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FOREWORD

The charting of research activity in the social sciences throughout the world is an important accompaniment to the assembly of bibliographies and other records of published material, but it presents great difficulties if it is to be carried out thoroughly and made available quickly. Few countries, thus far, keep any consolidated record of current research, and the collection of information on an international scale concerning individual projects is an extremely complex task.

Following the International Register of Current Team Research in the Social Sciences (1950-1952), Unesco's series Documentation in the Social Sciences is now being extended by the addition of three companion trend reports respectively covering recent trends in economic, political science and sociological research in the United States of America. In view of the enormous amount of social science research that is pursued in the U.S.A., it has been thought most appropriate to proceed in this fashion—to give a bird's-eye view of general tendencies and preoccupations rather than seek to catalogue in detail all that is being done over a given time by every serious researcher. These reports have been commissioned from eminent specialists who are in close touch with developments and whose accounts constitute an authoritative guide to progress within three major disciplines. Each one is complete in itself and entirely independent of the other two, but for a composite picture of the state of social science research in the U.S.A. today the three reports can, of course, most usefully be read together.
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INTRODUCTION

A foreign observer has recently remarked that 'the study of politics in the United States is something in size, content and method unique in Western intellectual history'. The present report is an attempt to discern the main currents within and the general direction of this 'study of politics'.

It is well to begin by noting some of the assumptions, and problems, of this assignment:

1. This study deals primarily with the three years 1952-54. However, an attempt is made to relate this most recent period to the preceding history of political science in the U.S.A., and, by judging the strength of contemporary currents, to suggest developments in the foreseeable future.

2. It is addressed primarily to readers outside the U.S.A. While it is assumed that all readers have some interest in and knowledge about political science—or they would not be reading the report—differences in national background multiply what would be difficult problems in type, level and detail of presentation even if the report were addressed to American political scientists only.

3. This is an attempt to report on trends in American political science generally. That is to say, it is not limited to research activities, even construing these broadly. Rather, non-research publications, teaching, and participation in political processes have also been scrutinized in trying to discern trends. The report is not organized by types of activities, however, but primarily in terms of areas of interest (such as international relations) within the discipline.

4. Difficult problems of definition and delineation have been faced in preparing this report. As a body of writings, 'political science' shades off gradually into the writings of the other social sciences, and into law and the humanities. Again, there is no sharp division between 'political scientists' and 'others', whether the latter are specialists in some other social science, general social


The essays in Contemporary Political Science, dealing with various aspects of American political science, are largely reportorial. Macpherson's essay contains a succinct and discerning section on the U.S.A.—as well as inclusive comment on current world trends. The essay by Hawley and Dexter is based on an extensive survey of research in progress, but goes beyond reportage to interpretation and criticism. The volume Goals for Political Science was sponsored by the American Political Science Association, and presents the discipline as seen through the eyes of a committee of its members. As the Goals volume emphasizes teaching, it, together with the essay by Marshall Dimock, complements the Hawley-Dexter report on research. The book by David Easton bears especially upon the orientation toward and the proper role of theory in political study. The work is highly critical of contemporary American political science, but its criticism is different from—in some respects the contrary of—that of Crick. The article by Cook is in form a review of Easton's book but in fact a very perceptive essay on the history and present dilemmas of political science.
scientists, or simply ‘laymen’ who contribute to or influence the study of politics. Moreover, there is no sharp line marking off ‘American’ political science. Foreign students and many students of foreign background write, teach and publish in America; and many foreign publications, especially from other English-speaking countries, find wide use and influence.

Stress is laid most sharply on the professional writings of Americans who are members of the American Political Science Association; but an attempt has been made to view political science as it is—indistinct at all its margins, and at some of them growing rapidly.

5. The author has assumed his role to be that of reporter, not of critic, and has conscientiously sought to minimize his personal responses. Reporting shades easily into interpretation, however, and interpretation requires a point of view. The author has tried, however inadequately, to represent varying attitudes within political science, rather than express a personal opinion, when he was conscious of dealing with a ‘sensitive’ or controversial matter.
CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND: ON HISTORY, SOCIETY AND IDEOLOGY

Recent and contemporary trends can be explained meaningfully only in relation to developments which they extend or reverse; the background is necessary to see the foreground in perspective. This section is an attempt to sketch the background, for those not familiar with American political science. Those fully familiar with the background will find it appropriate to proceed immediately to the next section.

