

CLASS OF SERVICE DESIRED	
DOMESTIC	CABLE
TELEGRAM	FULL RATE
DAY LETTER	DEFERRED
NIGHT MESSAGE	CABLE LETTER
NIGHT LETTER	WEEK END LETTER
Patrons should check class of service desired; otherwise message will be transmitted as a full-rate communication.	

COPY OF WESTERN UNION TELEGRAM

December 28, 1935

Mr. William Carter
Phone Caledonia 5-5399
New York City

MANY THANKS ARRIVING TOMORROW 3:40

David Mitrany

Charge to Institute of Advanced Study
20 Nassau Street

130

20 NASSAU STREET
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

25.XI.1935

Nov. 25, 1935

Mitrany

Dear Flexner,

Many thanks for your comments on my Memorandum. I shall be glad to talk over with you, at your convenience, the points raised in your communication. Perhaps I can make this easier by putting down briefly some preliminary remarks on them.

There is nothing that appeals more to me than what you say of the need to 'live oneself in', by becoming acquainted with the American life and scene. As you know, my activities everywhere have been guided by that viewpoint. In this respect I start with some advantage over my other foreign colleagues, as for the last twelve years or so I have been in close and continuous contact with American men and policies; and the policy which I worked out for them, at their invitation (I mean especially the group led by General ~~xxxxxx~~ Pershing, David Hunter Miller, etc.), has proved itself so well, that it still holds the field, as the one practicable solution for American international policy. (Incidentally, Senator Capper was good enough to read into the Senate records the fact that I was the originator of that policy.) I am all the time being asked by groups in New York and elsewhere to join them in their studies in this field, but I have refused, for reasons which you will appreciate.

All this, however, leaves out an essential half of the picture. When I asked Wymant whether he was enjoying his stay in Geneva, he replied that the work was most interesting, but that 'I miss the contact with the common man'. That is the danger of all specialized communities, like Geneva or ideal University towns; and in politics more than in any other field, as you rightly say, one must redress the balance of one's understanding and judgment by that kind of contact of which you speak. The truth is that I am most anxious and curious to get to know this country, but I am not now in a position to do it myself, and I have not felt justified to call upon the Institute until my preparatory work enables me to make the most from visits to other Universities and scholars.

Again, one cannot but endorse what you say on the need of contact with other scholars; that, if I may say so, ~~was~~ the very idea implied ~~in~~ in my suggestion of last year, which you quote again. Such contact will have to be more frequent and extensive than the 'ten' reports mentioned in the proposed budget. These, as I said, were meant more in the nature of a reserve, and what was in my mind was, first, the possibility that some formal statement on some problem may be needed from a Continental or perhaps one of the refugee professors, from whom it would be rather unkind to ask help without some acknowledgement; and, secondly, the possibility that some other scholar may be willing to give us the benefit of his guidance on a specific issue, but may be unwilling to undertake himself the task of working up the material for a proper statement, and we could offer that small contribution for necessary assistance.

-2-

On the question of part-time assistance, I should like your advice and help. My present proposal is the result partly of a feeling that there was some difficulty in providing me with full-time assistance, partly of a problem of personnel. But on this I would prefer to speak to you personally.

Yours sincerely

D. Mitrany

November 20, 1935

Memorandum for Professor Mitrany

Comment on Memorandum on a Study in Politics

I have read with great care several times this memorandum, and I am profoundly impressed by the progress which it marks in your thinking within the last year, as you will see from the enclosed extract from a letter, dated May 14, 1934. While I am of course in no sense qualified as an expert, the subject in general is one in which I have been interested all my life so that in a measure at least I can feel the force of your critical observations on the manner in which the subject has been attacked and realize the novelty and perhaps the promise of the approach which this memorandum proposes. I need not say that I am delighted that you yourself see the need of taking a single problem and seeing what can be done with it, leaving out of sight and out of mind the effect on general theory which any such study may eventually produce either in our lifetime or hereafter.

In so far as the financial aspect is concerned, there would be no difficulty, for the sums which you mention are modest. I am not, however, clear as to whether they can be effectively used, and on this point I should like to have a conversation with you sometime during the coming week. There are several points in the page dealing with the budget that I do not grasp. I do not understand, for instance, what "organized assistance on a proper scale" means, and I have my old difficulty of understanding how in any novel study of the kind you propose organized assistance can be utilized.

I have had far too much experience with assistants to have faith in part-time assistants of any kind. A part-time worker must necessarily divide his time and his thought. There is not a part-time worker in the entire Institute. My objection to it is based on principle. Any one who is competent to be active in the Institute should give his entire time to it, which means that he is not subject to call from the outside and derives no financial remuneration from the outside, though he is perfectly free to do on the outside anything that promises to contribute to the work which he is doing for the Institute. I am myself in the dark as to what you would expect from

Professor Mitrany

November 20, 1935

2

the guidance of experts to each of whom an honorarium of \$100 would be paid. You would, in my judgment, get nothing from service of this kind, but you can at any time have anything of this sort that you need. You would get far more from informal and unpaid intercourse and conversation with persons who are really interested in the problem and who are willing to sit down and talk to you for hours by reason of their interest. This is common American practice at the research level. During the last twenty-five years everything I have done has been based upon conversation and discussion of this informal character with men who were willing from time to time to put their whole mind upon the problem, to deal with which I had had no special preparation.

I venture to make for your consideration one suggestion, which I believe is of enormous importance. Even mathematicians - and they are the farthest removed from local considerations - have without exception found that the Institute must be an American Institute. They must live in America, even though from time to time one or the other may take a vacation trip abroad. They have American homes, they are making American friends, and they are developing an interest in American institutions. Last week Professor Panofsky without any suggestion from me told me that he believed it would help him to gain a proper perspective if he could get in personal touch with American colleges and universities in different sections of the country, and of course I not only agreed but I had foreseen that this impulse would inevitably arise. Now if it is important for a mathematician without cutting himself off from continental mathematics to identify himself with American mathematicians and mathematical activities, and if the same is true of a humanist, I wonder if it is not infinitely more true of a person working in the field of politics. No matter what subject you study, American history, American traditions, American idiosyncrasies will modify a point of view which up to now is in the main continental or European. Before therefore settling down to the study of a single problem, would it not be wise for you to take such time as is required to acquaint yourself at first hand, as you have done

Professor Mitrany

November 20, 1935

3

in Europe, with American history and American development, including the development of public opinion? It is a rich and varied field, and it cannot be mastered at second hand. You would have to give yourself time to soak it up through reading and contacts. There is no definite prescription for this sort of thing so that you would have to work out your own method or technique and be your own judge as to when you had had enough of any particular aspect, but I cannot but believe that such acquaintance with America as you would thus obtain would react strongly upon any views which you might reach based either upon previous experience or upon further study of British and continental sources. When I say America, I include Canada. Already American policies zigzag. Though they have ~~not~~ exerted enormous influence upon the quality of political thinking and action throughout the whole world, it is obvious that, with European resources depleted and our own resources still hardly more than touched, this influence will grow. For example, if President Roosevelt should be enabled to cut off American supplies of oil from Italy, the termination of the Ethiopian war might come into sight, and what is true in a sphere of action is likely to be also true in a sphere of political thinking. As England influenced the continent during the nineteenth century, so America may perhaps influence it during the twentieth century. I should be afraid that you would be needlessly limited if you attack any problem until your acquaintance with Canada and the United States is as sure and as detailed and as first-hand as is your acquaintance with Europe. The Eastern seaboard with which you have had a limited contact heretofore is not America. It will itself require special study and, as you proceed southward and westward historically and otherwise, you will, I think, be surprised to find what differences go to make up that strange conglomeration which we call the United States. Having familiarized yourself with American history and organization, you would find a fascinating and very important chapter in the different and decisive attitudes taken by the Supreme Court at critical moments during the last one hundred years.

This may look like a slow process, and indeed it is, but time is of no consequence in the Institute. I happened last night to be talking with Einstein

Professor Mitrany

November 20, 1935

4

about some work he is doing. He told me that, since he had promulgated his theory of relativity now some years ago, he had been devoting his undivided attention to an elaboration and simplification of it, but he added lightly, "There is a dark spot which I do not seem able to penetrate, and I may never be able to penetrate it. However, here at the Institute no one hurries me, and I feel free to devote the rest of my life to it, even though the effort prove fruitless." That I thought the highest compliment that thus far had been paid to the Institute. Can we realize that state of mind in the social sciences? The answer depends upon the men forming the group.

Think these suggestions over. They are not orders but just points about which we can talk. I have put them down in typewritten form so that they may be more concrete than they would be apt to be if expressed in the course of a conversation.

P.S.

AF:ESB I have just been reading Austen Chamberlain's reminiscences entitled "Down the Years". His is not obviously first-rate intelligence, but there is a chapter dealing with Great Britain and the United States, which shows a very definite appreciation of the point of view which I expressed above before I had read the chapter in question. I shall be glad to lend you the book if you care to read it.

As to workers, there is no need for our looking forward to any particular action in that direction at this time. Even the mathematicians, whose projects were quite clear to them, spent over a year before the question of workers was raised.

A. F.

November 18, 1935

Dear Mitrany:

I had hoped to read your memorandum over the week-end and to have an answer for you this morning, but some special delivery mail, which I received Saturday, made it impossible for me to carry out my purpose. As I have a number of appointments, it may be a day or two until I can get at it, but I shall lose no time in so doing.

Thank you for preparing it for me.

Ever sincerely,

ABRAHAM FLEXNER

* Professor David Mitrany
20 Nassau Street
Princeton, New Jersey

AF:EBB

Private

I

Mitrany
Nov 15, 1935

Memorandum on a Study in Politics

I. Politics is the most venerable and inclusive of all the social sciences, but in method it has remained the most backward of them. The other social sciences have branched off from politics, as traditionally conceived, and on doing so each one has had to create a method of its own - as in this field, method is hardly separable from doctrine and purpose. Economics, especially, through the intense work and interest devoted to it during the past hundred years, has been able to develop methods which embolden its practitioners to aspire to the achievements of a pure science.

Politics, however, as studied and taught still, has remained in the main an accumulation of doctrines - interesting but mostly irrelevant. Higher teaching in the Universities still is based on a scholastic exposition of that miscellany of old doctrines; and in so far as new doctrines are put forward, they work for the most with the norms of the old.

The only change in recent years has been an attempt to develop a positive method, through the quantitative analysis of certain isolated factors and situations (pressure groups, voting frequency, measurements of public opinion, and so on). The instrument has been elementary, and the method hardly related or relatable to any systematic general theory. One should mention also the attempts at a psychological approach, in which Graham Wallas has been a pioneer. Though empirical, the studies in that group have been stimulating; but as a general method this approach must wait on the development of the psychological instrument with which it works.

Politics, therefore, though the cardinal social science, is still in search of a scientific method. That protracted adolescence goes a long way to explain the ease with which so many esoteric doctrines have been propagated

in recent years; even the most self-willed dictators, it seems, having felt the need to legitimize their rule by wedding it to a formal doctrine. These are ephemeral phenomena. More significant is the hold which the materialistic doctrine, in its Marxian setting, has acquired of late; so much so that it now dominates the minds of those who oppose it as much as the minds of those who support it.

There are a number of momentary reasons for that. But the main reason is that the materialistic doctrine, as elaborated by Marx, is at present the only one providing certain universal concepts which can be used in combination with a factual analysis satisfying modern ways of study - the only one, that is, which can lay some claim to a scientific status. That reputation and influence is the more significant because the Marxian framing of the materialistic doctrine has really vitiated the scientific claims of the method in two respects. It has decreed in advance that the economic factor is the determining element in political life and change, and in that degree has prejudiced both the working of the method and its results. It has, secondly, introduced the notion of the class struggle as the spring of all social action, thus injecting into its whole system a teleological element which must elude any attempt at positive analysis.

