

and less immediately utilitarian studies.

Those closest to my own concern and experience are social, behavioral, political and economic studies related to a great range of organizations with implications for policy and administration under a diversity of conditions. Ultimate applications might be in business administration, public administration, health administration, educational administration, international administration and so on.

That is in contrast to fields of inquiry generally perceived to be better established in their traditions of theory building, research design, additive contributions to discipline and the rest. Examples of this class might include at least the heartland areas of so-called laboratory sciences and those with appropriately developed laboratory and experimental traditions. Physics, biology and chemistry with room for inclusions and exceptions for such as astronomy, geology and psychology would qualify.

Beyond the heartland, however, which is to say at the front edges even of the so-called hard sciences, top investigators reckon with some of the same problems of elusiveness and softness so often thought to be a more exclusive attribute of the category first cited. As others have observed, endurance does not add truth to the canard that the intellectual demands of one set of sciences to be called hard are much greater than for another set to be called soft. One might argue that developing traditions of rigor where they have not previously existed might be more rather than less demanding.

Nevertheless, something approaching effectiveness in understanding and coping with first steps is essential if inquiry is to proceed, to reach some point of completion, hopefully to result in some learning about matter and method and conceivably to yield findings of some significance. Investment in research that does not result in world-shaking findings can be more readily