THE BIRTH OF POLITICAL SCIENCE: A BRIEF REVIEW OF INHERITANCE AND ENVIRONMENT

Although the study of politics in the present area of the U.S.A. reaches back beyond the framing of the Constitution, political science is a product of the twentieth century—that is to say, what is most characteristic or distinctive in recent and contemporary political science is associated with developments of the past two generations. These developments, both in the realm of ideas and in the realm of ‘things’, deserve a brief review.

The closing of the physical frontier, marking the end of the continental expansion of the U.S.A., is conventionally dated at 1890, and during the present century the U.S.A. has become ever more urban and more highly industrialized. In this recent period of American history the physical and biological sciences grew rapidly in number of students and in popular esteem; and physical and biological technologies advanced swiftly, becoming widely disseminated and greatly affecting many aspects of the national life. Accompanying this rise of science and technology was a rapid growth—and rise to considerable popularity—of empirical or non-idealistic philosophies. In this same period, the system of higher education greatly expanded and matured; many millions of immigrants were received and integrated into the national life; and the country faced new and severe problems of adjustment in national and international life.

The rise of political science is intimately related to these events. The American Political Science Association was formed in 1903. Its formation reflects the quantitative increase, so to speak, in political problems, brought about by such factors as an expanding economy, heavy immigration, and rapid urbanization. It reflects also the rise of the system of higher education, for the Association has been centred in the colleges and universities.1 The word ‘science’2 in the title

1. It should be borne in mind that the number of students pursuing college and university studies in the U.S.A. is very large (more than 3 million) in absolute terms, and very high also in relative terms. This has placed an emphasis upon the teaching of political science. This teaching function should in turn be viewed in relation to problems posed by rapid economic and social development and the absorption of large numbers of immigrants (more than a million a year in some of the early years of the century). Given these conditions, the development of national self-consciousness and civic knowledge would in any case have been great; and in a country founded upon the principle of self-government—and in this troubled century—it has been severe.
2. It is significant also that the singular rather than the plural (i.e. ‘the political sciences’) form was adopted. This symbolizes the specialization of American social scientists—economists, social psychologists, political scientists, etc.—as well as that separation of the study of the social sciences from the study of law which has proceeded apace during the first half of the twentieth century.
of the Association reflects the growth of technology, and the rise of scientific thought and would-be scientific philosophies; here is symbolized an intent to apply scientific method to the phenomena of politics. This intent and the efforts toward its achievement are the hallmarks of American political science in the last half-century.

Of course American political science did not write science upon a clean slate in 1903. In the minds of the early political scientists there were important residua of natural law ideas (discussed below). There was also a heritage of legal studies, of so-called political economy, of philosophical strains stemming from Kant and Hegel, and of the approach to political study associated with the term Staatslehre—several of the most prominent American students of politics in the late nineteenth century studied in Germany. Moreover, though political science as a concept and curriculum was created in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by a 'factoring out' of the 'political' from historical and legal studies, from so-called moral philosophy, and from political economy, the separation was not clean and complete, and data and concepts from these studies were brought into the new political science.

THE EFFECT OF REFORMISM ON POLITICAL SCIENCE

The period from 1890 to 1914 in American history witnessed much ‘reformism’ directed toward purifying and perfecting social, economic and government institutions. It was the period of the exposé, of the so-called Muckrakers, who prodded the national conscience by pointing out the gaps between a lofty democratic ideology and serious abuses and shortcomings. Stirred by the reformist spirit, political scientists reacted against the abstractness and ‘bookishness’ of the nineteenth-century approach to political study. They sought to probe, to ‘expose’, to get out of the academies and into ‘real life’, to be practical instead of idealistic—though paradoxically their practical reformist zeal was spurred by a deep-lying idealism. This new bent toward practical reform was wedded to the growing popularity of science: one became scientific by studying ‘nature, not books’; the scientific method was thought of as the natural partner of a practical reformism.

