

**3rd International Risk Assessment and Horizon Scanning Symposium
(IRAHSS 2010) * March 15-16, 2010 * Singapore * www.rahs.org.sg**

Theme: “Strategic Anticipation: Developing Effective Strategies for the Future”

Panel 4: New Approaches for Strategic Anticipation

**Better Scanning and Beyond: Old Ideas and New
“Right Balance” Frontiers for Foresight**

by Michael Marien

(former editor, *Future Survey*, World Future Society; 1979-2008)

(director, New and Forthcoming Books project; www.globalforesightbooks.org)

The opportunity to fly, literally, to the other side of the world, allows me to get a better perspective on what I have been doing to understand our fast-changing world. In addition to taking a huge trip in space, I wish to take this opportunity to step back in time, and to offer some autobiography on how I started what I have been doing for 40 years, and some lessons learned along the way that may be relevant to horizon scanning and strategic anticipation. My position is not necessarily better, but it is different, so some background should help.

I set out to graduate school in 1965 with the mission of trying to learn “what’s happening,” which essentially translates as horizon scanning. As you well know, no institution in the world gives degrees in “what’s happening.” And so I defined the quest somewhat more narrowly as studying interdisciplinary social science. There were two programs available at the time, and I went to Syracuse University, where I was fortunate to meet Bertram Gross, who headed a one-man National Planning Studies Program. Although I took several courses with Gross, who also guided my doctoral dissertation, I never took a course per se in “national planning.” Three lessons learned: 1) What’s Happening? is closely intertwined with two other futures-oriented questions: What is likely to happen or may happen? And the normative question, What ought to happen or what should we do? 2) The social sciences provide a large amount of insight into What’s Happening? But the question cannot be fully and reasonably explored without understanding what happened in the past, what’s happening to the environment, the recent and anticipated impacts of new technologies, and thinking in the various professions, especially law. 3) National Planning could be a valuable focus for study, especially if combined with global studies (now in vogue) or global planning studies, but I know of no programs that focus on national or global planning. “National Planning,” as I now realize, is a taboo term in America. We have national planning of sorts, but we don’t call it that because it is highly decentralized and extremely competitive; indeed, at the moment, the process is largely gridlocked.

Continuing on my autobiography, after completing my coursework in 1968, I joined the Educational Policy Research Center at Syracuse, one of two “think tanks” funded by the U.S. Office of Education under Great Society impetus (the other being at Stanford, under Willis Harman), to think about the future and its implications for education. At that point I became an instant “futurist,” and I still treasure a hand-typed note from Ed Cornish, founder of the World Future Society in 1966, inviting me to become a member of WFS. A year later, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris contracted with EPRC to provide an overview of futures-thinking in the US, which was an ascendant vogue (what we might now call a “bubble”) in the late 1960s. The EPRC director asked me to do an annotated bibliography of the futures literature in general and education reform in particular, and I published my first literature survey in 1970 (1). At that point, I became the world expert in futures literature, albeit by virtue of being the only person who was trying to put it together. Since then, I have been doing various literature surveys and biblio-integrations in one form or another. And I owe it all to OECD! Lessons learned: 1) there is a lot of “futures literature” to discover; 2) discovering it, like any scholarly specialty, is addictive; 3) horizontal thinking though biblioscans are a great way to learn about “what’s happening.”

My four years at EPRC ended in 1972, when the Nixon mentality finally seeped down to our level, and the broad and open-ended mission was redirected to more narrow policy questions. I then turned entrepreneurial, and self-published *Societal Directions and Alternatives* in 1976, a 400-page critical guide to 917 items. It was a commercial success, in that I sold out the 1,500 copies I had printed; indeed, I was so busy mailing out copies that I never considered writing a spin-off article on key themes. Lessons learned from SD&A: 1) there is a lot of futures literature to discover; 2) this literature is disconnected, and no one tries to synthesize it in any way (I was amused at the time, prefacing my collection with a reprint of the 19th century poem by John Godfrey Saxe, “The Blind Men and the Elephant” about six men of Indostan who saw only part of the elephant); 3) most important, we don’t think about the future today as we did in the 1970s.