II. Is it possible to find a fresh approach to Politics which should lift this ancient discipline out of this scholastic stagnation: - an approach which should have a solid philosophical core, so as to permit a statement of theory in sufficiently universal terms; which should be capable of applying the tests of positive analysis to the history of government, as well as to the facts and problems of government; and whose results shall not depend for their significance on dogmatic apriorisms like 'class struggle' and 'democracy', 'individual liberty' and 'national sovereignty'?

Having gone over the field again during the past two years with this question in mind, with excursions in one or two specific directions as a test, I am inclined to believe that such a fresh approach is possible; and various scholars with whom I have discussed my tentative hypothesis have encouraged me in that belief.

The argument which leads up to that working hypothesis can be stated briefly.

Government, as an institution and as an act, has never been an end in itself. Men did not gather in communities in order to set up certain political institutions; they gathered for certain social ends, for the better performance of certain common functions, and institutions were set up to facilitate that performance. Government has been a framework destined to enable the social life of a community to unfold itself peacefully and progressively (just as the buildings which so dominate our landscape are but protection for the real life which goes on within them).

Social life has ever been in a state of flux, in its needs and in its means. To perform their function adequately, forms and rules of government have continually had to adapt themselves to that evolution; and every political doctrine, though argued in universal terms, has really been concerned with some such specific problem of change, either approving it or opposing it. Marxian theory says that all that is the expression and result of a continuous class struggle. But if the influence of princes grew in times of political crisis, that of the soldiers in time of war, and that of the bankers and traders when economic action was pressing - was it because their class was momentarily in the ascendant or because their function was then predominant? If rulesⁿ interfered at times less and at times more with social

activities, was it because of changing political fortunes or changing theoretical fashions; or was it because social conditions and problems called in a varying degree for common action and control? It seems ^{possible} to hold that the active element in the history of political institutions has been not their form but their function.

The methodological problem suggested by that premise is to find the correlation between the forms of government and the functions of government. If such a correlation, sufficiently general and substantial, can be discovered, we should at last have an inductive method capable of building up a systematic body of political knowledge, and from this in turn find the means to formulate a body of political 'laws'.

III. Not the least merit of such a functional approach, in so far as the hypothesis works true, is that it would not be bound in advance by either doctrinal or territorial limitations. By its very nature it would do away with the wholly dogmatic division between municipal and international political theory. The now much-discussed problem of Security might serve as an illustration.

A study of it on those lines, following up its evolution through history, would probably show a continuous functional correlation between the nature of the social group and the means used to protect it:- From the self-contained city life protected by city walls the function of security gradually moved to the self-contained national life protected by national military establishments. But then an unnatural break between means and ends happened. At a certain period in history social life overflowed beyond the limits of the national territory, but 'security' did not follow suit; it remained bound to national means and to a national scale. At the

same time, and no doubt for the same reasons, its whole sense changed. It came to be looked upon no longer as a political function but as a political prerogative; and the State, from having been an instrument of security, to protect social life, became the chief object of security, to which for that purpose all social life had to be subordinated.

A functional study of Security would reveal when and how the break happened. The method thus seems capable of taking naturally in its stride, without special deviation, both the physiology and the pathology of political institutions, so to speak; and it will be seen from the above reference to the State how through positive analysis the method leads up, directly and rationally, to the theoretical position.

The summary example used above indicates the lines to be followed in the preliminary studies. It is neither necessary nor desirable to attack the whole field from the outset. The method makes it possible to select certain 'functions' and to study them separately; and these first sectional studies will provide the means both to develop the method and to test it. That should be a sufficient task for the current academic year and the next - a task which because of its experimental nature must be kept in limited hands. If by the end of that period the method has proved itself, and in the process has become sufficiently perfected for more general use, then it would be timely to widen its application to the field with the cooperation of a group of workers.

The analytical work involved will of necessity be considerable. The sectional studies must rest upon a thorough historical analysis; and while they will have to rely in that upon existing material, most of the material will have to be re-grouped and recast for the purpose of this approach. At the same time, the workers will have to watch continuously for any new fact or view

which may throw fresh light on the relations between social life and government, in a particular function or in a particular period. The characteristic aim of the method is to reconstruct the meaning of institutions of government - not descriptively, from texts and forms, but functionally: as the active nervous system of all political community, affecting and being affected by every aspect of social life.

D. M.

For Dr. Flexner.

Note on Budget for a Study of Politics.

1935-36

The current year is too far advanced for organized assistance on a proper scale. But a certain amount of preliminary work can be done now, and especially during the next summer, for which the sum of \$500 should be sufficient.

\$ 500.-

1936-37

During the subsequent academic year the work would require: 1. part time assistance here, at a cost of \$ 1000-1500; 2. the guidance of experts, here and elsewhere, on special problems (an arrangement which would in the end save labour and money) - this cannot be definitely estimated, but one might provide for ten such reports at an average cost of \$100 each.

\$ 2500.-

15.XI.1935.

D.M.

Mitrony

Nov. 1, 1935

October 23, 1935

Dear Mitrany:

In order to complete and formulate the kernel of our discussion this morning, I want to put ^{it} in writing so that you can reflect on it and see the point of view from which the Trustees have decided to consider questions, which, as you say, were brought to your attention before you came to America.

The problem was presented to you in this form. A professor is a professor. Ergo: if one man enjoys certain conditions, the same should apply in other cases, else, to quote your words, "a dangerous situation may result".

The Board's point of view is as follows: a professor is not a professor in the sense that an inch is an inch, or an actor an actor, etc. Men vary enormously in importance, in productivity, and other qualities. While fine distinctions can not be made, broad distinctions can certainly be made, and it would be far more wholesome for academic life if they were made instead of the kind of mechanical uniformity that usually prevails in America (not by any means in pre-war Germany, where enormous divergences existed and worked beneficently). In the Institute titles amount to nothing. Real eminence, productivity, inspirational quality count for everything, and such distinctions as are made depend frankly upon the latter qualities. The recognition of this distinction is not only wholesome but is an incentive, and the whole policy of the Institute is based upon its reality. This position the Trustees

D.M.

Oct. 23, 1935

2

have officially taken, and it must be loyally and silently accepted, until experience leads the Trustees to order otherwise.

You contend that there is a difference in the possibilities, etc., in a subject like mathematics and a subject like economics. Such is the case to some extent; but mathematics appears to you, I suspect, to be much more uniform than it really is, for there are many differences in the field of mathematics as to what is and what is not at the present time of prime importance. Who is to decide? Obviously, that responsibility is in the end mine. On the whole, however, mathematics is more homogeneous than the social sciences; but that does not mean that within the social sciences, however disorganized they may be, certain individuals have not won acknowledged places of great distinction, corresponding to the positions held by men like Einstein, Weyl, and others. For example, Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Max Weber, Werner Sombart, and Hobhouse - whether one agrees with them or not - are recognized as outstanding figures. In your thinking it is this fact which ought to determine your attitude and state of mind. The Board has decided that it shall determine the policy of the Institute. If we can develop men of this type, it will prove worth while to have established the School of Economics and Politics, and the proper recognition will ultimately follow. If we cannot do substantially better than universities now do, the one cause for the establishment of the new school will have disappeared. I write this of course without reference to you individually.

The School of Humanistic Studies is more nearly like the School of Mathematics and thus far offers no peculiar problems that are not encountered there. Tests that can be applied by a layman like myself in any one school are the enthusiasm and the rebirth of the individuals who work in it, whether as professors or as workers. That has happened so decisively in mathematics that I have to do the minimum of thinking in regard to it. Can I bring about the same

D.M.

Oct. 23, 1935

3

result; or something nearly approximating it in these other fields? That depends upon the members of their respective staffs and not upon me. Your letters and our interview were disquieting from this standpoint. I hope that I made it clear that there are certain academic fetiches from which an institution like the Rockefeller Institute or this Institute has got to break away. Otherwise within a very short period they will find themselves in the same situation as respects personnel that exists in universities in this country and elsewhere.

I may add that differentiations occur and will continue to occur based on the reasons set forth above in every department in which the Institute is active - among the administrative workers of the Institute, among the scientific workers, and among the professors - and differences in certain departments are much greater than in others. It is a pity that any terminology whatever has got to be applied to the persons associated with the Institute. We have reduced it to a minimum. I wish we could get rid of it altogether and let everything depend upon ability, eminence, productivity - the real factors and qualities that can alone bring distinction.

No greater mistake could be made than for the persons connected with the Institute to compare themselves with one another, to become unhappy, and to spread discord, for the one thing that the Trustees would surely uproot would be unhappiness that sprang from any such source. There has never been a trace of it, and the Trustees do not propose that any shall exist. You remarked this morning that such feelings may exist without my knowing it. In the flood of happiness which exists at Fine Hall I do not believe that there has been any unhappiness whatever.

I hope that this letter may end all discussion between us and may enable you to make a fresh start. It ought also to guide you should any one seek

D.M.

Oct. 23, 1935

4

to discuss the policy of the Institute with you. The Board has the right to expect unquestioning loyalty from us all. It has received such loyal support from me and from every one else thus far and with the happiest results, whether we originally agreed with the majority or not. If we fail, we should first look within ourselves rather than to its policies. The latter may some day be necessary, but certainly not until the former alternative has been very thoroughly scrutinized.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM FLEXNER

Professor David Mitrany
20 Nassau Street
Princeton, New Jersey

AF:ESB

October 22, 1935

Dear Mitrany:

Inasmuch as you tell me that you have learned through Laski that Felix is no longer a member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute, I think I should explain the only thing which has any bearing whatsoever on the matter. Frankfurter's views on some important matters differed from those of the majority of the Board. Inasmuch as the proceedings of the Board must necessarily be of a confidential nature, I do not feel that I have any right to go further into details, but I can say this, that his opinions and views had absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with his being omitted when it came to a question of reelecting him to the Board. There are, and there have from the start been differences of opinion within the Board, but when a vote has been taken, the matter is settled and forgotten. You will naturally then ask why he was omitted. It was purely and entirely a question of his conduct. He did things in violation of the confidential nature of his position. On hearing of one of them, I wrote him a hasty and angry letter, for which I asked President Aydelotte to apologize. I should not have written it.

I was asked to attend the meeting of the Committee on Nominations which considered the question of nominating trustees for the next five years. I declined to do so, and I have no idea whatsoever of what took place at the meeting. Aydelotte did tell me that at the request of the Committee he had made a trip to Cambridge, but once more I asked him not to tell me what took place. The Committee was unanimous

D.M.

Oct. 22, 1935

2

in making a report to the Board, which omitted his name. The matter was discussed freely and without feeling. I said nothing. The report of the Committee, omitting his name, was after discussion unanimously adopted.

You will see therefore that no question of freedom of opinion is or was involved at any stage. The decision was taken first by the Committee and then by the Board solely on the question as to how members of the Board must comport themselves outside Board meetings, if the high level which we have succeeded in establishing is to be maintained.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM FLEXNER

Professor David Mitrany
20 Nassau Street
Princeton, New Jersey

T:ESB

Mitrany

THE LOWER FARM,
KINGSTON BLOUNT,
OXFORD.

25. IX. 36.

Dear Mrs. Bailey,

I wrote you a few days ago, as soon as I had booked my passage, and now your letter of the 13th. has come.

First let me say how sorry I am for the trouble I caused you with the Graduate School. At Harvard & Yale they seem to have some difficulty in filling their Houses and, in my ignorance, I assumed that it would be the same at Princeton.