One result of the early reformist atmosphere has been a continuing search for the ‘real’ presumed to underlie official ideology and formal institutional structure—a search manifesting itself, for example, in a continuous and substantial study of ‘propaganda’ and ‘pressure groups’. The exposé became the common expectation, and is now taken for granted as a general scientific method; in America, Marxism, as an instrument of analysis and exposure, has been but one current in a large stream.

Another result of the early reformist period was to give political science a bent toward practical reform. This interest continues down to the present on the part of many. But meanwhile some political scientists have reacted strongly against practical reform activities, thereby creating tension and conflict within contemporary political science.

1. Crick, op. cit., argues rather persuasively that it was technology rather than science which was the 'model' for American political science, and that general historical and environmental factors more than abstract ideas have made for a favourable reception of 'political science', 'The growth of political science in the universities and colleges even now bears heavy marks of an age where technological achievement was carried over into a 'scientific' optimism—as for technology, so for the study of man, the "method of intelligence" would shake off the irrational heritage of the centuries. The reception of the science of politics was conditioned by certain groups of historical factors more than by any subsequent discoveries of philosophic pragmatism and logical positivism.'—p. 509.
Why have some individuals reacted against practical reform? The reaction against reform and idealism after the first world war probably has some relevance. The failure of Woodrow Wilson—a former teacher of political science—to achieve his international goals has been found by one writer symbolic of failure and retreat. For whatever reason, science and practical reform are no longer intimate partners. Some political scientists now view reformist activity suspiciously, as taking time and attention away from needed, basic scientific research. At best these individuals regard reformist activity as applied rather than pure science; at worst they regard reformist activity which claims scientific sanction as harmful or dishonest.

THE EFFECTS OF MAJOR HISTORICAL EVENTS

The two world wars, the great depression of the thirties, and the changed nature of the world power structure have altered the scope and direction of American political science in many ways. One result has been to change the relative emphasis upon ‘levels’ of government. In the period before the first world war, state and local government were probably the centre of attention. Rapid urbanization had created critical problems, and the ‘shame of the cities’ received much study and inspired much reforming zeal. The two world wars naturally brought a shift of interest to international affairs; and the Great Depression as well as the wars—and near wars—have hastened and dramatized a ‘nationalization of problems’ and a shift in emphasis to the federal government. The Great Depression, incidentally, was largely responsible for a shift toward a preponderant identification of political scientists with the Democratic party, a fact of some importance in understanding the temper of contemporary political science.

THE EFFECTS OF SPECIALIZATION AND PROFESSIONALIZATION

The trend toward specialization and professionalization characteristic of America in this century has affected political science in many ways. For example, at the same time that political science has become ever more specialized and professional the other social sciences have been responding to similar forces. One might say in consequence that, while there is more and more to learn from the other specialized social sciences, the obstacles to learning it—in terms of time and energy, not to mention other factors—become ever greater. Moreover, while specialization and professionalization create problems of communication and synthesis at the periphery of political science they create problems of homogeneity at its core. For the forces of specialization and professionalization have brought into being many new specialized journals, such as Personnel Administration, and several new professional societies, such as the incipient American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy. Public administration and international relations as fields of study are especially restive, having strong secessionist tendencies, evidenced by the achievement in some institutions of separate schools or curricula.1

1. The tendency toward specialization and emergence of new fields of study is indicated by the following: In 1914 a committee of the American Political Science Association on instruction in political science conducted its survey under four categories, viz., American government, comparative government, political theory, and elements of law. But during the second world war the Association delineated eight divisions of political science for the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, viz., political theory and philosophy; political parties, public opinion, and pressure groups; legislatures and legislation; constitutional and administrative law; public administration; government and business; international law and relations; American government and comparative government. It is interesting that public administration and international relations, which are pressing for independent status, do not even appear among the 1914 categories.
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NATURAL LAW HERITAGE

It will be helpful, before proceeding to a more intensive scrutiny of the current scene, to take a brief look at the ancestry of some current doctrines and problems. This ancestry lies far back of the twentieth century and 'political science' as such. American study of politics was, of course, Western, and more particularly British, in its origins. The statesmen who led the successful revolution and framed and set in motion the constitutional system were heirs of a distinguished tradition and well read in the European thought of their day; and some of them, for example Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, were competent and creative students, writers, and actors in the field of politics.

