

National Council of the Churches of Christ.

In recent years, an increasing number of scholars have used the Center's data archive in connection with cross-national comparative studies. The following projects are illustrative. All made use of non-American material, and a number involved cross-national comparisons:

(1) *Problems of Political Consensus—Canada, the United States, Great Britain, and Australia*, Professor Robert Alford, University of California;

(2) *Differential Responses of Racial, Ethnic, and Religious Groups to Various Political and Economic Problems*, Professor Leonard Broom, University of California at Los Angeles;

(3) *Social Determinants of Party Affiliation in Different Democratic Countries and Analysis of Attitudinal Structure of these Countries as Related to Stability and Instability of Democracy*, Professor Seymour M. Lipset, University of California;

(4) *Public Attitudes toward Housing and other Community Problems*, Dr. John Mogy, University of Oxford;

(5) *Canadian Opinion Relative to U. S. Foreign Policy and Canadian Opinion Relative to British Foreign Policy*, Professor Albert Ossman, Jr., Chatham College.

The bibliography of publications based wholly or in part on data made available through the Roper Centre has been rapidly increasing during the last few years. The following is a partial illustrative listing:

(1) Appleton, Sheldon, *The Eternal Triangle? Communist China, the United States, and the United Nations*, Rochester, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1961.

(2) The Brookings Institution, *Leadership, Management and the Public Service*, Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1959.

(3) Burns, James M., *John Kennedy: A Political Profile*, New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1960.

(4) Chase, Stuart, *American Credos*, New York: Harper, 1962.

(5) Hero, Alfred O., *Americans in World Affairs*, Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1959.

(6) Huntington, Samuel P., *The Common Defense: Strategic Programs in National Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

(7) Newman, Robert P., *Recognition of Communist China*, New York: Macmillan, 1961.

(8) Rockefeller, Laurence S., *Outdoor Recreation for America: A Report to the President and to the Congress by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission*, January 1962.

(9) Stember, Charles A., *Education and Attitude Change*, New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1961.

The Inter-University Consortium for Political Research

by Warren E. Miller

Dr. Miller, executive director of the Consortium, provides a brief report on its promising first year of work and the services it provides member universities.

The Inter-university Consortium for Political Research was formally organized in the summer of 1962, in a joint effort by twenty-one universities and the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan to further the development of research in political science. The first meeting of the Committee of Official Representatives affirmed the interest of the participating schools in four general objectives: (1) the development of data resources; (2) the establishment of a formal training program for graduate students and faculty; (3) the stimulation and facilitation of new research; and (4) the operation of a clearing house for the improved communication of information about ongoing research.

In accord with the Memorandum of Organization under which the Consortium is organized, a Council of five Representatives was chosen to work with the Survey Research Center staff in implementing the organization's goals. Professor James W. Prothro of the University of North Carolina was elected as the first Chairman of the Committee of Representatives and its Council. His colleagues elected to the Council were Professor David Easton, University of Chicago; Professor Robert E. Lane, Yale University; Professor Austin Ranney, University of Wisconsin; and Professor William H. Riker, University of Rochester. The Council met regularly throughout the fall and early winter to establish the basic policies of the organization and to develop the sequence of activities that would comprise its program. The extended deliberations of the Council and the staff resulted in detailed plans for three lines of activity embracing the data repository, research conferences, and the training of faculty and students. These plans were reported to the membership in memoranda distributed in December 1962.

Services and Seminars

The first major action of the Council and the Survey Research Center in behalf of the Consortium consisted of the preparation of two proposals seeking foundation support for some of the Consortium ac-

tivities outlined in these plans. The proposals sought financing for a program of research conferences and for the expansion of ongoing data repository activities. The National Science Foundation approved a grant for \$95,000, to extend over eighteen months, for the research project pertaining to the data repository.

In the fall of 1962, the staff carried out a decision of the Committee of Representatives and utilized the resources of the Survey Research Center to undertake a major collection of data relevant to the 1962 Congressional elections. On the recommendation of the Committee, the collection was financed with \$10,000 from the grant given to the Survey Research Center for the purpose of establishing the Consortium. The data, along with all necessary supporting documents, were processed and distributed to the member schools by February 1963.

The first Consortium Summer Program was held between June 24 and August 16, 1963. Over sixty graduate students and faculty members from twenty-seven institutions participated in one or another part of the program. Two special seminars were presented. The first was a series of lectures on Comparative Political Research by Professors Karl Deutsch of Yale and Herbert Hyman of Columbia. The second seminar was organized by Professors Joseph Tanenhaus of New York University and Walter Murphy of Princeton. Some twenty-five participants engaged in discussions of working papers prepared by the seminar leaders on the topic, Research in Public Law and Judicial Behavior. Dr. Gerald Gurin, Program Director, Survey Research Center, taught a course in research design offered during the first four weeks. Professor Philip Converse offered a course in quantitative methods in the analysis of political data during the second four weeks.

