

*Area Studies in American Universities.* By WILLIAM NELSON FENTON for the Commission on Implications of Armed Services Educational Programs. (Washington: American Council on Education, 1947. Pp. 89. Paper. \$1.00.)

*Language and Area Studies in the Armed Services: Their Future Significance.* By ROBERT JOHN MATHEW for the Commission on Implications of Armed Services Educational Programs. (Washington: American Council on Education, 1947. Pp. xix, 211. \$2.50.)

*Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences.* By ROBERT B. HALL for the Committee on World Area Research. (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947. Pp. 90. Paper.)

Dr. Fenton reports the results of a survey of language and area study programs under the ASTP and the CATP, a survey undertaken in 1943 by the wartime Ethnographic Board, with the backing of the Smithsonian Institution and the American Council of Learned Societies. While finding much of permanent value in the programs, Dr. Fenton's report has, generally speaking, a tentative character. Among its significant conclusions, however, may be noted its emphasis upon an ethnographic approach to area study: "Integrated area study, then, may be defined as the focusing of all the disciplinary competences (geography, history, economics, languages and literature, philosophy, political science and the like) upon a cultural area for the purpose of obtaining a total picture of that culture" (p. 82).

The second report is the culmination of a study first undertaken during the war by a committee of the Modern Language Association. It is based upon a survey of Army and Navy foreign language and area programs. As its origin might suggest, it is more concerned with problems of intensive language instruction than with the broader aspects of area study. There is, however, a general consideration of the practicability of applying both intensive language instruction and area study to peace-time college programs. Part Two of the report deals with current effects in our colleges and schools. Again, the major emphasis is upon language instruction. The broader question of area studies in general is left in the form of a series of stimulating questions (pp. 172-176) raised by the war-time experience.

The Social Science Research Council survey, the results of which are reported by Robert B. Hall, is a follow-up of the other two. Twenty-four universities were visited and surveyed during 1946. Twenty of them reported undergraduate area programs in operation and one other had such a program pending. A majority had graduate programs, either

in operation or pending, while a considerably smaller number had area research programs, mostly in the planning stage. Area study has apparently been an outstanding post-war development, and Latin America is one of the areas most frequently defined. Among the conclusions of the report the following may be noted: (1) "Language is not the end of area study" (p. 71); (2) "A program which does not offer highly integrated knowledge of the area studied fails in one of the main objectives of area study" (p. 72); (3) "where possible a minor concentration in a selected discipline should be required in addition to the area major" (pp. 72-73); (4) in most cases the doctor's degree should be taken in a particular discipline, limiting the degrees awarded for area study to the M.A.

An interesting commentary on these reports appears in the *Forty-Second Annual Report* (1946-47) of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which gives considerable space to a discussion of the "broad and urgent" need for area studies. The Hall report is mentioned by name, as are two other important and pertinent studies: *The Teaching of International Relations* by Grayson Kirk (Council on Foreign Relations), and the *Report of the Interdepartmental Commission of Inquiry on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies*, Lord Scarbrough, chairman.

HAROLD E. DAVIS.

The American University.