The major themes and characteristics of the political thought of the eighteenth-century enlightenment extended to America. Probably the dominant theme was natural law and natural rights. Although the idea of natural law can be traced back to classical and Christian conceptions of a 'higher law', the eighteenth-century version had developed some new aspects, such as the appeal to natural rights and to Newtonian physics. The significance of natural law ideas in American political thinking lies in the fact that, regardless of whether the doctrine has been employed for 'conservative' or 'liberal' or 'radical' purposes, its exponents have assumed that there existed no deep cleft between 'what is' and 'what ought to be'. Whether it has been used to defend the 'naturalness' of existing political institutions and practices, or whether it has been enlisted to prove their shortcomings, American writers have generally agreed that existing arrangements were, or could be made to be, reflective of natural law values. The translation of ethical imperatives into political practices has been accepted as an entirely feasible enterprise. The transition from study to action, from investigation to prescription, has itself been viewed as 'natural'.

Some American interpreters of the foundations of their national social thought have emphasized the large a priori component in eighteenth and nineteenth-century social thought. It has seemed to them that the outstanding characteristic of social thought before the twentieth century was deductive reasoning from 'first principles'. Other interpreters, however, have emphasized what has seemed to them a very deep empirical foundation for American social thought. To this school the unquestioned frequent use of a priori and deductive language was but a conventional gloss for a 'realistic', that is to say inductive or pragmatic, approach to social life.

To the writer, each of these schools of interpretation is right in what it insists upon, but wrong in disparaging the other. And the chief clue to the reconciliation of the two positions is in an appreciation of the significance of natural law as explained above: as against dominant modes of social science thought today, which tend to pose 'real' against 'ideal', 'is' against 'ought', natural law thinking moved easily between the two realms, indeed found them in some ways one.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECLINE OF NATURAL LAW THOUGHT

Whether or not the social policies favoured by the natural law adherents were in fact derived or derivable from 'nature' is, of course, an extremely complex

1. The reader is referred to the excellent essay by Gunnar Myrdal, 'The Relation between Social Theory and Social Policy', British Journal of Sociology, IV, 3, September 1953, pp. 210-42, for a fuller discussion of this matter: 'According to the philosophies which formed the seed-bed for the social sciences, there were objective values which, like other social facts, could be ascertained by reasoning or by observation and calculation. Rational policy conclusions could be drawn in terms of what was "natural" or, later, of what led to the maximum "general welfare".'—p. 213.
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and disputed question. It has been persuasively argued, for example, that the basic ideals or values alleged to have been found in 'nature' were really but postulates of the older classical-Christian 'higher law', ideas of putative supernatural origin admitted surreptitiously into the revised and presumably scientific mode of thought. For present purposes of reporting and interpreting American political science it is not necessary to engage in argument about such matters. It is enough to indicate the style and pervasiveness of natural law thought, and to note some of the consequences.

In briefest summary, one may say that the elements of thought that were joined in natural law thinking have during the past century or so become separated, not completely but on the whole—and that one can understand some of the tensions and turmoil of contemporary American political science only in terms of this development.

On the one hand, it is a very widely accepted position in American political science (and American social sciences generally) that 'questions of fact' and 'questions of value' are different types of questions, not to be confused. In this common view, science as a realm of discourse or mode of procedure deals only with questions of fact; it cannot 'validate' values, and deals with them only in secondary or derived ways, when 'pure' science becomes 'applied'. In advanced and sharp form this position is associated with or relies upon the philosophy—or anti-philosophy—of logical positivism. And in the view of this school, or of some branches of it at least, values are simply emotional orientations or responses; any attempt to inquire into their 'validity' is radically meaningless.