To elaborate on this third point, in the late 1960s to mid-1970s, there was a flood of societal titling and evolutionary stage theories. I identified 81 titles of where we were, such as the learning society (Robert Hutchins, 1968), a knowledge society (Peter F. Drucker, 1969), the computerized society (James Martin and Adrian Norman, 1970), the unprepared society (Donald N. Michael, 1968), and the stalled society (Michel Crozier, 1970). I also identified 63 stage theories, such as transition from civilized society to post-civilized society (Kenneth Boulding, 1964), from democracy to technocracy (Jean Meynaud, 1964), from the mechanical age to the electric age (Marshall McLuhan, 1964), from industrial society to post-industrial society (Daniel Bell, 1966 and 1973), from industrial society to technetronic society (Zbigniew Brezezinski, 1970), from industrialism to super-industrialism (Alvin Toffler, 1970), from metropolis and megalopolis to ecumenopolis (Constantinos Doxiadis, 1968), from the machine age to the systems age (Russell Ackoff, 1974). And I distilled a list of 206 titles for desirable societies that we ought to have, e.g. self-renewing society (John Gardner, 1964), a person-centered society (Willis Harman, 1969), the mature society (Dennis Gabor, 1972), global homeostasis (Ervin Laszlo, 1974). All of this is still informative.

Today, the labeling activity for society, both descriptive and prescriptive, has virtually disappeared, as well as any attempt at evolutionary stage theories. The certitude about our direction has vanished. Bill Halal's notion that we are undergoing an evolutionary crisis of maturity is about as close to a stage theory as anyone has come in some time, but he doesn't offer his vision with strong certainty. Rather, the gloomy futures-thinking of today is generally addressed to problems in specific sectors and complex problems, such as climate change, the economic crisis, terrorism, and sustainability. An excellent example of this gloomy thinking is an essay by Harvard historian Niall Ferguson in the March-April 2010 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, pointing to how quickly empires collapse, and suggesting that the fate of Rome, Britain, and the Soviet Union could soon befall the United States because of our fiscal woes. There was a lot of social criticism in the 1960s and 1970s, but nothing close to this bleak image of the future.

The *Future Survey* Years

After SD&A, I started a bi-monthly newsletter in 1978, "Public Policy Book Forecast," which was a clear commercial failure, poorly produced and publicized. So I looked for an organization to help out, and teamed up with the World Future Society to produce a monthly publication, *Future Survey*, which began in 1979 and lasted for 30 years, publishing more than 21,000 abstracts of futures-relevant books, reports, and articles. It was a glorious run, especially in the early years. Some of you may be familiar with the Walt Disney character Scrooge McDuck, the consummate capitalist (and unlikely uncle of Donald Duck) who amused himself by wallowing in his money bin that was roughly the size of an indoor tennis court. I often felt like Scrooge McDuck wallowing in review copies of the latest futures-relevant books, which often accumulated to more than 30 shelf-feet, or five times my height! Lessons re-learned from the *Future Survey* years: 1) there is really a lot of futures-relevant literature out there (although much of it doesn't have the f-word on the book cover); 2) this literature is more disconnected and fragmented than ever; 3) our conception and management of the so-called "knowledge society" appears to be seriously flawed—i.e., if we are so smart and well-educated, with so much knowledge at our disposal, than why are most societies today in such a mess, and why is "global megacrisis" an increasingly appropriate descriptor of our condition?

It was entirely my decision to end *Future Survey* in December 2008. I did so for five reasons: 1) it was increasingly getting to be a burden to put out the monthly issue, and no one wanted to take over or share the editorial duties as I entered my so-called retirement years; 2) subscriptions @\$109 per year were declining to about half of what they had been a decade earlier (this decline, I'm sorry to say, was in tandem with a fivefold decline in WFS membership, from a peak of nearly 60,000 in 1980 to just a bit more than 12,000 members today); 3) I had a chronic sense that I was covering only a third to a half of the books that deserved to be covered; 4) completing 30 years was an appropriate moment to call it quits; 5) most important, FS was decidedly oriented to print in an increasingly digital age.

I really had nothing in mind when I ended FS, other than finding time to write and relax a bit. But, as previously noted, chasing books is an addictive activity, and it wasn't

long before I began to fret about all of the good titles I was missing, and how they might best be captured.