What you kindly suggest is just the best thing. If I don't hear any further from you, I will go straight to the Beacall Inn. A single room will do, and I don't mind the position, if it is quiet. Noise is no great bother, and we are constantly in search - generally hopeless - of peace, when we go to town. For the rest, I shall make use

of your friendly guidance when I get there.

A single room would do, and breakfast (which

I do not mind getting myself at need).
To make a confession, when I looked at
the map, you kindly sent me, I thought of
how great it would be if I could find
a cabin by the canal, or some house where
is a back garden - where I could settle
down 'for keeps', and try to 'day-dream
right' (as Dr. Flexner says). And I have
a great lot of attic - I even managed to
find one in Cambridge, and kept it for
1 1/2 years, till I left. But these are
things to be seen to and settled when I come
- you are more than kind to do all the
preliminary inquiries you have already done.

My wife is back in London (eternally
pursued by the neighbors' radios), much better,
and, as small hope, on the way to a complete
cure. She is braver than I am, or wiser (or
both), for I find it terribly hard to leave
her behind and be useless. Thank you for
your kind inquiries and good wishes - and
again for all your friendly help.

Yours sincerely,
David Mitrany

THE LOWER FARM,
KINGSTON BLOUNT,
OXFORD.
19.10.35.

Dear Dr. Exner,

I am coming over on the 'Statendam',
which sails from Southampton on Saturday Oct. 5
(the Conference ends on Monday, Sept. 30), and is
due in N.Y. a week later.

I have went back to London last week;
I shall see her a few times between now and
my departure, but I think everything will be
alright.

We hope that you all had a good and
pleasant rest, and we send our best wishes
and kind regards to you the family.

Yours sincerely
D. Mitrany

September 13, 1935

Dear Professor Mitrany:

Immediately upon receipt of your letter last spring we made application for a room for you at the Graduate College. We were informed that there was a long waiting list, but perhaps there would be a vacancy this autumn. I returned from Canada on Wednesday and learned, alas, that there is no vacancy. However, if you will let me know the date of your arrival, I shall have a room reserved for you at the Peacock Inn where you may stay until you find suitable living quarters.

I am preparing a list of available rooms and shall be glad to help you all I can to find what you wish. It will aid me if you give me some idea as to your needs - one room, a bedroom and study, a room with or without bath, near the office or in the outskirts of the town, breakfasts or any meals where you live. I assume that you will not wish an apartment.

Your office will be Room 308, 20 Nassau Street, Princeton, New Jersey, which adjoins the other rooms of the Institute.

I hope that Mrs. Mitrany continues to improve and that you are very well.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Professor David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

ESTHER S. BAILEY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

L. P. EISENHART
Dean

August 2, 1935

Princeton, New Jersey

My dear Miss Eichelser:

Your letter of July 24th came while I was on my vacation, and that is why the answer has been delayed.

I take pleasure in putting the name of Dr. Mitrany on the waiting list for any possible vacancy in the buildings of the Graduate College.

With best wishes to you for a happy vacation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Houston Scott

Secretary to Dean Eisenhart.

Miss Marie C. Eichelser,
Institute for Advanced Study,
Princeton, New Jersey.

July 24, 1935

Miss Houston Scott
Nassau Hall
Princeton, New Jersey

My dear Miss Scott:

I told Dr. Flexner what you had told me about the waiting list of applicants for rooms in the Graduate College for the coming year. He would appreciate it very much if you would keep in mind that Professor David Mitrany, one of our economics professors, would like to have a room there if one should become available.

Very truly yours,

Marie C. Eichelsner

July 6, 1935

Dear Mitrany:

Your letter of June 23 reached me this morning. I am perfectly satisfied to leave in your hands, the doctor's, and Ena's the final decision as to when you shall come to Princeton. If Ena is helped by feeling that you are at work over here, then come by all means. If, on the other hand, you and she feel that you ought to remain in England, you may do that. Meanwhile, I have cabled you to certainly accept Ginsberg's invitation.

As to the rest of your letter, I have the feeling that nothing I say really helps. There has never been a moment when I dreamed of a coordinated attack on the social sciences. I have indeed the gravest doubt as to whether any such thing as sociology exists in coordinated form, and I believe - rightly or wrongly - that if it is even a possibility it can be brought into being only if separate branches of the so-called social sciences are more or less independently developed over a long period of time.

I am sorry that you feel that my suggestion regarding publication was "pretty stiff advice". As a matter of fact, writing at the level of the article in question is, in my judgment, the sort of journalism that members of the Institute for Advanced Study ought to leave to college professors, editors, and persons of that type. Not many years ago my brother Simon summarily dropped

Mitrany

July 6, 1935

- 2 -

from the Rockefeller Institute an able young man whose sole offense at the time was that being a member of a research institute he was writing journalism of an exceptional quality. He has since written a number of interesting, helpful, and successful books, but he has never made a discovery or advanced a new idea. I still believe that inquiries into specific problems rather than comprehensive generalisation and discussion will alone yield results. I do not know whether Riefler intends to go on with his study of durable goods or not, and I do not care. I thought the paper which was prepared in response to an inquiry would interest you because it showed what a first-rate mind that had been in actual contact with specific problems thought about one of them. I have the feeling that you did not appreciate this and that perhaps you do not approve it. Both Frankfurter and Stewart insisted - the former in a memorandum - that all important works in the fields of law and economics had come out of contemporaneous phenomena carefully and philosophically studied. There is not only no inconsistency, but precisely the reverse, in taking hold of a specific problem and working through it to a philosophic end. Perhaps the difficulty is that you do not read my letters carefully or have them before you when you write me, for I have given you specific examples of just that sort of thing and you have never commented upon them. Indeed, I may go further: I have the feeling that you do not really weigh what I have been at so much pains to write. For example, I referred you to a chapter in my book in reference to the so-called social sciences: no comment; I quoted Frankfurter and Walter Stewart, as I said above, to the same effect: no comment. Finally, I have repeatedly asked you questions in the most definite form, which you have completely ignored, though in that case I think you should have referred to them and said that you either preferred not to answer or did not feel free to answer, e.g., your horror at the idea of a mathematical

Mitrany

July 6, 1935

- 3 -

economist, which, evidently, reached you from some source, but not from me, and was never a matter upon which I had come to any conclusion. Almost in the same category belong your remarks about statistics. Now you tell me that you have never set out to be an economist. Is it not therefore presumptuous for you to pour scornful criticism upon suggestions made by as able an economist as can be found anywhere in the world?

I wonder whether you are not thinking of the Institute in terms of a college or university which has a job of teaching to do and in which fundamental research is more or less incidental. The bulletins, every one of which you have received, ought certainly to have convinced you that such is not the case. The Institute is a place for men who can hope to make original contributions to thought. They have no teaching burden whatsoever in the ordinary sense of the term. A person who is not equal to leading a productive life of this sort at a high level has no place in the Institute. I have told you this in writing, and you have read it in the bulletins and in my book on Universities. The members of the Institute are like the generals of an army. If they cannot live up to their responsibilities there is no place for them here permanently. Precisely the same is true of the workers; unless they are capable of doing productive work with a minimum of direction and conference they had much better go to Harvard or Columbia or Oxford. We are now two years old. During this period one of the professors in mathematics came to me and expressed such grave doubt as to his ability to live up to the standard of the mathematicians that he thought he should look around for another place. After making very careful inquiry, not only among his associates but outside, I was convinced that he was underrating his own ability and I persuaded him to stay on, and the experience of the last six months has proved that he is really one of the most brilliant persons living in the field of mathematics. Unless we

Mitrany

July 6, 1935

- 4 -

can all work in that spirit and face the dangers involved without regard to ourselves, the Institute will within a generation drop to the level of an ordinary university, in which there are some brilliant people and a great many mediocre ones. As long as I am director I shall uphold the doctrine that the Institute shall remain small and that there is no place in it for anything but the very best. It will interest you to know that both Earle and Riefler have told me that if they do not measure up they do not wish to stay.

There is one other consideration which has been in my mind a whole year and which I have not mentioned on account of Emma's illness, namely, that while it is perhaps possible for a mathematician to carry on his work anywhere - in the Desert of the Sahara as well perhaps as at Princeton or Oxford - persons dealing with contemporaneous phenomena such as economics or political theory must be close to the life of the community with which they are going primarily to deal. If you will read Cliff Leslie's essays you will see that there is no place in economics for abstractions. There is just as little place, in my opinion, for abstractions in political theory, which may deal now with England, now with America, now with France. It is of enormous importance for a political theorist from time to time to keep in immediate touch with happenings elsewhere, but his home must ultimately be in the country in which he is to work and his work must have the flavor of the soil.

I think we will gain nothing by continuing our correspondence on these subjects. I can understand that your personal situation has been such that it may have been impossible for you to look at the Institute with the almost brutal objectivity with which I regard it. I am not looking for quick results from anyone, but results, when they are announced, must, like Einstein's most recent paper - tho' perhaps Einstein is too high a standard - be such that

Mitrany

July 6, 1935

- 5 -

American people will say that it was worth while to create another institution of research. It is certainly not worth while in this country to create anything at a lower level than that to which we have thus far unwaveringly adhered.

As for the rest, I think you are right. Let us wait and see. If you can achieve something in your field of the kind that led me to invite you to become a member in the Institute you will have nothing to fear. On the contrary, you will be appreciated at your full value. But I keep on recurring to the idea with which I originally won Mr. Bamberger's support, that unless every man in every faculty that we form can do something that he simply cannot find time and conditions to do in other academic institutions, our whole reason for existence disappears.

Don't try to answer this letter. If you do anything re-read the bulletins, re-read my former letters, re-read page 106 in my book on Universities and the section on social sciences, to which I called your attention, and see if I have not pursued an absolutely consistent course in my thinking.

The hot weather has just set in. We are going to Canada Monday night - Anne, Jean, Eleanor and myself, and we shall have the month of July to ourselves. At the beginning of August Woodward and his wife are coming over for a few weeks, and a little later President Aydelotte and his wife, but we are counting on making it a very quiet summer.

I do hope that Ena's improvement continues and that you will yourself get abundant time for rest and recreation without worry of any sort during the summer.

I think there will be no difficulty in your getting a room in the Graduate College when you arrive.

With all good wishes, in which Anne, Jean and Eleanor join,

Ever sincerely, ~~HERBERT A. FLEXNER~~

- over -

P. S. Since writing the above I have made inquiries and am not absolutely sure about the Graduate College, but you will have no difficulty in getting comfortable quarters.

A.F.

CLASS OF SERVICE DESIRED	
DOMESTIC	CABLE
TELEGRAM	FULL RATE
DAY LETTER	DEFERRED
NIGHT MESSAGE	CABLE LETTER
NIGHT LETTER	WEEK END LETTER

Patrons should check class of service desired; otherwise message will be transmitted as a full-rate communication.

COPY OF WESTERN UNION TELEGRAM

Mitrany
Kingston Blount
Oxfordshire (England)

Certainly accept Ginsberg invitation

Flexner

Charge Institute for Advanced Study
July 6, 1935

2.14 1935

June 29, 1935

Professor David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

My dear Professor Mitrany:

I am sending you herewith duplicate deposit
slip, receipted by Princeton Bank and Trust Company, for
\$791.66, which represents your salary for the month of
June, 1935, after having deducted your payment of \$41.68
towards your retirement allowance.

Very truly yours,

ROTHEN B. BAILEY

Assistant Secretary

THE LOWER FARM,
KINGSTON BLOUNT,

OXFORD.

June 23,
23.VI.1935.