On the other hand, American political scientists perforce live in a society and have personal values, which they share in greater or lesser degree with their colleagues and fellow-citizens. Moreover, they are called upon as teachers to inculcate values in others, and as researchers to stress the values of society—or of some part or aspect of it. In short, 'professional man' (or 'political man') and 'personal man', once closely joined, have been pulled apart.

This brief discussion has necessarily over-simplified the situation. A full discussion would make many qualifications. For example, the American philosophy of pragmatism, associated most prominently with the name of John Dewey, is a naturalistic philosophy characterized by a close joining of ends and means, of fact and value. It too claims the sanction of science, but it takes the position that values can indeed be validated, in and for human experience. Pragmatism has been found a firm philosophical foundation by some political scientists.

Nevertheless—to repeat—much of present tension and turmoil in political science are interpretable in terms of a long-range historical development: the values or value-orientation once associated with natural law have continued to be 'received', and they constitute in the main the most fundamental part of the value-structure of the political scientist. But at the same time the philosophical and religious supports for these values have been seriously eroded. Some of the implications of this situation will be indicated in the sequel.

THE VALUE ORIENTATION OF AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE

It will be useful to discuss briefly the questions: What values do American political scientists prefer? What were the goals or policy preferences associated with natural law which have continued to shape the outlook of students of politics?

These values or goals are set forth in the opening phrases of the Declaration of Independence: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights,
that among these, are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness'. American culture down to the present day has given a relatively high status to and realization of these values; and American political scientists, immersed in this culture, are deeply and subtly influenced by these values—even when they seek a 'value-free' political science.

Liberty or freedom is a fundamental value of American political science; one cannot understand, for example, its recent concern with 'civil rights' without appreciating this fact. Equality is a fundamental value; one cannot understand, for example, the continuing preoccupation with the possible skewing of election results by wealth or power without appreciating this fact. It is obvious that not only is each of these values subject to varying interpretations or realizations, but that there is opportunity for serious conflicts between them. Disputes over these matters are continual: often they centre on the meaning of democracy. For democracy, though not the stated objective of the framers of the Declaration of Independence, is the term that has come to mean for most Americans the cluster of ideas in the opening phrases of the Declaration and of the Preamble to the Constitution.

To the contemporary political scientist the 'pursuit of Happiness' is likely to have a secular and materialist meaning—that is to say, he is likely to interpret happiness primarily in terms of the material necessities of life, and beyond that of the material goods that seem to make life fuller or richer in experience. The American political scientist seeks not equality in poverty, but equality in a rising 'standard of living'; he seeks not merely freedom from coercions, but the 'positive' freedom to enjoy this world's goods. It is to the point to observe that though utilitarianism as a term or distinct school of theory has had no important vogue in the history of American political thought, nevertheless there has been always an important strand of utility, in the sense of concern for material welfare.

There are other value orientations. For example, American political scientists not only strongly prefer peace to war, but more generally and on the whole, harmony to conflict. They prefer, on the whole, urban life and values to rural life and values, reflecting the urban revolution of the past two generations. In a culture in which science is an honorific word they have a strong belief in science, and politics becomes political science. It is important to understand this, for in the literature of political science many disputes are carried on in terms of what is or is not 'science', disputes which elsewhere may be carried on in a different idiom.

Although there are disputes among American political scientists that arise from differences in their individual value orientations, yet—compared to some cultures and countries—there is nevertheless a remarkable homogeneity of values. The case for the relative homogeneity of American political thought as a whole through national history has been cogently argued in a recent book by Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought since the Revolution.* The major clue to understanding the American political tradition Hartz finds in Alexis de Tocqueville's observation that 'The great advantage of the American is that he has arrived at a state of democracy without having to endure a democratic revolution; and that he is born free without having to become so.' As relatively little of the ancien régime was transferred to the New World, the argument runs, there was relatively little to repudiate, and little violence in the repudiation; there is an unbroken tradition from the eighteenth-century

---

The background: on history, society and ideology

enlightenment down to the present day, a tradition in which the difference between liberal and conservative is relatively small—and often confusing. 'America is . . . conservative . . . ', to quote Gunnar Myrdal, 'But the principles conserved are liberal and some, indeed, are radical.' In short the American tradition must be distinguished even from that of Western Europe, and even where the vocabulary is identical the meaning is often different.

