflected in the organization of the SSRC's records. The following list presents the names of the committees that appear as subseries within the SSRC Collection. Accession 1, Series 1 Committee Projects, 1924-1990, includes 35 subseries that represent committees; Accession 2, Series 1 Committee Projects, 1924-1990, consists of 106 subseries, each representing a committee.

For additional information about a specific committee, readers should contact the Rockefeller Archive Center.

Accession 1.

Series 1. Committee Projects, 1924-1990. 122.4 cu. ft.

Subseries 1 Africa

Subseries 2 China

Subseries 2.1 Contemporary China

Subseries 3 Cognitive Research

Subseries 4 Compensatory Education

Subseries 5 Economic Stability

Subseries 6 Employment and Training Screening Committee

Subseries 7 Government Statistics and Information Services

Subseries 8 Industrial Relations

Subseries 9 Industry and Trade

Subseries 10 International Relations

Subseries 11 Japan

Subseries 12 Korea

Subseries 13 Labor Market Research

Subseries 14 Latin America

Subseries 15 Law and Social Sciences

Subseries 16 Life Course Perspective on Middle and Old Age
Subseries 17 Mass Communications and Political Behavior
Subseries 18 Methodology of Longitudinal Research
Subseries 19 Miscellaneous Projects
Subseries 20 Near and Middle East
Subseries 21 Pacific Coast Region
Subseries 22 Personality and Culture
Subseries 23 Public Administration
Subseries 24 Slavic Studies
Subseries 25 Social Aspects of Atomic Energy
Subseries 26 Social Behavior
Subseries 27 Social Indicators
Subseries 28 Social Security
Subseries 29 Sociolinguistics
Subseries 30 South Asia
Subseries 31 Southeast Asia
Subseries 32 Southern Regional
Subseries 33 Television and Social Behavior
Subseries 34 Transnational Social Psychology
Subseries 35 Urbanization

Accession 2

Series 1. Committee Projects, 1924-1990. 264.4 cu. ft.

Subseries 1 Ad Hoc Committee and Associates
Subseries 2 Affective Development
Subseries 3 African Studies
Subseries 4 Annual Reports
Subseries 5 Biological Bases of Social Behavior
Subseries 6 Biosocial Perspective on Parent Behavior
Subseries 7 Biosocial Science

Subseries 8 Business Enterprise Research
Subseries 9 Census Monographs
Subseries 10 Center for the Advanced Study
Subseries 11 China
Subseries 12 Contemporary China
Subseries 13 Civil Military Relations Research
Subseries 14 Cognitive Research
Subseries 15 Comparative Study of Public Policy
Subseries 16 Completed Projects
Subseries 18 Department of Labor Employment and Training
Subseries 19 Dissertation Fellowships in Employment and Training
Subseries 20 Eastern Europe
Subseries 21 Economic Growth
Subseries 22 Economic History
Subseries 23 Economic Stability and Growth
Subseries 24 Economy of China
Subseries 25 Employment Relationships and the Family
Subseries 26 Ethics
Subseries 27 Evaluation Research
Subseries 28 Exchanges with Asian Institutes
Subseries 29 Exchanges with Asian Institutes and Appointees
Subseries 30 Exchanges with Soviet Academy of Science
Subseries 31 Experimentation as a Method for Planning and Evaluating
Subseries 33 Faculty Research
Subseries 34 Faculty Grants
Subseries 35 Family and Economic Behavior
Subseries 36 Family Research
Subseries 37 Federal Government and Research
Subseries 38 Foreign Area Fellowship Program
Subseries 39 General Correspondence

Subseries 40 Genetics and Behavior
Subseries 41 Government Records and Research
Subseries 42 Government Statistics and Information
Subseries 43 Governmental and Legal Processes
Subseries 44 Grants in Aid
Subseries 45 Grants for Research in Government Affairs
Subseries 46 Guide for Study of Local History
Subseries 47 Historical Analysis
Subseries 48 Historiography
Subseries 49 History of Science
Subseries 50 Human Resources and Advanced Training
Subseries 51 Identification of Talent
Subseries 52 Intellectual Processes
Subseries 53 International Conference Travel Grants
Subseries 54 International Congress in the U.S.
Subseries 55 International Cooperation Among Social Scientists
Subseries 56 International Exchange of Scholars
Subseries 57 International Organization
Subseries 58 International Relations
Subseries 59 International Research and Exchange Board
Subseries 60 Italy, Social Sciences
Subseries 61 Japanese Studies
Subseries 62 Korean Studies
Subseries 63 Labor and Market Research
Subseries 64 Latin America
Subseries 66 Life Course Perspective
Subseries 67 Linguistics and Psychology
Subseries 68 Longitudinal Research
Subseries 69 Manpower, Population and Economic Change
Subseries 70 Mass Communication and Political Behavior

Subseries 71 Mathematical Training
Subseries 72 Methodology of Longitudinal Research
Subseries 73 Miscellaneous Awards
Subseries 74 Miscellaneous Files
Subseries 75 Near and Middle East
Subseries 76 Political Behavior
Subseries 77 Research
Subseries 78 Research Training Fellowships
Subseries 79 Scholarly Communication with China
Subseries 80 Simulation of Cognitive Processes
Subseries 81 Slavic and East European Studies
Subseries 82 Social Adjustment
Subseries 83 Social and Affective Development
Subseries 84 Social Aspects of Atomic Energy
Subseries 85 Social Aspects of Medicine
Subseries 86 Social Behavior
Subseries 87 Social Indicators
Subseries 88 Social Organization of Science
Subseries 89 Social Relations
Subseries 90 Social Science Abstracts
Subseries 91 Social Science Periodicals
Subseries 92 Social Science Personnel
Subseries 92A Social Stratification
Subseries 93 Socialization and Social Structure
Subseries 94 Sociocultural Contexts of Delinquency
Subseries 95 Sociolinguistics
Subseries 96 South Asia
Subseries 97 Southeast Asia
Subseries 98 Southern Asia
Subseries 99 Soviet Union Studies

Subseries 100 Television and Social Behavior

Subseries 101 Transnational Social Psychology

Subseries 102 Urbanization

Subseries 103 War Studies

Subseries 104 Western Committee on Regional Economic Analysis

Subseries 105 Western Europe

Subseries 106 Work and Personality in the Middle Years