Dear Flexner,

My humble apologies for not replying sooner to your letter of May 1st. Your offer to extend my leave was most generous, but of course I could not make use of it unless amply justified by Ena's condition. It so happens that for awhile past both she and her doctor have expected something to 'break', so much so that we rent the flat in which she lives only by the fortnight, and I was waiting therefore in the hope of a definite report, from week to week. On receiving your cable I went up to see the doctor: he is still in the same state of expectation and cannot say anything definite as to time. But he is certain that she is heading for a good cure, and that even if she has to stay behind for a time, there will be no reason for any anxiety.

You know how difficult will the parting be for us, and in that measure the kindly thought and generosity behind your offer is deeply appreciated by both of us. The temptation is very great indeed. But work means a lot to both of us, and I know that Ena is worrying a great deal because ~~she~~ she feels that she is hampering me. She has a horrible conscience, and I must try and live up to it. As things are now, perhaps on balance I can make it easier for her by relieving that feeling of guilt, however unnecessary and unjustified it may be. They are all so confident that she will be perfectly well, and that before long, that I have no right to indulge in further leave. But, again and again, our gratitude to you.

In the meanwhile, however, I have had the enclosed letter, which explains itself. The Conference is to be private and limited, and most of the leading people in England will be there. Besides being interesting in itself, it might be also very opportune for anything I might be able to report to you, and if you see no objection to my starting after the Conference instead of before it, I should much like to join in the discussions.

As to our unfortunate controversy, there was a 'problem' only in so far and for so long as we had the idea of a coordinated attack on the Social Sciences; an idea in regard to which, as you say, we saw, or appeared to see eye to eye. There is no 'problem' at all if that idea is dropped. But everything I said suggested hung on that. The preliminary survey, with the help of outsiders, had sense only when linked to it; as had the feeling that the mathematical approach in economics would present difficulties to its realization. I took it that even your objections were tied to the same purpose: when you preferred that the members of the School should first get together and then consult with themselves and outsiders, or when you gave me the pretty stiff advice not to commit myself to any public views till I met my colleagues - and advice which I took in good part because I thought I saw in it still that central and common wish for a joint effort. But after that followed, first, a Memorandum with your high commendation, which envisaged the economic work as a statistical inquiry, with travelling etc. - i.e. an attack on a sectional issue without the rest of the School instead of a general approach with the rest of the School; and, second, the letter in which you corrected an assumption I had made, as to medical cooperation, and told me that, on the contrary, at the Rockefeller Institute everyone worked ~~worked~~ independently on some interest of his own.

2
That was a standpoint which may be as just as the other, but it was a very different one. If I misunderstood you, I misunderstood you comprehensively, and others with me. But I must say, in all friendliness, that until your last letter, I have never heard you favour an approach through 'current economic phenomena'. What I heard you say and repeat at every opportunity ever since you founded the Institute, was your firm belief in the need for a 'philosophical' approach. I remember vividly how you took me aback by telling me, in New York, that you would not have given me the appointment had the Dodge lectures, which you saw in MS., failed to disclose that philosophical approach on which you placed such great value. And last summer, when we sat and talked in the smoking room of the National Liberal Club, I gave you a brief outline of the line of work I was thinking out, and you said that it was very interesting and fine, though there was certainly nothing either current or economic about it.

However, perhaps I am once more misjudging the drift of your remarks; for knowing as you do my work and my writings and my interests, and that since so many years, all of which are political, you cannot really mean to attribute to me the impertinent intention to deal with economic phenomena, let alone to try and rewrite economic theory. I have indeed some hope and ambition to make a fresh approach to political theory, and in a School of Politics that should not be amiss. But, again, in these circumstances no 'problem' arises at all. Nor do 'open mindedness,' and an ability and willingness to work with one's colleagues, come in at all at this stage. That is, for all of us, a matter of 'Wait and See'.

It was kind of you, though hardly needed, to assure me that your personal feelings continue as before. I took that for granted, for so frank a discussion as ours would not be possible without that amical security. But, on my part, I want to say and repeat that if Ena gets her health back it will be your doing as much as her doctor's, for without you we could not have had him; and than that no man could have a greater and more lasting claim to my gratitude.

I fear that recent events must have thrown a fresh load of work upon Jean, and I can only hope that she will get away for a rest before the heat sets in. She, too, is one of those people with a conscience most uncomfortable to fellow-workers. Please give her my good wishes, and as many to Ann and to Eleanor. We both hope that you will all get new strength during the summer, and much pleasure.

Ever yours

S. Mitrany

The 'Political Science' title is of no significance and not wholly of my doing. Toynbee, who is arranging our group, seemingly got hold of your Bulletin even before I saw it, and I found myself on a preliminary private list described as 'Professor of International Relations'. On the telephone, and on the spur of the moment, I gave a less unsatisfactory description - but I don't know whether we can change custom and adopt in the Social Sciences a generic title, like the mathematicians.

CLASS OF SERVICE DESIRED		
DOMESTIC	CABLE	
TELEGRAM	FULL RATE	
DAY LETTER	DEFERRED	X
NIGHT MESSAGE	CABLE LETTER	
NIGHT LETTER	WEEK END LETTER	

Patrons should check class of service desired; otherwise message will be transmitted as a full-rate communication.

COPY OF WESTERN UNION TELEGRAM

Mitrany
Kingston Blount
Oxfordshire (England)

Do not decide until doctor is completely satisfied

Flexner

Charge Institute for Advanced Study
June 22, 1935

THE COMPANY WILL
SPEED
PLUS POWER

THAT'S A TELEGRAM. USE IT AS A
QUICK SHORT-ARM JAB TO SMASH
THROUGH BUYERS' RESISTANCE

PRECIMATE SUGGESTIONS FROM ITS PATRONS CON NING ITS SERVICE

**EASTERN
UNION**

NEWCOMB CARLTON
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

(59) VER
FII SIDENT

1201-S

SIGNS

DL = Day Letter

NM = Night Message

NL = Night Letter

LC = Deferred Cable

NLT = Cable Night Letter

Ship Radiogram

The filing time as shown in the date line on full-rate telegrams and day letters, and the time of receipt at destination as shown on all messages, is STANDARD TIME.

Received at Lower Pine Bldg., Princeton, N. J.

1935 JUN 21 PM 9 15

NAL154 VIA RCA=CD HIGHWYCOME 21/20 21

NLT VANSPI TUTE=

PRINCETON NJ=

MANY APOLOGIES HAVE BEEN WAITING DAILY FOR DOCTORS
DEFINITE ADVICE SEEING HIM TONIGHT WRITING TOMORROW=
MITRANY.

MINUTES IN TRANSIT	
FULL-RATE	DAY LETTER

THE QUICKEST, SUREST AND SAFEST WAY TO SEND MONEY IS BY TELEGRAPH OR CABLE

CLASS OF SERVICE DESIRED	
DOMESTIC	CABLE
TELEGRAM	FULL RATE
DAY LETTER	DEFERRED
NIGHT MESSAGE	CABLE LETTER
NIGHT LETTER	WEEK END LETTER

Patrons should check class of service desired; otherwise message will be transmitted as a full-rate communication.

WESTERN UNION

NEWCOMB CARLTON, PRESIDENT

J. C. WILLEVER, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

NO.	CASH OR CHG.
CHECK	
TIME FILED	

Send the following message, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to

Mitrany
Kingston Blount
Oxfordshire (England)

Would like answer to my letter May first

Flexner

(Charge Institute for Advanced Study
June 21, 1935)

THE QUICKEST, SUREST AND SAFEST WAY TO SEND MONEY IS BY TELEGRAPH OR CABLE

May 31, 1935

Professor David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

My dear Professor Mitrany:

I am sending you herewith duplicate deposit
slip, receipted by Princeton Bank and Trust Company, for
\$791.67, which represents your salary for the month of
May, 1935, after having deducted your payment of \$41.66
towards your retirement allowance.

Very truly yours,

ESTHER S. BAILEY

Assistant Secretary

May 1, 1935

Dear Mitrany:

I have been unusually slow in answering your letter of April 8 because before doing so I wished to reread with care the entire correspondence which has passed between us since last autumn. You have, as I see it, two entirely different problems to deal with. I am hopeful that Ena will now be able shortly to return to Kingston Blount, but, even if so, I cannot but wonder whether you should in October put the ocean between you and her. It would, I believe, be possible to secure for you additional leave of absence for a year or a part of a year at your present salary. I am certain that, in your place, I should not want to subject either myself or my wife to the anxiety involved in such a separation.

If on consideration and conference perhaps with Ena or her physician you decide that it will be wise and helpful to prolong your leave, write me to that effect, and I shall take steps to put the arrangement through. At the same time please give me a sketch in a general way of your activities during the last two years, so that, if asked, I may be in position to answer questions more or less intelligently.

When we talked in Oxford last summer and previously, I had the feeling that we saw sufficiently eye to eye to make it reasonably certain that, whatever differences of opinion might arise in course of time between you and

Mitrany

May 1, 1935

2

your colleagues, there was a certain general basis of thought which would make intercourse between you and them, whoever they might be, fruitful. I have in writing and in every bulletin insisted on the autonomy of the several schools, that is, upon complete academic freedom within them. On the other hand, the problem of starting a school is an entirely different one from that of maintaining one after it has run along for a period of years. You have several times suggested the importance of my taking a more or less active part in shaping the School of Economics and Politics, and I have always replied that I had no such intention, for I have no qualifications whatsoever, and I should not do so even if I had. While I have tried in my replies to exhibit no shock, I think that in fairness I should now say that I was deeply disturbed when in your letter of November 19, 1934, half-jestingly perhaps, you suggested that I was looking on the mathematicians as a "club" and on the economists as a "nursery". While I do not subscribe to these terms, in answering I tried to point out to you that there was never a moment when the mathematicians hesitated as to the line to take, while every economist that I have ever spoken to has deplored the chaotic condition of his subject. There is no difference in my attitude towards the groups nor will there be any difference, as far as I am concerned, as between the groups. None the less, the subjects are not in the same plight. Only a few days ago Professor Seligman of Columbia wrote to me emphasizing this fact and calling my attention to a young economist, who, in his opinion, realizes the gravity of the situation and could be relied on to approach it open-mindedly. I had thought the same of you, but more and more it has been borne upon me, and most of all, as I reread our entire correspondence, that such is not the case, for you have, while you express the finest intentions, exhibited one bias after another, from which I believe the other members of the proposed school are entirely free. As I have said above, you apparently rely upon me to keep the team in order. I do not understand that to be business.

Mitrany

May 1, 1935

3

My function is, as I conceive it, in starting the successive schools, to bring together a few men who are tolerant, open-minded, congenial, able, leaving the future to them. As I reread our correspondence, I am struck more and more strongly by the fact that since last autumn you have made a series of suggestions, with none of which I am in sympathy, with which I suspect that neither Riefler nor Earle will be sympathetic, and, though, I have replied in the most kindly way, I cannot see that except for your repeated expressions of "good will" I have made any impression upon you. Your suggestions have indeed been of such a character that I cannot see that there would be any point of contact whatsoever between Riefler, Earle, and yourself. They involve such matters as the appointment of a Freudian psychologist, a year's contact with Ginsberg, whose scheme includes even a school of biology, emphatic disapproval of the appointment of a mathematical economist, which I never made, and, though I have twice asked you the source of your information, I have received no reply. At a time when the sole question in my mind was what you in conjunction with a couple of mature and open-minded thinkers can yourselves evolve, you asked for a youthful assistant; which I was indisposed to grant at this time because no man can at the outset see through the eyes of another man in such an enterprise as this or think with another man's brains.