If this interpretation is essentially correct it helps to explain what seem some major characteristics of political science. For example, however great the heat engendered by professional disputes, the range of opinion has on the whole and in the larger perspective of all political thought been remarkably small. The very fact that there could be widespread agreement on the possibility and desirability of reducing the study of politics to the single level of a 'science' signifies a large amount of basic agreement as to political ends. American political science has not been characterized by works seeking either to justify or to controvert the political order. Rather, the political order has been 'accepted', and distinctive American 'political theory' has tended to be concerned with means and methodology.

A NOTE ON CONTRADICTIONS

This short review of the background of American political science in the mid-century period may have seemed confusing rather than enlightening to the reader. If this is true it is no doubt due in part to lack of skill by the writer. But some of the confusion and, indeed, contradiction is in the situation itself. It has been indicated, for example, that there are serious differences in outlook among political scientists, yet that basic homogeneity of values is an important fact. These generalizations are both correct—within limits. To understand American political science it is necessary to understand the sources and implications of some contradictions and tensions within it. Unfortunately, however, there are no good extensive treatments, historical and analytical, of the discipline as a whole, to which the reader can be referred. A work in American political science comparable to Ruggiero's on liberalism or Halévy's on utilitarianism has yet to appear.
In the preparation of this report an attempt has been made (as will appear below) to ascertain, by somewhat crude measurements of quantities of writing, shifting emphases in political science. There was neither time nor staff, however, for the more thorough and careful techniques of so-called 'content analysis', and it is questionable whether even thorough content analysis would penetrate adequately to the important matters of the tone and force of ideas.

Thus there is an impressionistic and intuitive element in the writer's delineation of trends. The trends asserted can be 'documented' at some length. They cannot, however, be 'proved' beyond question. It must be borne in mind that we are dealing not with a single current, nor even with parallel currents, but with currents and cross-currents. Or, to change the idiom, it should be borne in mind that there are both secular and cyclical trends—and counter-secular and counter-cyclical trends.*

A SUMMARY VIEW

The mood of contemporary American political science is one of dissatisfaction tinged with hopefulness. There is a great amount of self-criticism, of stock-taking, of discussion of methodology, but also of hopeful and enthusiastic pursuit of new (or rediscovered or refurbished) ideas and methods.

Contemporary political science might be said to be engaged in an intensive 'quest for the real'. There are some who assert that the 'reality' which is the proper study of political science is something sui generis, for example, that it is 'power' or 'the political process' which is the central and distinguishing phenomenon and concept of political science. Others might be said to seek some base outside political science itself upon which the discipline can be firmly rested. There are those, for example, who seek to base the study of politics on the methods of the physical sciences, or the concepts and data of the other social sciences. On the other hand, there are those seeking to rest political study upon foundations of metaphysics or theology. While these alternative approaches are not necessarily mutually exclusive (e.g. one can insist that the phenomenon to be studied is 'power', using the methods of science), they are important as emphases.

The most prominent trend is toward 'science'—i.e. toward conceiving 'reality' as that which lends itself to study by the methods of the presumably more advanced sciences. The words giving the key to this trend are 'empirical' and 'behavioural'. The empiricists or behaviouralists seek to study the 'real' phenomena

---

1. In 'The Political System', cited above, Thomas I. Cook writes: 'In its range and depth of material, in its thoroughness and inquisitiveness, in its organization and continuous development of particular areas within the whole discipline, American political science is without peer; but in its lack of clearer relation between its parts, in its lack of adequate theory for the several parts, and in its lack of overall system or frame of reference, it is also unique.'—p. 128.
Contemporary trends

of political life, starting with carefully refined hypotheses, using rigorous methods of observation, measuring, counting and using mathematical tools wherever possible, and ending with cautious, modest conclusions.