The New Website: GFB.org

And so I started writing “mini-abstracts” of new and forthcoming futures-relevant books announced in some 70 publisher catalogs and websites, and this has led to creating a new website independent of the World Future Society. I am pleased to announce here that the new website— www.globalforesightbooks.org —was unveiled just this past week, with mini-abstracts of some 800 titles, readily accessed in seven ways: 25 generic categories, specific subject search, specific subject scroll, author search, author scroll, publisher search, and by selected overlapping lists of Recommended Books and of Paradigm-Breaking Books that purport to give a fresh angle on an important issue. I have no idea as to whether you will find it very useful, of limited use, or of no use. Try it out and let me know, but please note that the collection of 800 titles from 2009 and 2010 is still incomplete, albeit sufficient for starters to give you an idea of what is out there and how I think it ought to be presented. For example, check out the 40-50 titles each on climate change, the economic crisis, development, and security. Just two clicks and you will get it. Ultimately, once fully caught up toward the end of 2010, I hope to be reporting on about 1,000 titles per year. The GFB website lacks the depth of FS abstracts, but will offer greater breadth and timeliness of coverage, important for these turbulent times. Unlike FS, which was financed by subscriber fees, access to the GFB website is free, and I am hoping that a sufficient number of enlightened individuals and organizations will volunteer as sponsors so as to make this demonstration sustainable.

Some lessons that are being re-learned and re-enforced at the new website:

- ~ Roughly 1000 futures-relevant books in the English language are being published each year—about 2-3 times the number covered in *Future Survey*. American publishers are increasingly becoming global publishers of authors from many countries, and issues are increasingly global issues, or national issues such as healthcare and education where international comparisons can be fruitful. Yes, the number of current affairs books is huge, and very few people will be interested in all of them. But most people, especially horizon scanners, ought to be interested in many of them, or at least some selected titles.
- ~ Although books are by no means the only source of information that one must consider for horizon scanning, they certainly should be a major source if not the major source. (2) (Just in quantity alone, they usually contain much more information than articles in journals, magazines, and newspapers—all of which deserve scanning.)
- ~ In a rapidly changing world, the universe of futures-relevant information appears, on average, to have a half-life of about a year or two. On the one hand, it is necessary to stop on top of what is new, and even assess forthcoming books; on the other hand, some futures-relevant information retains value for many years, if not decades. Thus, better scanning requires both a speed-up in looking forward, and more attention to the past.
- ~ The world of futures-relevant literature remains highly fragmented, and getting more so. This is readily explained by the fact that academics and journalists are trained and rewarded for writing books and articles, not for pulling them together in synoptic overviews or “knowledge architectures” (3). I call this problem the “brickmaker

syndrome”, derived from a classic 1938 lecture by sociologist Robert H. Lynd, **Knowledge for What?**, which urged more integration for the social sciences (4).

- ~ Book reviewing tends very strongly to consider one book at a time in isolation from other books, rather than gaining a broader and more sophisticated perspective by assessing a related cluster of books. This one-at-a-time reviewing works fine for fiction, but not for current affairs non-fiction.
- ~ We obviously suffer from infoglut (5). To cite a *New Yorker* cartoon from March 2002, showing a mother consoling her daughter, the caption reads “It’s all right sweetie. In the information age, everyone feels stupid.” But we are also seemingly empowered by nifty new infotech such as iPads, which brings us ever more information. The only way to master this overload is through some variant of Operation BASIC, as articulated nearly fifty years ago by Bertram Gross: a combination of Bibliography, Abstracts, Surveys, Indexes, and Copies (6). The Copies problem has since been solved with a vengeance, but the other four elements—necessary but not glamorous--still need much attention.
- ~ Scanning efforts in individual nations and organizations should be complemented by one or more public scanning systems similar to the “world brain” advocated by H. G. Wells in the late 1930s (7, 8), described as “a sort of mental clearing house for the mind...in direct touch with all the original thought and research in the world...a depot where knowledge and ideas are received, sorted, summarized, digested, clarified, and compared.” I emphasize the summarizing, digesting, clarifying, and comparing—processes that cannot be undertaken by AI and information technology, at least not yet. And rather than a single world brain, similar to a single world government, there should be at least several overlapping regional and/or national clearinghouses open to all.
- ~ Adding to the problem of many competing books and articles offering rational, evidence-based insights and solutions to our many problems, albeit from various ideological viewpoints, a strong backlash of know-nothing irrationality is underway in the US at least, under the guise of the “tea party” movement. Suffice to say, as a very rough estimate, the two million plus copies of Sarah Palin’s ghost-written memoirs sold to date may well be more than the total number of copies of reasoned current affairs books sold in the past year in the US, generously assuming an average of 2,000 copies sold for each of the 1,000 reality-based books. Is this any way to run a supposedly well-educated democracy in troubled times? Better scanning is needed, of course. But we must go beyond scanning to seriously consider the most important frontiers for foresight, strategic anticipation, and planning in light of the exploding information environment.