Now finally comes your letter of April 8 in which you quote me as "pouring scorn on minute statistical research". On this I have two comments to make: (1) I do not know to whom you refer, though it may be plausible to conjecture that you are referring to the appointment of Riefler. In any event, your comment once more mystifies me, and (2) it again discloses what I should regard at this stage of the game as a bias, though perhaps in the course of years it may turn out that your surmise or position is correct. I have indeed made fun of fake statistics on washing dishes and things of that kind, but I have looked in vain through

Mitrany

May 1, 1935

4

my book on Universities for any word that would seem to indicate that I either undervalue or have anything whatever to say on careful statistical research in general. Graham Wallas once said to me that, in his opinion, the most important economic organization in Great Britain was the British Board of Trade, for, he added, it has every responsibility for ascertaining facts and no responsibility for making its will prevail. That seemed to me wise.

If you will reread our correspondence - and I can furnish you copies of your letters if you have not retained them - and recall our conversations, it will be clear that I was looking to you, as I explained both to you and to the Board, as a person who would be interested in the international implications of economic policy. Though I read with interest your memorandum on the State, I did not suppose that it meant that our previous discussions had been lost sight of. I have the feeling now, especially in view of the description of yourself as professor of political science, that such is the case, but perhaps I am mistaken. In any event, if you will reread Section IV, Part I, of the book on Universities, you will note that, like Frankfurter and Stewart, I had the feeling that the starting-point of the new school should be present economic phenomena and that perhaps a realistic approach of that kind would in time lead to a reconstruction of economic theory.

Since your appointment four additional professors have been appointed. Not one of them has asked for a thing beyond a table, chair, a waste-basket, and book-shelves. While I am seeking open minds, you have enunciated opinions which seem to me at war with the fundamental conception of the entire Institute. For example, in your letter of April 8 you say, "Not only does a statistical approach preclude this (coöperative attempt) but may land us straight into topical battles." I have no idea what this phrase means, but it certainly does not indicate a state of mind on your part in harmony with the open-mindedness which in

Mitrany

May 1, 1935

5

the early years seems to me the one condition on which the success of any school or group is conditioned.

I find myself therefore in a situation of extreme perplexity. The Institute far transcends in importance any school or any individual. From the beginning I felt this so strongly that I have never permitted myself to be elected for more than a single year, despite the fact that the Board was inclined to do otherwise. I have insisted on the autonomy of the several schools, subject only to the absolutely indispensable condition that the small group originally brought together should respect one another and should be in sufficient harmony to insure their capacity to work together, for I myself, as I have said above, am out of the situation the moment I have brought the initial group together. No difficulty whatsoever has arisen in connection with either the School of Mathematics, of which the mathematicians by their ability to work together have made a brilliant success, or the School of Humanistic Studies, which has lately been launched. Your letters raise a very serious problem. Whatever happens, you may rely upon the fact that the Institute will be in financial matters fair to the point of generosity, as it has been with you in the past. Beyond this I confess that I cannot at the moment see what is the sound procedure either for you or for me.

Let me add that nothing will ever modify my respect for your abilities or my personal affection for you. I need hardly say what I have written above is the result of deliberations running over months and that I have never mentioned the subject to anyone whatsoever.

Anne appreciates very much your kind note of April 15 and will be very glad to meet Toller should he be coming to America.

Jean is busier than usual in Washington because the chief of the division in which she works has been ill for weeks. Eleanor is full of enthusiasm and has

Mitrany

May 1, 1935

6

even finished a play, the fate of which, like the fate of all plays, lies in the lap of the gods.

With all good wishes and affectionate greetings to you and Ena,

Ever sincerely,

ABRAHAM FLEXNER

Professor David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

AF:ESB

April 30, 1935

Professor David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

My dear Professor Mitrany:

I am sending you herewith duplicate deposit
slip, receipted by Princeton Bank & Trust Company, for
\$791.67, which represents your salary for the month of
April, 1935, after having deducted your payment of \$41.66
towards your retirement allowance.

Very truly yours,

ESTHER S. BAILEY

Assistant Secretary

D. N. Mitrany

April 29, 1935

Dear Professor Mitrany:

I have been tremendously busy since the annual meeting of the Institute Board so that your note of the fifteenth has not been answered earlier.

I shall be here until early in July, and there will be someone here to receive mail in my absence. Although my plans are not quite definite, I shall probably return from my holiday about August 20 and then go to Dr. Flexner's camp in Canada to work there until returning to Princeton with Dr. Flexner about the middle of September. Any letter addressed to me at 20 Nassau Street, Princeton, New Jersey, will be forwarded, of course, except during my vacation.

I am sending you various receipts showing you that your Massachusetts insurance has been looked after.

I hope that Mrs. Mitrany will be better in the near future, and that all will be well with you.

Very sincerely yours,

Professor David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

ESTHER S. BAILEY

THE LOWER FARM,
KINGSTON BLOUNT,
OXFORD.

10-IV. 35.

Dear Mrs. Bailey,

Would you kindly let me know
sometime how late you will be in Princeton,
before you start on your summer holidays?
I am unable to make any plans yet,
because I am still waiting for my wife
to get out of the doctor's hands; but I may
have occasion to beg your help a little later,
if I should know better how I stand.
I have written Dr. Flexner yesterday about this
- I take it that we are expected to meet
in Princeton on October 1st.

(v) if I make up any boxes of
books during the summer - both my own
and those relevant for the Institute - should

I address them to be dispatched to Nassau St.?

(3) My Massachusetts insurance will be due on May 1st. - They should send you ten demands, but you need only send them one cheque, to ^{the} Boston ^{the} for the 1st. it was their suggestion, and it saves much trouble. There will be enough money in the bank for the payment. Thank you so much.

Have no things with you? I hope you will have a long and good summer holiday, for we shall probably keep you fairly busy in the autumn. It will be good to get to work.

Many thanks for everything, and many good wishes, and remembrances,

Yours sincerely
D. Mitrany

THE LOWER FARM,
KINGSTON BLOUNT,
OXFORD.

8.IV.1935

April 8, 1935

Dear Flexner,

I have not written you for some time, as I felt that my argumentative letters were putting an unfair burden on you, and that, as somewhat inevitably in such discussions, we were arguing at cross purposes. A good talk will do better than a batch of letters.

I will say therefore merely this - that my standpoint and suggestions did not spring from any peculiar view of my own, but from a convinced adherence to the view from which your great plan started. You always said and insistently repeated that what the social sciences needed was a philosophical approach and revaluation; and as a natural corollary to that, in your lectures and in your book and in your talks you poured scorn on minute statistical 'research'. You utterly convinced me, and a good many others, and I remain faithful to your original conception.

And I will add only one more thing, because you have also insisted, with my full sympathy, on the need for a cooperative attempt. Not only does a statistical approach preclude this, which is only too obvious; but a statistical approach to an issue which is part and parcel of the present economic system, may land us straight into topical battles. The book of the Harvard economists on the 'New Deal' shows how easy it is to slip from an examination into a justification of the present order; and once you get that, the would-be scientific cooperation is apt to change into dogmatic division. Again I remain in this faithful to your ideal: you have inspired me with the conviction that it is not our job to try and 'solve' this or that practical problem of the moment, but to try and see even a little issue in the great circle of history and of social life as a whole.

So I will leave it at that. I must confess that I am deeply distressed at the turn things have taken, for I have put my whole heart and life in the work which we are to do at the Institute; and because it oppresses me to be at odds with you. But soon we shall get together, and perhaps I shall find that I am wrong.

Private.

The second reason for delaying to write is that I was hoping to be able to consult you, and beg your help, concerning my plans for Princeton. I have only this week been able, after receiving the announcement of the opening of the School, to get hold of Ena's doctor for a longer talk. As you know, she has been in London since the beginning of December, in a little furnished flat, with her nurse. It was a great thing to get her out of the nursing home and into a more normal life, and I could not have done it without your generous help. She has made solid progress, beyond doubt, and is every week getting away from her troubles. But it is a desperately slow business, and the 'few weeks' more grow again like a serpent's severed tail. Yet my hands are tied - the doctor and her very experienced and kindly nurse, both of whom are devoted to her, are utterly convinced that she will make a complete cure and will feel better than she ever did before her collapse. They also expect the good end to come suddenly, and at any moment; and as Ena shares their conviction, and in spite of strain and the longing for a normal life is determined to see it through, there is nothing for me to do but to stand by her and give her such help and encouragement as I can.

I told the doctor that one reason for my impatience is that I have to go to America in the autumn, and I want to know how to arrange things. He felt sure that Ena will be able to face anything, but I have doubts, unless I get her home within the next few weeks, whether I ought to drag her with me before being able to look round and make arrangements for our life at Princeton. So that I can make no plans, beyond the fact that I shall of course be there at the appointed date. Perhaps the sensible thing is to assume that I shall be alone during the first year; and in that case I wonder whether it would be possible to be put up in the Graduate School? I found the intercourse with students in the Harvard houses a great help to me, and it would simplify various other problems at the beginning, and I gather from the plan you kindly had sent to me, that I would be near your own lodgings. But I shall have to be guided by your advice in this; Kemmerer wrote me a most kindly letter and offered his help, but I do not want to approach him with a request which for one reason or another may be impracticable. Could you be so kind to find out whether it is feasible, or tell me what you think of it? I shall be grateful for your advice.

In the meanwhile I am doing a good deal of reading etc., and have also kept in touch with affairs through the use which the Institute of International Affairs have made of me. They have put me on the British delegation to the big international

conference which is meeting here in June (this being the first occasion on which I have made use of my new title), and I thought it might interest you to see the delagation etc. I am not sure who is coming from America, beyond Allen Dulles, whom we intend to make chairman, that he may keep the balance between the warring European schools.

People are very scared here. They feel that anything might start a quarrel, and the 'national' policy is to do nothing until we see the rick burning.

We send our very good wishes to you and Ann and the girls, and I also wish you success in your work

Always yours sincerely
D. Mitrany

BRITISH COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES.

EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CONFERENCE.

London, June 3rd - 7th, 1935

PREPARATORY MEETINGS OF BRITISH GROUP.

A preliminary Meeting of the Members of the British Group to meet the Leader of the Group, Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland, the other members of the Group and the members of the British Coordinating Committee for International Studies, will be held in the Common Room at Chatham House, 10, St. James's Square, S.W.1., at 5 p.m. on Wednesday, March 20th, 1935.

A G E N D A

1. A brief statement by Lord Meston on the purpose of the Conference.
2. Discussion of subjects on which it would be useful for the members of the British Group to exchange views before the Conference.
3. Rough allocation of subjects arising out of the Agenda among the members of the British Group.
4. Preparation of a calendar of five or six meetings of the Group to be held before the Conference.
5. Decision with regard to
 - (a) the subject for discussion at the next meeting;
 - (b) invitations to be sent to authorities other than members of the British Group to take part in the discussion of this subject.

OTHER BUSINESS

MARGARET E. CLEEVE,
Secretary, British
Coordinating Committee.

March 6th, 1935.

Chatham House,
St. James's Square,
S.W.1.

BRITISH CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Members of the Group are requested to revise their bibliographical notes for publication in the List of Participants of the Conference

EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CONFERENCE

MEMBERSHIP OF BRITISH GROUP

Leader: THE RT.HON.SIR ARTHUR STEEL-MAITLAND, M.P.,
Hon.LL.D., Edin.; LL.D.St.Andrews;
Fellow of All Souls College, 1900;
Parliamentary Under-Secretary for the
Colonies, 1915-17; Joint Parliamentary
Under-Secretary of State for the
Foreign Office and Parliamentary
Secretary to the Board of Trade in his
capacity as Head of the Department of
Overseas Trade (Development and Intelligence),
1917-1919; Minister of Labour, November 1924-
June, 1929.