During the past year the staff made available to Consortium participants analysis books and code books covering ten Survey Research Center studies. The staff also processed and made available the data

from the Almond-Verba Five-Nation Study. Work is proceeding on the preparation of additional studies, including Dahl's New Haven Community Study; Stouffer's study of Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties; and the State Legislative Study conducted by Wahlke, Eulau, Buchanan, and Ferguson. The staff also is assembling 1950 and 1960 Census data for ready access. In cooperation with Professor Duncan MacRae of the University of Chicago, the complete roll-call record for the United States Senate and House of Representatives from 1946 through 1962 is being organized and stored for Consortium use. The staff is also proceeding to process national election data, beginning with the data contained in the four *America Votes* volumes prepared by the Governmental Affairs Institute under the direction of Dr. Richard Scammon.

Additional activities by the staff include substantial work in the area of data retrieval, preparation for research conferences to be held during the coming year, and provision of consultation, data, and data analysis assistance requested by Consortium participants. A substantial volume of work during the past year consisted of preparing analysis cards for use in graduate seminars taught by Consortium participants.

Membership

At the June meeting of the Official Representatives the new Council for the current year was elected. Its members include Professor Austin Ranney, University of Wisconsin, Chairman; Professor Robert E. Agger, University of Oregon; Professor Robert E. Lane, Yale University; Professor Robert H. Salisbury, Washington University; and Professor John C. Wahlke, State University of New York at Buffalo.

As of the end of September 1963, Consortium membership included these thirty universities: University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; The University of Chicago; Cornell University; University of Florida; The Florida State University; Georgetown University; The University of Georgia; University of Illinois; Indiana University; State University of Iowa; The University of Kansas; The University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota; State University of New York at Buffalo; The University of North Carolina; Northwestern University; University of Oregon; University of Pittsburgh; Princeton University; the University of Rochester; Southern Illinois University; Stanford University; Vanderbilt University; University of Washington; Washington University; Wayne State University; The University of Wisconsin; Yale University.

Letters to the Editor

B. F. Skinner on Theory

Dear Sir:

The Introduction to "A Current Appraisal of the Behavioral Sciences" which appears as a supplement to the September 1963 issue of *The American Behavioral Scientist* contains the following sentences:

"At one extreme are those who deny that they use theory, such as B. F. Skinner. Yet his writings exhibit frequent use of hypotheses, sometimes in the same context as his denial of theory." May I ask you to clarify my position by publishing the following quotation?

From "Are Theories of Learning Necessary?" published in *Psychological Review*, 1950, 57, 193-216, the introductory paragraph:

"Certain basic assumptions, essential to any scientific activity, are sometimes called theories. That nature is orderly rather than capricious is an example. Certain statements are also theories simply to the extent that they are not yet facts. A scientist may guess at the result of an experiment before the experiment is carried out. The prediction and the later statement of result may be composed of the same terms in the same syntactic arrangement, the difference being in the degree of confidence. No empirical statement is wholly non-theoretical in this sense, because evidence is never complete, nor is any prediction probably ever made wholly without evidence. The term "theory" will not refer here to statements of these sorts but rather to any explanation of an observed fact which appeals to events taking place somewhere else, at some other level of observation, described in different terms, and measured, if at all, in different dimensions."

From "Current Trends in Experimental Psychology" in *Current Trends in Psychology*, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1947:

"Whether particular experimental psychologists like it or not, experimental psychology is properly and inevitably committed to the construction of a theory of behavior. A theory is essential to the scientific understanding of behavior as a subject matter." (Pages 28-29). "The important trend in experimental psychology then is towards a satisfactory theory of behavior." (Page 46).

Sincerely yours,

B. F. Skinner

Psychological Laboratories
Harvard University

A Reply to B. F. Skinner

Dear Sir:

Inasmuch as we consider Professor Skinner an outstanding contributor to behavioral science, we are happy to have his clarification. As the quotations in his letter indicate, "theory" is used in many ways in scientific discourse. Our statement in the Supplement unfortunately could be interpreted as saying that Skinner is opposed to theory in all senses that term might have, which clearly would be mistaken. What we had in mind were the many statements of Skinner's in which his opposition to various theories or hypotheses seems quite general and far-reaching.

For example, in the excellent and important article, "A Case History of Scientific Method," he says, "I never attacked a problem by constructing a Hypothesis." (*The American Psychologist*, Vol. II, 1956, p. 227.) That article, as well as his present letter, illustrates Skinner's interest in discovering order, and it seems reasonable to label "hypotheses" his assumptions about the orderliness of nature. In an older work he said: "Deduction and the testing of hypotheses are actually subordinate processes in a descriptive science, which proceeds largely or wholly without hypotheses to the quantitative determination of the properties of behavior and through induction to the establishment of laws." (*The Behavior of Organisms*, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1938, p. 437.)

And in the article "Are Theories of Learning Necessary?" cited in his letter above, Skinner suggests that frequently the necessity of theorizing is overemphasized: "It would be foolhardy to deny the achievements of theories of this sort in the history of science. The question of whether they are necessary, however, has other implications and is worth asking. . . . The alternatives are at least worth considering. How much can be done without theory? What sorts of scientific activity are possible? And what light do alternative practices throw upon our present preoccupation with theory?" (pp. 194-95).

Perhaps Professor Skinner would agree that although he clearly is not opposed to "theory" in all current senses of that term, he is opposed to some senses that many other behavioral scientists would accept.

Sincerely yours,

Rollo Handy

State University of
New York at Buffalo

Paul Kurtz

Union College