.

Knowledge Society Reconsidered: A New Paradigm

What this all leads up to is that our “knowledge society” needs serious rethinking in a number of ways. As a general guideline, I propose utilizing the Taoist concept of “right balance” between yins and yangs. In his very thoughtful 700+ page autobiography, **From Third World to First** (9), Singapore’s Lee Kuan Yew explicitly describes “the need for balance between individual competition and group solidarity by using the metaphor of the oriental yin and yang symbol,” and trying to strike “right balance” between yang (male) competitiveness and yin (female) solidarity through

redistribution to some degree. We can of course argue about where to apply yin and yang thinking, and what constitutes “right balance.”

I think it can be very useful to apply it to our burgeoning world of knowledge and information, where, in my experience, we suffer from at least three gross imbalances:

- 1) In the overall world of information, there appears to be a growing imbalance between edification and entertainment—between useful knowledge for conducting our affairs and information that is merely entertaining, trivial, personal, or commercial in a variety of overlapping forms (movies, TV, Internet, YouTube, cellphones, and now iPads) on an immense range of topics.
- 2) Within the world of knowledge, there is an imbalance between the “hard” sciences and hard technology and the “soft” sciences and soft technology (technology assessments, social inventions, policies, laws, ethical codes), notably the overlapping realms of futures studies, policy studies, planning, and leadership.
- 3) Finally, and in many ways most important, within the ill-defined world of futures studies and policy studies, there is far too much emphasis on pieces of knowledge (yet another book, report, article, or method), and not enough on integrating these pieces into systemic “big picture” wholes.

The first imbalance between edification and entertainment has been developing over a long period. Well before the Internet and cellphones, cultural critic Neil Postman argued in **Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business** (10) that a television-based epistemology pollutes public communication, and that the spirit of a culture is being shriveled in both an Orwellian sense, in which culture becomes a prison, and especially in a Huxleyian sense, where culture becomes a burlesque (just think of the many forms of “soma” that we now have readily at hand). Arguably, it has been downhill since then, and I need only cite a recent study by the Kaiser Family Foundation (11), reported in the *New York Times*, finding that the average young American spends more than 7.5 hours a day with electronic devices, compared with less than 6.5 hours five years ago, when the study was last conducted--and the 7.5 hours does not count the hour and a half that youths spend texting, or the half-hour they talk on their cellphones. The *Times* reported that “the study’s findings shocked its authors, who had concluded in 2005 that use could not possibly grow further, and confirmed the fears of many parents whose children are constantly tethered to media devices.” A recent comic strip in my local paper nicely confirmed this issue by showing two kids walking down the street. One says to the other: “I can’t stand our school’s ‘unplugged’ week. I’m having electronics withdrawal. I need my video game fix! I need my TV fix! I’m desperate!” Second kid: “Yeah. At this point, I’d even watch an educational program.” First kid: “Not that desperate!”

Perhaps the use of multiple electronic devices for entertainment and trivial personal contact is not as widespread in Asia and Europe, but I would not be surprised if it is far behind, or perhaps even ahead in some countries.

And, although adults lag behind the digital generation in use of the new media, we are still barraged by a plethora of cable television programs (nearly all entertainments), movies, and other cultural diversions ranging from the recent Winter Olympics to a burgeoning number of local festivals and sporting events. All of which does not leave much time for contemplating public affairs, in turn reflected by the declining number of

newspapers, declining newspaper circulation, and declining coverage of current affairs. Hopefully, this is not happening in your country. But the US is often a harbinger in such matters. Similar to the growth of obesity, from lack of exercise and eating too many fattening foods and rich desserts, there is far too much frivolity and fluff in our “information diets”. In a highly commercialized environment, it will be difficult to change our eating habits, even though the physical evidence of obesity is obvious; it will be far more difficult to seek some “right balance” in our information-consuming habits.