HUGH DALTON, D.S.C. (Econ.), M.A., Barrister-at-Law;
Parliamentary Under-Secretary, Foreign
Office, 1929-1931; Reader in Economics in
the University of London (London School
of Economics and Political Science).

H.LAUTERPACHT, LL.D., Lecturer in Public
International Law at the London School
of Economics and Political Science
(University of London).

THE MOST HON.THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN, C.H.,
Secretary, Rhodes Trust since 1925;
Secretary to the Prime Minister, 1916-21;
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 1931;
Parliamentary Under-Secretary, India Office,
1931-32; Chairman, Indian Franchise
Committee, 1932.

A.D.MCNAIR, LL.D., C.B.E., Barrister-at-Law;
Reader in Public International Law in the
University of Cambridge; Fellow and Law
Lecturer of Gonville and Caius College;
Associate of the Institute of International
Law.

C.A.W.MANNING, M.A., B.C.L., Barrister-at-Law;
Professor of International Relations in
the University of London. Sometime Fellow
of New College, Oxford.

DAVID MITRANY, Ph.D., D.Sc., Professor of
Political Science, Institute of Advanced
Study, Princeton, U.S.A.

ARNOLD J.TOYNBEE, Litt.D., Director of Studies,
Royal Institute of International Affairs;
Stevenson Research Professor of Inter-
national History, University of London

CHARLES K.WEBSTER, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.,
Stevenson Professor of International History,
(London School of Economics & Political
Science) since 1932; Secretary, Military
Section British Delegation, Conference of
Paris, 1918-19; Wilson Professor of Inter-
national Politics, University of Wales,
Aberystwyth, 1922-32; Professor of History,
Harvard University, 1928-32.

-2-

REAR-ADMIRAL H.G.THURSFIELD,R.N.(Retd.),late
of the Admiralty,London.

MAJOR-GENERAL J.H.MARSHALL-CORNWALL,C.B.E.,D.S.O.,
M.C., Member, General Staff Delegation,Paris
Peace Conference,1919; British Delegate,
Thracian Boundary Commission,1924-25;
Military Attaché,Berlin, Stockholm,Oslo and
Copenhagen,1928-32.

Invitations pending:-

LORD CRANBORNE
CAPTAIN J.DE V.LODER
AN AIR EXPERT.

March 19th 1935

Chatham House,
St.James's Square,
S.W.1.

January 23rd, 1935.

EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CONFERENCE

General Conference on
COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Draft Programme

Sunday, June 2nd. 8.30 p.m.

Informal Reception at
Chatham House.

Monday, June 3rd.

10.30 a.m. for 11 a.m. Inaugural Meeting at London
12.30 p.m. School of Economics

1. Address of Welcome
2. Reply to Address of
Welcome
3. Appointment of the
 - (a) Chairman of the
Study Meetings
 - (b) Bureau of the Study
Conference
 - (c) Press Committee
 - (d) Editorial Board
4. Statement by the
General Rapporteur on
the preliminary memor-
anda and on the agenda
of the Study Confer-
ence.
5. Opening Address by the
Chairman of the Study
Meetings.

1 p.m.

Lunch at London School of
Economics.

3 - 6.30 p.m.

First Administrative
Meeting.

9.00 p.m.

Evening Reception

Tuesday, June 4th.

10. a.m. -
12.30 p.m.

Study Meeting on "Collec-
tive Security"

1. Discussion of the
Chairman's and Gener-
al Rapporteur's sug-
gestions concerning
the programme and
methods of work of
the Study Meetings.

- 2 -

Tuesday, June 4th (Contd.)

2. Opening discussion on
"Collective Security".

3 - 5.30 p.m. Second Study Meeting

Wednesday, June 5th.

10 a.m. - Third Study Meeting
12.30 p.m.

3 - 5.30 p.m. Fourth Study Meeting

6 - 7 p.m. Meeting of Editorial Board

9 p.m. Meeting of Programme
Committee.

Thursday, June 6th.

10 a.m. - Fifth Study Meeting
12.30 p.m.

3 - 5.30 p.m. Sixth Study Meeting

8.30 p.m. Dinner given by the
Honourable Company of
Goldsmiths.

Friday, June 7th.

10 a.m. - Second Administrative
1 p.m. Meeting

3 - 5 p.m. Closing Study Meeting

1. General Rapporteur's
report on the results of
the two-year study of
"Collective Security"
2. Adoption of the Editorial
Board's recommendations
3. Chairman's Closing
Address

Chatham House,
St. James's Square,
S. W. 1.

BRITISH CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CONFERENCE
1935

A G E N D A

for Study Meeting on

"COLLECTIVE SECURITY"

I.

- A. The notion of Collective Security (Historical evolution.
Definition)
- B. The content - political, historical, moral - of the idea
of Collective Security.

II.

Principles and Methods of a System for the organisation of
peace.

- A. Prohibition of recourse to force.
- B. Prevention of war.
 - 1) Means of ensuring the progress of law and the respect
of justice apart from war.
 - 2) Means of ensuring the maintenance of peace in cases
of threat of war.
 - 3) Peaceful settlement of international disputes.
 - 4) Reduction and Limitation of armaments.
 - 5) Respect of international agreements. Revision of
treaties and international situations.
- C. Repression of war.
 - 1) Determination of the aggressor.
 - 2) The notion of neutrality in a system providing for
the repression of recourse to war.
 - 3) Measures of mutual assistance, and sanctions.
Regional agreements.

III.

Any other point that the Executive Committee may feel
obliged to insert when studying the material submitted.

March 19th, 1935.

Chatham House,
St. James's Square,
S.W.1.

March 30, 1935

Professor David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

My dear Professor Mitrany:

I am sending you herewith duplicate
deposit slip, receipted by Princeton Bank & Trust
Company, for \$791.66, which represents your salary
for the month of March, 1935, after having deducted
your payment of \$41.68 towards your retirement
allowance.

Very truly yours,

ESTHER S. BAILEY

Assistant Secretary

February 28, 1935

Professor D. Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kington Blount
Oxford, England

My dear Professor Mitrany:

I am sending you herewith
duplicate deposit slip, receipted by Princeton
Bank and Trust Company, for \$791.67, which
represents your salary for the month of
February 1935, after having deducted your
payment of \$41.66 towards your retirement
allowance.

Very truly yours,

EDITH S. ORLEY

Assistant Secretary

THE LOWER FARM,
KINGSTON BLOUNT,
OXFORD.

17. II. 35.

Dear Mrs. Bailey,

Thank you so much for your
continuous & faithful help. Everything seems
to work perfectly smoothly.

Would you kindly ask the Princeton
bank to remit - as soon as my February
salary is paid in - the sum of \$746.25
to the

Central Hammer Bank & Trust Co.,
70 Broadway, N.Y. - for the credit
of Westminster Bank, Ltd., Foreign
Branch Office, Lethbury, London,
- account D. Mitrany!

I am enclosing the personal advertisement
for which you asked. I think that's what you wanted?
And I am adding some copies of *Westminster*
which I found among my papers, inasmuch as because

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

That of Graham
Waller is not
a testimonial, but
a confidential
statement made
direct to the
Senate.

some of the writers are American, and
you may have some interest there.

With all good wishes and kindest regards,

Yours sincerely
S. Mitrany

Is there a small guide to Brunswick -
neighbourhood, with detailed maps, or
a bigger detailed map - I should like
to get the 'feel' of the place we are going
to live in. Perhaps you would kindly buy one
for me. Thank you again.

February 26, 1935

My dear Professor Mitrany:

I have your letter of the twelfth with enclosures, which are precisely what we need. Thank you.

I have given the Princeton Bank and Trust Company your instruction regarding the Central Hanover Bank and Trust Company, and that is being attended to. Your bank statement should come in tomorrow, and I shall hold this note and send all under one cover.

I told Mr. Flexner of your wish to purchase a copy of a Princeton guide and map, and he said, "Don't let him buy them." Mr. Collins has written a book entitled "Princeton, Past and Present", which will give you the background of the town. The map shows the village of Princeton on one side and the campus of the University on the other, so that you can study the map as you read about the town.

I hope you will be happy here. Of course, you know how much I like Princeton, and I imagine that you have also heard similar accounts from Mr. and Mrs. and Eleanor Flexner. Let me know if I can be of any assistance at any time.

With kindest regards from us all to you and Mrs. Mitrany,

Sincerely yours,

ESTHER S. BAILEY

1.30.35

Mitrany

OXFORD AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

Rockefeller Gift

An offer of the Rockefeller Foundation of £5,000 per annum for five years for the development of research in the social sciences was accepted by Congregation at Oxford University yesterday.

The Master of Balliol said it was not easy for the University to play a prominent part in research in social matters without substantial help. "We believe," he added, "that this University can conduct social research which will not suffer from that one-sided specialisation which I think has been a fault of a great deal of research during the last century in those matters. We hope by the wise spending of this money to have an instrument in Oxford for social research which does not exist anywhere else in the world."

MS. 30/3/35

January 30, '35

HILARY TERM AT OXFORD

MS.

13/4

Mitrany, D.

Study of Politics

(From our University Correspondent.)

The Hilary term at Oxford gives every prospect of being quiet and prosperous. The greatest evil to be feared during this term is an epidemic of influenza, but at present there seem to be only isolated cases.

No important issues in University affairs are before us, although there will no doubt be much discussion of an impressive article by Sir Richard Livingstone in the "Oxford Magazine" last term in which he made a plea for a permanent Vice-Chancellor. This proposal raises serious issues, and if it were ever realised would probably be accompanied by other changes in University government. The case for a permanent Vice-Chancellor is based on the need for a longer period than three years, and on the desirability of freeing the Vice-Chancellor from college duties. At present he must always be the head of a college and therefore must give some of his time to college affairs. There is, however, little prospect of any action being taken on the proposal in the immediate future.

Professor Fraenkel, who was appointed to the Corpus Chair of Latin at the end of last term, has now taken up his duties. Some resentment was caused in Oxford by certain ill-judged comments on his election in the London press during the vacation. The merits of any professorial election are, of course, open to dispute, but when it was suggested that the electors had been biased by sentimental partiality for an exile, a serious allegation against the competence of the electors was made. To anyone who knows the electors the allegation was absurd, and we in Oxford are grateful to Professor Housman for publicly testifying to Dr. Fraenkel's "European reputation."

POLITICS

The study of politics this term is accorded a more definite recognition than it has previously been given. There is now a Sub-Faculty of Politics within the Faculty of Social Studies. Politics is now officially on a par with economics in respect of organisation. This should assist those dons who are interested in political studies to watch over the interests of their subject both in teaching and in research. It cannot, and ought not to be, as clearly defined and specialised a study as economics, and it requires the services of philosophers, jurists, historians, and economists. In so far as any of these take part in political studies in Oxford they will become members of the sub-faculty and pool their knowledge and experience. The Oxford school of politics may therefore be expected to maintain a broad and eclectic outlook.

Jan. 29, 1935

January 28, 1935

Dr. David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

My dear Dr. Mitrany:

I am sending you herewith duplicate deposit
slip, receipted by Princeton Bank & Trust Company, for
\$791.67, which represents your salary for the month of
January 1935, after having deducted your payment of \$41.66
towards your retirement allowance.

Very truly yours,

ESTHER S. BAILEY
Assistant Secretary

January 21, 1935

Dear Mitrany:

My letter of December 13 must have crossed your letter of December 20.

Meanwhile, at its last meeting the Board made the first economic appointment - Dr. Winfield W. Riefler - who in addition to an excellent training in theoretical economics is something of a statistician and has had an extraordinary practical experience with economic phenomena through his association with the Federal Reserve Board and the Economic Council, which was created by President Roosevelt. Also, he is a lovely person, tolerant, open-minded, and eager to get at the truth.

