

tain their position as the providers of an information "safety net," but recognize that without some major changes they will be bypassed by new technology. The scholarly community—some of the most consistent users of government information—are neither organized nor vocal. It is clear that we are likely to wake up to find that some of our key government information is no longer available, or that the most useful information is only available at a commercial price beyond our means.

In defining both the scholar's stake and position in this on-going battle it is important that we recognize that we neither can nor should retard movement toward more government information being provided in electronic formats just so that we can remain comfortable in our ability to use existing formats. Our position must be one of hailing the potential of new technology, but being ever watchful for examples where applications of technology reduce our access and/or competitive advantage. There seems to be enough room in the government information realm for a healthy mix of formats and delivery mechanisms. Scholars need to fight for their rights to continue to play on the new information playing field. Our potential allies and opponents are neither fixed nor always clear. It is not a matter of lining up against the vendors in favor of direct government dissemination, but rather seeking ways in which the unique needs and resources of the academic community can be better served through vendor recognition and accommodation. We should support the efforts of the library community as our advocates, but recognize that our interests might lie in revising the ways in which libraries traditionally collect and/or disseminate information. We need to make ourselves known to the government agencies whose information we use, sensitizing them to our needs and desires, and making ourselves a visible constituency.

The electronic information age offers tremendous potential for creating a better informed society. Some scholars are already reaping the benefits and frustrations of the "electronic ivory tower," but most are just beginning to recognize the potential advantages and dangers. Our first step lies in understanding the issues outlined in

the OTA study as they apply to our interests. The next step lies in activating and sensitizing our professional organizations. Finally, as the issues develop into policy in the legislative process we must make ourselves heard both through our professional organizations and individually.

## **Southern Political Science Association 1988 Manning J. Dauer, Jr. Award To Evron M. Kirkpatrick**

---

### **Walter E. Beach**

Senior Staff Member, Brookings Institution, and Chairperson, Manning J. Dauer Committee

In recognition of the nearly fifty years of distinguished service of Manning J. Dauer to the Southern Political Science Association, the Association established the Manning J. Dauer, Jr. Endowment Fund shortly after his death in 1987. The fund provides



WALTER E. BEACH

## The Profession

for a biennial award to an individual who has performed exceptional service to the profession of political science in the tradition of the dedicated and able service personified by Manning J. Dauer of the University of Florida. The exceptional service to the Southern Political Science Association by Professor Dauer included a term as president, and long tenures as secretary-treasurer and Managing Editor of the *Journal of Politics*. It also embodied commitment and affection for the development and prosperity of the Association.

An Association committee composed of Naomi Lynn, Georgia State University; Malcolm Jewell, University of Kentucky; and myself, was established to raise an endowment to support a \$500 honorarium and to select the first recipient of the award. We are pleased to report that with respect to our first task we have raised approximately \$8,500 for the award endowment, including a generous gift of \$2,000 from the University of Florida. We wish publicly to thank donors.

We are also pleased to report that our second task has been fulfilled with the selection of Evron M. Kirkpatrick as the first recipient of the Manning Dauer Award. Dr. Kirkpatrick was the immediate and unanimous choice of our committee. The exceptional and able service by Dr. Kirkpatrick is in the tradition of his long-time friend, Manning Dauer, and, indeed, his acceptance of the award further enhances its significance.

The dimensions of Evron Kirkpatrick's service and leadership in political science are vast, including institutional development, intellectual direction, scholarly contributions, and public service. The central arena for his accomplishments was during his tenure as Executive Director of the American Political Science Association from 1954 to 1981, although before his appointment and since his retirement he displayed the same talents and made vital achievements.

Before he came to APSA, Dr. Kirkpatrick served on Association committees, including the Committee on Political Parties, was a member of the University of Minnesota political science faculty, and played a central role with his prize stu-

dents Hubert Humphrey, Orville Freeman, Arthur Naftalin, and Max Kampelman, in the evolution of the Minnesota Democratic Farm Labor Party into its victorious coalition.

As Executive Director of the American Political Science Association for twenty-seven years, Dr. Kirkpatrick developed institutional resources to insure effective membership services, programs, and publications; he created an intellectual environment which allowed a broad range of approaches to political science to flourish; he gave active support and encouragement to political science organizations at the state, regional, national, and international levels; he engaged actively to ensure the place and support of political science and political scientists in the halls of government, including provision for funding by the National Science Foundation, support for the Congressional Fellowship Program, seminars for freshman state legislators and Members of Congress, and service on the Presidential Commission on Registration and Voting and the Presidential Task Force on Career Advancement in Federal Service. Finally, he made a continuing effort to provide educational programs for secondary social studies teachers, small college professors and journalists. The discipline, profession, and associations of political science grew and prospered enormously on his watch.

Since he retired as Executive Director of APSA, Dr. Kirkpatrick has remained active in the world of political science and public service as President of the Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation, which supports an APSA award in the international area, and publishes a number of significant journals in the field of political science. He is a member of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace, President of the American Peace Society and Editor of its journal, *World Affairs*. Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Institute for American Universities, and a member of the Advisory Board of the Hubert Humphrey Institute of the University of Minnesota.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick has received a number of honors for his service to political science, including an honorary degree

from Indiana University, the National Capital Area Political Science Association Pi Sigma Alpha Award, the APSA Committee on the Status of Blacks Award for service and leadership, and APSA's Charles E. Merriam Award. He was also honored by the American Political Science Association with the establishment of the Evron M. Kirkpatrick Fund which supports the Pi Sigma Alpha Oral History Project and a monograph series on the craft of political science.

## Comment on the NEH Report *Humanities in America*

*Editor's Note: The following paper was prepared by the Policy Planning Committee of the National Humanities Alliance, and permission has been given for reprinting in PS. The APSA is a member of the National Humanities Alliance.*

The release of *Humanities in America*, a report by NEH Chair Lynne V. Cheney, prepared in response to a 1985 Congressional mandate, will surely stimulate consideration of the achievements, shortcomings, and future of the humanities. In the hope of assisting public discussion, the Policy Planning Committee and the Board of Directors of the National Humanities Alliance (NHA) wish to call attention to several issues readers of the report should note. We divide our remarks concerning the report into three sections, indicating points of agreement first, statistics requiring cautious interpretation second, and points of disagreement last.

The NHA is an independent federation of 54 learned and professional societies, organizations representing museums, libraries, historic organizations, and other non-profit institutions committed to enhancing the place of humanistic inquiry in American life and to assisting in development of federal policies for the support of research, teaching, and other humanities activities. A list of NHA's members is attached. The views expressed in this docu-

ment should not be taken to be those of every member of the Alliance.

I

We support Mrs. Cheney's recognition of the growth of public interest in exhibitions, public humanities programs, musical and theatrical performances, and media programming of the past two decades.

*College and university enrollments have remained stable, while enrollments in some humanities courses have increased.*

Our museum constituency takes particular satisfaction in the acknowledgment of the important educational role played by their institutions.

We join her in praising the achievements of the state humanities councils in public programming. The rich variety of state council programs has made an indispensable contribution to the "parallel school" of public learning to which Mrs. Cheney refers.

Finally, we agree with her comments on the potential of humanities programming in the mass media, particularly in television and film.

II

However, we find the report's statistics (p. 4) regarding the study of the humanities in colleges and universities incomplete. Because the cited statistics focus on the beginning and end points of a complex period (1966 and 1986), the report overlooks a number of significant changes within the period. Using only these statistics obscures the fact that college and university enrollments did not increase uniformly throughout the period and minimizes growth in humanities enrollments since 1980. Consequently, the report draws a conclusion that seems to us unduly negative.