The second imbalance in our “knowledge society” is between the “hard” sciences and technology, and the “soft” sciences. This is typified by a recent announcement that came in on my TV set stating that “The future of our nation and our children depends on math, science, and technology.” Indeed, use of “knowledge society” is generally confined to hard knowledge that leads to the many new technologies and innovations that are in the pipeline, as nicely summarized by Bill Halal. But “soft” knowledge is or ought to be equally important, parallel to Joseph Nye’s concept of “soft power” in international relations (i.e., admired ideals, diplomacy, peacemaking) that is needed in right balance with “hard” military power (12). Arguably, it is the imbalance between hard power and soft power in the past decade that contributed to many of the US problems in Iraq and Afghanistan. Domestically, we suffer from lack of emphasis on soft knowledge and social invention, as illustrated by the global economic devastation caused by bad ideas in high places, leading to the Great Recession. Unlike the hard sciences, which are cumulative and subject to general concurrence on method, the soft sciences are much more fragmented in time and space, and subject to differing perspectives and modes of articulation. Like it or not, the nuance and sophistication of social science thinking is needed, and the softer areas need more respect and refinement if we are to get through our time of multiple transitions and difficulties.

And yet there are problems with the softer areas of knowledge, which leads to the third area of gross imbalance: the production of too many unusable, and unused, bricks of knowledge (along with many useless pebbles in countless journals), amidst the lack of knowledge architects to bring the pieces together in some integral fashion. This problem was clearly spelled out in a 1990 report by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, **Scholarship Reconsidered**, which articulated three areas of scholarship deserving more equal attention to the traditional scholarship of discovery: the scholarship of teaching, the scholarship of public outreach, and the scholarship of integration (13). There is much talk of integration, or synthesis, or holistic thinking, or systems thinking, but in fact, from my perspective, there is little that is done. The fragmentation in thinking about systems-like methods is quite evident in the mini-guide, **Many Methods and Mentors**, that I recently prepared on futures-relevant methods (14).

When I think about heroic integrative efforts that I know of, they still appear quite independent of each other. For example, the 15 Global Challenges in Jerry Glenn and Ted Gordon’s annual **State of the Future** report from their Millennium Project, the 1996 **Encyclopedia of the Future** (not updated) assembled by George Kurian and Graham Molitor, Rick Slaughter’s articulation of “the knowledge base of futures studies” in the 1990s (not updated), the planet management books by Norman Myers, the assessments of global trends and new technologies by Walter Truett Anderson, the many overviews of energy and sustainability by Lester Brown (notably **Plan B 4.0**, his fourth version of what is needed for sustainability), the syntheses of world problems and

resources by Vaclav Smil, the syntheses of climate change science and promising energy options by former Vice President Al Gore (utilizing more than 30 “Solutions Summits” with leading experts), the innovative and intriguing “info-murals” created by Bob Horn of Stanford University, the TechCast overview of new technology by Bill Halal, the textbook on global issues and humane values by Mel Gurtov, the introduction to futures thinking by Ed Cornish, the *ProZukunft* German-language *Future Survey* edited by Walter Spielmann and colleagues in Salzburg, the survey of futures thinking and sci-fi thinking by Tom Lombardo. And so on. There are many ways to integrate—far more than we realize—and we need to start the task of integrating the integrators.

In this final IRAHSS Panel on New Approaches to Strategic Anticipation, I will be followed by three integrators: Adam Kahane on the Change Lab approach to highly complex challenges, the International Futures model of Barry B. Hughes, and Riel Miller on building futures literacy for policy making. If they are all quite similar to each other, with just a few differences in wording, my argument is weakened. But if they are quite different from each other, as I suspect, my argument for further efforts at integration as the key frontier of foresight is strengthened.

To conclude, I wish to recite part of an untitled sonnet, first called to my attention by Bertram Gross in the late 1960s (15):

...Upon this gifted age, in its dark hour
Rains from the sky a meteoric shower
Of facts...they lie unquestioned, uncombined
Wisdom enough to leach of us our ill
Is daily spun, but there exists no loom
To weave it into fabric.