I myself asked him whether five years ago he would have taken the subject of Durable Goods. He said, "No", he would not. I forget now what he would at that time have wished the point at which to insert the thin edge of the wedge.

Don't fear that there is going to be anything like the "organization of the economic unit". We are going to do in economics and politics what we did in mathematics and what my brother has done in the field of medicine - bring first-rate men together, give each of them an opportunity to work out his own salvation in the way he thinks most effective and at the same time provide the conditions under which they can be in sympathetic and helpful contact. I have not asked any one of the three persons thus far appointed what he thinks

D.M.

Jan. 21, 1935

2

about the next step any more than I asked what Einstein and Veblen what they thought about the next step. All I know is that one of the members of the mathematical group submitted to me a scheme of organization in the early days of the Institute. I read it with care and then said, "Now let us put this aside, and let us see how this thing develops as a result of your own experience with one another and with the mathematical field." You will not be surprised to know that the author of the memorandum has several times had a good laugh with me about it.

Whatever I can do to make things easy, whether it be along the line of your individual research or along the line of coöperation, I shall do, but of course I am not technically equipped to do much for you either individually or as a group and, as you are all mature scholars, each of you is responsible for his own work and nobody either among the Trustees or among the members of the School of Economics is going to try to make you "coöperate" unless coöperation is as spontaneous as it happens to have come to be over in Fine Hall.

I believe absolutely that, as you say, "good will will not be lacking". Let us wait and see what else is needed and, if so, what.

It now seems not improbable that Harle may be able to be in Princeton next autumn. I hope so. Though I do not know what you have been busy with during this year and a half, I think it would be a good thing for the three of you to have abundant opportunities to talk with one another under no pressure to produce results until you all feel that the fruit is ripe.

By way of showing you how welcome you will be I am sending you a copy of a letter which was sent to me following the announcement regarding the School of Economics by the senior members of the Princeton groups in economics and politics.

D.M.

Jan. 21, 1935

3

I venture to believe that you will find the situation here helpful, congenial, tolerant, cooperative beyond anything that you have ever known in your experience. I hope that Ena continues to improve and that it will be desirable for you and I hope, for her to be in Princeton at the beginning of October. Please shed all your doubts. There is no occasion for any. Let your mind play upon the problems congenial to it.

With all good wishes, in which Anne, Jean and Eleanor join,

Ever sincerely,

ABRAHAM FLEXNER

Professor David Mitrany
The Lower Farm
Kingston Blount
Oxford, England

AF:ESB

Mitrany

Notes
on
THE SCOPE AND METHOD OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Political philosophers have been more fortunate in their popular reputation than is usually the lot of the lawyers. Lawyers are assumed to be, at best, narrow Conservatives. Political philosophers are looked upon, as a rule, as big-hearted seers. Every period and every new movement found some writer who had sensed in good time and voiced its own aspirations. And though Morley is safe in arguing that "it is events, after all, that make the fortune of books, rather than books that create events" - nevertheless, the fact that every political event of note had its prophet has nourished a popular belief that all political philosophers have been prophets.

In that way they have secured credit beyond their deserts; or, at any rate, for what they were not. For on closer scrutiny it is but obvious that most political theorists, hardly less than the lawyers, have at all times placed their wits in the service of the powers that were. Dilke asserts, from intimate experience, that the task of the legal officers of the Crown is to find legal arguments for the policy preferred by the Cabinet. Political theorists have been no less skilful in finding philosophical arguments in support of the dominant power. They upheld the Monarchy as of divine right against the People; and with equal persuasiveness they showed it to be the embodiment of the People against the divine right that is in humanity. If, on the whole, the name of the group is fair, that is because some of them were always quick enough to speed the looming change - and, no doubt, also because of the magic that is in words, which has caused a 'lawyer' to suggest a twisty mind and a 'philosopher' a

- 2 -

guileless soul. But there is always in political thought a 'lag', which in periods of marked change is more substantial than the spurt. Political theorists, on the whole, are slow to break away from the mould in which their views have been set. Like the average chemist or physicist, they try to analyze and shape new elements with the apparatus - their political notions and institutions - which they find at hand; until disaster overtakes them or the invention of a keener mind saves them therefrom. The political theorists at the beginning of the modern era, dismayed spectators of the undoing of the medieval world, were slow to realize the meaning of the new world that was being born. They prayed and pleaded for a return to that constricted formal unity in which alone their ideas had any currency. And most political writers of our time gaze with similar dismay and reluctance upon the débacle of our political world. They strain and strive to devise some adjustment that might still allow them to use their wonted individualist principles and doctrinal canons for the shaping of our communal existence.

2. In a way, the plight of present-day political theory is much worse. The medieval theorists were guided by a harmonious philosophy, which enabled them to apply their principles with consistent logic to internal as to external society. Modern political theory has succeeded in using the same principles to justify two opposite kinds of society. Though it starts from the same philosophical premises, it arrives in the national field to conclusions that are diametrically opposed to those which it draws in the international field. It rests ultimately in every case upon natural law, from which it has extracted the all-pervading individualism of its outlook and the ideas of formal equality upon which our political institutions and laws are built. Yet the social results of these ideas are startlingly discordant. Within the State, the recognition of the individual meant that he was given a right to define the duties to which he was to be

- 3 -

subjected. Between states, the same premise has given individual states a title to refuse any duties at all. Within the State, equality was a starting point for the creation of a society holding authority over the whole. Between states, equality was interpreted as implying that no society, and therefore no authority, bound the peoples together.

The quixotic result of that supposedly rational philosophy is that, with every advance of society, the discrepancy between theory and practice deepens. If we cling to our present theory, the civilized world will get more disrupted. If we pursue our better practices, our political theory will get more disjointed. For our present theory, and the policy derived therefrom, is such that every degree added to the cohesion of the State means a corresponding dilution of its ties with other states. Ideally, the achievement of 'autarchy' would mean absolute external insulation. Principles and practice of our political life are therefore self-contradictory. For no group of population or slice of territory forms such a perfect organic unit as to warrant the assumption that what is desirable internally must be avoided externally.

Yet that is the implication of our modern political theory. It is so arbitrary that social life has in fact gone against it and, in spite of it, has evolved similar societies in both the national and the international spheres. The modern trend broke up the fixed social groups of guilds and estates and set up in their place the individual as a political unit in his own right; in the very same way old and newer empires were broken up to be replaced by individual state units. Nationalism was for the peoples what democracy was for the individuals. The nineteenth century - ending with the new arrangements brought about by the Great War - was peculiarly a period during which the political individuality of nations was discovered and recognized. It was a period during which an ever greater number of nations was enfranchised; in the same way in which an

ever greater number of individuals was enfranchised within each nation. And as that process of citizen-making moved step by step with the discovery of new worlds and with the revolution in our economic life, the states of the world like the citizens of each state were bound increasingly together by a growing division of labor. In the light of that living interdependence among states the idea of their independence became a fiction; and, in keeping with that, their formal sovereignty was sacrificed by them more and more upon the altar of their social needs. The extensive web of treaties and conventions which in the last hundred years has spread over the civilized world is nothing else, in a different sphere, but what the mass of social laws has come to be in the national sphere. Until the inescapable demands of their existence have now led the nations - "half drawn, half succumbing," and with truly sovereign disregard for their formally still absolute sovereignty - to gather into a society with a Constitution, with a system of representation and with organs of administration in no way differing in their nature from those which form the political skeleton of every state.

3. Political science is clearly concerned with the life of that emerging society. Its task is nothing less than to discover from it and for it principles which would provide a continuous channel for social progress. They would have to be principles free from the innate contradictions which lurk in modern political theory: which would relate any advance within a group to that between groups; which when used in one place would by their very nature further their use all round; which, in brief, would correlate rather than isolate action within the various units of government.

It is a serious and urgent question whether political science can do that, as long as it persists in the present tendency to submit to a filial connection with jurisprudence and political theory. That there is something wrong in the very material and tools with which the latter works is seen from its apparent inability to escape from one of two extreme alternatives. Taken in groups, political theorists may be said either to

- 5 -

abhor or to worship the State. Life is in none of its aspects as absolute. But political theory is led to try and make political life so, because it finds itself caught in the dilemma of an inherent and growing incompatibility between form and function in the modern State. One can see very clearly its trials and failings by looking at the difficulties which confront living English theorists, from whom I might select three to illustrate my point, because they can in a general way all be described as progressive and universalist in their ideals.

Professor Ernest Barker is different in so far as he works with individualist principles. His doctrine, as stated as recently as 1928, insists that "a true internationalism . . . must recognize the existence of the State in all its fullness, and it must strive to comprehend states in its fold without any derogation from the fullness of their being." Professor Laski is, by contrast, a pluralist and a collectivist. In an essay first published in 1929 he argues that states have no claim to predominance over groups and associations within them, but that international authority must possess absolute predominance over states. Professor Laski tries to set aside the sovereign title to the State and, with formal logic, to transfer it to the civitas maxima. Like Professor Barker, he still accepts the State as a solid unit, which can only be tamed by being chained. Moreover, his theory provides only a basis for the defiance of one authority and for the definition of another, but not an active principle of political development. Above all, the argument would seem to suffer from a philosophical contradiction: for if groups within a State have a claim to autonomy, why not nations or other groups under a world authority? The answer is supplied, without intent, by another collectivist, Mr. Bertrand Russell. Mr. Russell having come to politics by choice rather than by training drives straight to his goal, untrammelled by democratic inhibitions, and unwittingly shows where we might end with such a political theory as Mr. Laski's. He, too, believes

in a World State. But being a practical reformer he demands, in his latest book, a world system of education which should inculcate allegiance to that World State; echoing Professor Miles Walker who, in his presidential address to the Engineering Section of the British Association, last summer, pleaded for a World State in which one and the same language should be taught in all schools.

A number of other distinguished writers, like Duguit and Krabbe and Kelsen, have questioned the ability of our traditional political theory to guide the evolution of the modern State; their own ingenious political theories, no doubt, would make a State more congenial to some of us than Hegel's - . . . The so-called sociological school - not only the Marxians, but others, of whom Oppenheimer is the best known - have gone beyond that. They set aside all political theory in examining the State. But they have been concerned almost wholly with the origins of the State; and they were thus concerned, moreover, to discredit the State's genealogy by showing it to have issued from conquest and oppression. Their conclusions may be unanswerable. But they do not teach us much about the evolution of the State as an instrument of social life, and nothing at all about its present problems. - . . . Perhaps the most instructive attitude for our argument is that of the 'geo-political' school. Having been started as a gentle plant by Ratzel and Kjellén it has, since the War, grown suddenly into a very forest, mainly in Germany, with many textbooks and a learned periodical of its own. Its aim is the study of political evolution in the light of geographical factors. Here, if anywhere, one might have expected a free-thinking approach to politics. So far one discovers instead a tendency to create a natural science of the State, which is studied as "a living personality" in "whose nature it is to grow."

