

In order to avoid embarrassing fractions, I shall reduce the above figure to \$150,000, the estimate of expenditure, and in my calculations subordinate arithmetical exactitude to simplicity and clearness. I shall also confine myself to Budget B as the plan least out of relation to facts likely to be realised. According to Budget B, the United States is to furnish \$125,000, or roughly  $\frac{5}{6}$ , and all the other units together \$26,000, or roughly  $\frac{1}{6}$ . But the \$125,000 assigned to the American Council includes \$20,000 from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, funds which under the terms of the Trust created by Mr. Carnegie are in the strictest sense of the term internationalised. Under Budget B therefore the funds are to be allocated as follows:-

From the American Council (roughly)	21/30
From all other Councils .....	5/30
From international funds .....	4/30

The money will thus be furnished in the ratio of 21 from American sources, 5 from all other national units, and 4 from international funds. Roughly the percentages work out as 68 America, 18 other national units, and 14 international funds.

In the most improbable event that all these quotas will be paid, the movement will have failed to create an instrument of research which is international in fact as well as in name. The Chinese, Canadians, Japanese, Australians, New Zealanders and British will be in the position of guests, contributing mere gratuities to a fund provided from American sources. To meet his commitments the General Secretary will always be looking to the American Council. A system which is international in name but not in fact puts its members in a false position.

With these difficulties forced on our minds by a study of the estimates, we were led to ask ourselves whether we were, after all, right in assuming that research was the primary