The poet: Edna St. Vincent Millay. The year: 1939. The relevance to our times: more than ever. The need for looms is not merely for intellectual curiosity to more fully understand what’s happening, or for improving strategic anticipation; increasingly, it’s a matter of national—and global—security.

#

REFERENCES

1. Michael Marien, **Essential Reading for the Future of Education**. Syracuse NY: Educational Policy Research Center, 1970/56p. Expanded to **Alternative Futures for Learning: An Annotated Bibliography** (EPRC, 1971/223p).
2. Michael Marien, “Scanning: An Imperfect Activity in an Era of Fragmentation and Uncertainty,” *Futures Research Quarterly*, 7:3, Fall 1991, 82-90. Notes a long-term trend to ever greater fragmentation, and points to 12 choices that we make as to what we will or will not look at in our effort to understand the world, e.g. books vs. periodicals, present vs. past, print vs. film, English vs. non-English.
3. Richard Saul Wurman, **Information Architects**. NY: Graphis, 1996. Such Architects “take complex information and convey it to a target audience as simply As possible.” Also see Robert Jacobson (ed), **Information Design** (MIT Press, 1999/357p), with a foreword by Wurman.

4. Robert S. Lynd, **Knowledge for What? The Place of Social Science in American Culture**. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1939.
5. Michael Marien, "Infoglut and Competing Problems: Key Barriers Suggesting a New Strategy for Sustainability," in Dennis Pirages (ed), **Building Sustainable Societies: A Blueprint for a Post-Industrial World** (Armonk NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1996, 299-311). Introduces an information-based modification of Paul Ehrlich's $I = P \times A \times T$ formula (environmental Impact = Population x Affluence x Technology); the $I = P \times O \times T$ formula suggests Infoglut = Population x Occupation x Technology.
6. Bertram M. Gross, "Operation BASIC: The Retrieval of Wasted Knowledge," *The Journal of Communication*, 12:2, June 1962, 67-83. A vision of "new institutions for the organization of knowledge," involving Bibliographies, Abstracts, Surveys, Indexes, and Copies. Only "Copies" has been solved.
7. H. G. Wells, **World Brain**. Freeport NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1938. Various essays and lectures on knowledge organization.
8. Michael Marien, "The Future of Human Benefit Knowledge: Notes on a World Brain for the 21st Century" in Walter Truett Anderson (ed), **Knowledge Futures** (Special Issue), *Futures: The Journal of Policy, Planning, and Futures Studies*, 39:8, Oct 2007, 955-962. Paper presented at the 2005 meeting of The World Academy of Art and Science in Zagreb.
9. Lee Kuan Yew, **From Third World to First: The Singapore Story, 1965-2000**. Foreword by Henry A. Kissinger. NY: HarperCollins, 2000/729p. (See p.106)
10. Neil Postman, **Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business**. NY: Viking, 1985.
11. Tamar Lewin, "If Your Children Are Awake, Then They're Probably Online," *The New York Times*, 20 Jan 2010, p1. Also see John Palfrey and Urs Gasser, **Born Digital: Understanding the First Generation of Digital Natives** (Basic Books, revised edition, July 2010/384p; www.borndigitalbook.com), a report from the Harvard Digital Natives Project.
12. Joseph S. Nye Jr, **Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics**. NY: Public Affairs, 2004. Soft power is defined as the ability to get what is wanted through attraction rather than coercion.
13. Ernest L. Boyer, **Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate** (Special Report). Princeton NY: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990. Explores four overlapping functions of scholarship: discovery, teaching, application, and integration. Very important.
14. Michael Marien, **Many Methods and Mentors: Thinking About Change and Shaping Futures** (Special Issue), *Future Survey Mini-Guide #4*, Aug 2008 (available from World Future Society; www.wfs.org). A 40-page guide to 98 items arranged in a "5 P's and a Q" format: Probable futures, Possible futures, Preferable futures, Present trends, Panoramic views, and constant Questioning.
15. Edna St. Vincent Millay, **Huntsman, What Quarry?** NY: Harper & Brothers, 1939 (p. 92). Cited in Bertram M. Gross (ed), **Social Goals and Indicators for American Society**, Volume 1, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May 1967, p.2.

#