All these views, therefore, so diverse in their sources and trends, have yet in common what psychoanalysis would call a 'state fixation.' They all assume the State to be a rigid, organic unit and proceed therefrom

to argue, in keeping with their ultimate ideals, either that it must be maintained as it is or destroyed altogether. That is inevitable as long as these views stand upon the basis of modern political theory. In contrast to medieval theory, the ideas which underlie our modern government link up lay authority with a territorial jurisdiction. The State is the most developed product of that union which we know - a supreme territorial authority, with comprehensive functions and jurisdiction within those physical limits. Even those, therefore, who now see its shortcomings or believe it to be an obstacle to progress can only think of new institutions still built after its own image. They may wish them to be national or imperial, to be merged into continental units or into a global unit; but they still assume that our political life must inevitably rest upon such a union of authority and territory, and informed by the tenets of a rounded body of doctrine. And when faced with the contradictions which spring from their very theory, they seek a temporary escape in proposing, as the case may be, either to contract or to expand the functions and the relevant power of the State, in forlorn alternation. To that is due the seemingly wilful swinging of our political outlook from collectivism to individualism, and back again; and the apparently insoluble conflict between social equality and individual liberty. They are not due, in spite of all appearance, to the vagaries of our temper and tastes, but rather to the linking up of political life to a comprehensive territorial authority. Clearly, such a combination bars the way to more selective and realistic solutions. An authoritarian period, with the State claiming a say in every aspect of social life, gives way as a reaction to a period of laissez faire, with the individuals confining the say of the State to the least; until war or some other communal problem ushers in a fresh period of collective control, when the need for social action outweighs again and for the time being the desire for individual liberty. But always the State, having special jurisdiction, has to be held

- 8 -

either to great or to small power over life within those limits. Doctrine is definite and cannot allow that power to be hybrid. The State, like the Church, cannot be both high and low. Its power cannot be strong enough to ensure social equality without being too strong to allow individual liberty. And so the burthen of political philosophy shifts perennially from the dangers of anarchy to the dangers of obedience, from an exaltation of the State to the execration of the State - because the State apparently is so omnipresent and all-pervading that you must either love it or hate it.

4. It is not easy to explain the vice in which the idea of the State holds modern political speculation. One can but suspect that our supposedly rational philosophy has in truth a dogmatic core. Though described as a perfect social unit, "existing for itself and through itself alone," the State is really so unfulfilled as an individuality that we cannot understand the nature and life of any one State unless we study them in the light of its relations with contemporary or former states, and of the general trend of history. Though it is supposed to be the creation of "irresistible natural forces," the modern State has to use continually the most unnatural means to maintain its internal cohesion and its external form. The State, as we have it, was not known to the ancient and, especially, to the Eastern World; and even in Western Europe it is but of recent origin. Now only is it spreading to the East, just when vigorously attacked and disparaged in the West; for we at the same time are finding out, with all the reluctance and resistance of a mystic tradition, that our new social ends cannot be satisfied through the State. That much is clear from the difficulties in which the attempt at a new international system finds itself. The problem has not been simplified - in a way it has been made worse - by the creation of the League. For the League is based on a system of states and is pledged to their maintenance and protection. But one cannot maintain the State in its "fullness" without investing it with power; and one cannot

invest it with power without its becoming in the same degree recalcitrant to any superior authority.

No matter, therefore, what angle we may give to our customary instrument of theory, the difficulties which arise in social life from what I have called our State fixation recur in one form if not in another. We might continue with the present endeavor to build a new world upon the basis of the national State. But we must then face, first, the difficulty of fitting the structure and the legal status of the State into an international system. And, secondly, even if we were to succeed in that, the danger will always remain that under the stress of some serious difference or crisis the new society may revert to its present individualism. Alternatively, a World State would avoid the first difficulty, but not the second. For unlike the ancient and medieval worlds, when conceptions proceeded from a Whole to the particular, the modern world has to start from the particular towards the Whole; and any reassertion of those particularisms would mean the break-up of the unified structure. A World State could only escape the Scylla of that division by rushing into the Charybdis of an imposed uniformity, just as the national State has everywhere found it necessary to create by arbitrary means a cohesive and reliable national outlook; with the only difference, that the degree of uniformity and of constraint would have to be increased with the number and variety of the groups involved.

If the ultimate end of society is to enrich the personality of its members, then the prospect opened up by such a solution is not ideal. It matters little from that point of view whether the heavy hand which chokes that quintessence of social progress is that of a foreign or of a native ruler. It matters just as little whether it will be wielded by a national or by a universal State. Hobhouse points out that the word 'humanity' has a double connotation - which well indicates that the physical collectivity of the human race is merely the vehicle for its spiritual elevation. The

- 10 -

most satisfactory possible expression of modern political theory, the World State, might come to comprehend the first only to misrepresent the second. One cannot so raise the standing and extend the limits of an authority without a grave danger, if its jurisdiction remains comprehensive, that in caring for our material needs it may show little sense and tolerance for any spiritual needs that might complicate its task.

That danger is greater under present conditions than it would have been in earlier times. Our society is made infinitely more complex now by an extreme division of labor, both national and international. At the same time, it is no longer held together by those fixed rules of conduct which once were derived from religious or caste or guild discipline. Nowadays lay authority has both the task of coordinating our extremely complex social life and the right to impose the correspondingly wide and hard rules which may be needed to that end. In order to escape the pressure of authority, which inevitably follows from the performance of function, the revolutionary period which put an end to Benevolent Despotism chose the looser bonds of the laissez-faire State. International relations, too, which only became intense with the Industrial Revolution, were on the whole carried on during that period on a basis of laissez-faire and free trade. Our time, however, has seen the debacle of laissez-faire philosophy. In every field and in every direction the sails are set full towards organized social life. But the change came about through the pressure of conditions, accidental and cataclysmic. It was not ushered in, as even revolutionary changes have been in the past, by the deliberate and insistent philosophical preparation of our outlook and of our schemes. We have been caught in a torrential stream of utterly new conditions and problems without having had occasion, or time, to devise as yet any other basis of political organization. Hence, the not unnatural tendency to follow the line of least resistance and to guide the new current into the only effective political channel

- 11 -

we know - the territorial State; with merely such variations in scale as the more idealistic or more sceptical reformers think desirable.

5. It should be the task of political science to study in a more rational sense the problem of government in human society. It should be its aim to seek those principles and instruments of government which would seem best fitted to serve the twin ends of social life: the effective organization of our material conditions as a means to the fuller development of our spiritual life. That does in no way mean that political scientists are called upon to construct and support any particular form of government. On the contrary, their function is to show, in as detached a manner as may be humanly possible, how certain things might be done and others avoided; and their work and conclusions would have to rest, therefore, upon a basis of experience and observation which could be adapted by others and tested by others, and not upon a doctrinal system which must be accepted or rejected as it stands. For if a Weltanschauung is indispensable, as a general canvas, to every humanistic discipline, that does not imply an equal need for a doctrine concerning the political form of society. We could not, indeed, remain faithful to our social philosophy without constantly changing our political doctrine, or cling to our political doctrine without a continuous compromise on our social philosophy. A consistent social philosophy almost postulates a variable political instrument, for conditions of life and therefore problems of government are in perpetual evolution.

If this general assumption is sound, then one may lay down as a preliminary conclusion that the principles and method of political science must begin by breaking away from those upon which political theory now relies. Since the break-up of the medieval empire, political theory has been continuously engaged in defining the place and power of the new political factors exercising authority in the State. It has had to settle the juridical relations between State and State; and internally between State

and its subjects. In passing it may be noted that it is implicit in such a task that it should operate against a background of conflict. Attribution of power to one factor inevitably means in a corresponding degree reduction in the power of another factor. Hence the theoretical conclusions of political theory represent at each stage an attempt to strike a balance of power between the contending factors, and practical application has often been concerned more with checking the use of power than with guiding it. Even such friendly ideas as 'general will' and 'social contract' were in the hands of political theorists not so much ploughshares as swords. Even the discussion around laissez-faire was conducted with arguments not as to what was desirable for society, but as to what was permissible or not to authority. In other words, political theory has concerned itself primarily with the possession of power rather than with the use to which that power was put. But government is now increasingly a performance of functions and services. The governed seem willing to concede any powers that may be needed for the service they desire; while always inclined to question the possession of the first without the performance of the second. Hence, our politics are concerned no longer with a static division of powers, in accordance with a Constitutional pact, but instead with a dynamic and variable concession of powers in accordance with the specific requirements of individual acts of government. This clearly indicates the scope of the work that needs to be done. We need, so to speak, a study of political relativity - of the relation between power and function at the seat of government. Such a line of inquiry would be scientific rather than juridical; and its conclusions would have to be stated not in constitutional doctrines but rather in sociological formulae.

In the second place, one may lay down that the acceptance of existing political divisions and forms would be both inadequate and mislead-

- 13 -

ing as a starting point for such work. It would bring in, however subtly and unconsciously, the national and other prejudices on which we have been bred. If 'scientific' means the elimination of irrelevant factors, then economic and political issues cannot be examined and valued scientifically when linked up to the accidental background of existing political divisions, issued from some distant historical situation which may no longer have any meaning for the social life of that particular community. And such a starting point would be also inadequate, for it would offer no true standards with which to measure when an authority is assuming too much or too little power. A true scientific inquiry would take no political rules and institutions for granted. What is permanent, is the need for social action. The character of that action, and the nature of the instruments through which it is performed, is as eternally changing. The first task of political science should be to throw light upon the needs and conditions which brought into being certain political instruments. It would have to do so through comparative inquiry, both in time and in space. That would provide a systematic body of knowledge, being in a way the results of past experiment. On that basis political science could proceed to an analysis of our own times, so as to find out in what manner and degree the conditions which brought past or existing political institutions into being have changed. Then, and only then, could it venture to formulate those sociological formulae which would attempt to state what kind of political institution and authority would be best fitted, under given conditions, to perform a particular social function - when and in so far as it may be desired to have it performed through public authority. If one may venture a hypothesis at all, it is that such a line of work would tend to show that not all social functions can be effectively performed by one and the same type of authority: that certain mechanical arrangements, for the satisfaction of material needs, might best be devised upon the largest possible scale; and that other arrangements, which come nearer to our personal needs, would give

- 14 -

better satisfaction on a scale even smaller than that upon which they are carried out in the national State.

But one cannot well anticipate the result of a line of work which being so unorthodox must also be patient. If political science, however, is to deserve its name and to earn its bread it must be bold enough to break up new trails. It must refuse to concern itself any longer with ways and means which might justify and sustain certain political institutions. It must explore instead the nature of political institutions which would be fitted to carry out certain social functions. It should neither praise nor disparage the State: it should ignore it; and conduct its work and state its conclusions without regard to existing popular beliefs or with the intent of creating new ones. It should be neither for nor against the State, but above it; for it should be in the service of lasting ends and not of ephemeral instruments. Political theory has tended - perhaps more by its treatment than by its substance - to look upon political institutions as ends in themselves. It has merely varied the object of its interest in consonance with historical changes - from imperial and papal power to monarchy, from monarchy to the sovereign people and the democratic state. But in regard to each of them its devotion has been as absolute and its creed as rigid at one time as at another. It might be said indeed that while the Western peoples have conquered their political institutions, the institutions themselves have remained bound to the dogmatic intolerance of former years. The autocratic State was never so well guarded by the watchdogs of theory as is the popular State. The rational emancipation of political life has in fact merely changed the object of veneration, but not the habit of veneration; and the supposed political freedom of Western society is in truth but a servitude once removed. We are the slaves no longer of kings but of constitutions. So far, the change from rule by deity to rule by an ordained prince and, finally, to rule by the hallowed demos has kept throughout the seat of power in the teleological sphere. But now that we have come to look upon govern-

- 15 -

ment no longer as something to be feared but as something to be used, it should be possible at last to link up authority to a function rather than to a fetish. If we are to establish a political society that will approach as nearly as possible to the ideal ambiance for the fruition of human personality - by offering it equality of opportunity and freedom of expression - we must make our institutions as free of dogma as we have made ourselves free of our institutions. Political science, the science of organized society, has before it the inspiring task of showing how the great achievements of the exact sciences might be used for the continuous progress of the human race.