Associated with the trend toward empirical studies is a continuing shift of focus from formal institutions to human inter-relations, from structure to process and function, from State to Society, from 'official' man to 'political' and even social and biological man. There is a drive to discover the 'dynamics' of politics, including law and administration. There is a new interest in comparative studies of various kinds, studies which compare not formal structures but the 'real' or 'significant' phenomena behind superficial appearances.

Another contemporary trend is toward more concern with public policy problems. This is both broadening and deepening, owing to the effects of a generation of depression, war, and near-war.

There is also a great concern with 'theory'. As a separate branch or field of political science, political theory is in a state of ferment and expansion; and the theoretical aspects of all branches or fields of political science are receiving increasing attention by the persons specializing therein.

STOCK-TAKING AND SELF-CRITICISM

American political science has for a generation been engaged in self-inventorying and self-criticism, and the amount of such activity has risen in recent years. The programmes of the national and regional political science associations have been heavily salted recently with titles of meetings reflecting this concern.

The following, selected at random, are typical and illustrative: 'The Role of the Theorist in Political Science', 'The Political Scientist and Reform Politics', 'From Text to Context: New Approaches to the Teaching of National Government', 'Quantifiers and Qualifiers; The Future of Research in National Government', 'Policy Making and the Teaching of International Relations', 'How Can Theoretical Models be Most Effectively Used in Research?', and 'Current Research Problems and Techniques in the Field of International Studies'.

Much of this self-criticism is, in American terminology, placed under the heading of 'methodology'. Methodology may—and often does—mean methods of library research and scholarly writing, as well as techniques of empirical research (e.g. interviewing procedure) and quantification. But it is also a label for discussions of and disputes over the proper role of the political scientist—whether (or how) he should concern himself with 'values', whether (or how) he should engage in the political process, and so forth. Disputes over such matters raise questions of a general theoretical and philosophical nature, and so 'metho-

1. Indicative of the stock-taking is the series of conferences being sponsored by the political science department of Northwestern University in its Curriculum Development Project—a foundation-supported project to scrutinize thoroughly traditional courses, teaching, and research methods.

2. American social science has a large literature in these techniques, for example: Bernard R. Berelson, Content Analysis in Communication Research, Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press, 1952, 220 pp.; Durwin Cartwright, Group Dynamics; Research and Theory, Evanston, Illinois, Row, Peterson, 1953, 842 pp.; Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations, New York, Dryden, 2 vols., 1951, 759 pp.; Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz, Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Dryden, 1954, 660 pp.; Arnold M. Rose, Theory and Method in the Social Sciences, Minneapolis, Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press, 1954, 851 pp.; V. O. Key, A Primer of Statistics for Political Scientists, New York, Crowell, 1954, 209 pp. None of these authors, except Key, is a political scientist, and while the titles were selected somewhat at random, the word 'primer' in the title of his book addressed to fellow political scientists is perhaps significant. There is a general opinion, in and out of political science, that it is less advanced into 'behaviourism' than sociology, anthropology, social psychology and economics.

Attention is called to a very thorough and excellent bibliographical essay, 'Methodology for Political Scientists: Perspectives for Study', by Jean M. Driscoll and Charles S. Hyneman, American Political Science Review, XLIX, 1, March, 1955, pp. 192-217. Reprints of this essay may be obtained on request from the Curriculum Development Project, Political Science Department, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
dology' ranges from techniques of footnoting and choosing samples to discussions of the implications of the existence of God for political study.

There has been little 'settled' in recent methodological disputes touching philosophical matters, and some political scientists regard them as sterile or pernicious—wasting time and energy that might be devoted to substantive research, and driving opponents in the debates into extreme and even ridiculous positions. ('Self'-criticism must be understood as controversy within the discipline, not as voluntary examination by each of his own ideas!) Yet the continual ventilation of the interior recesses of the discipline as well as the continual remapping of its periphery has some obvious wholesome effects: new ideas are introduced from other disciplines, problems are removed from the 'already solved' and 'impossible to solve' categories, and students are moved to creative or critical essays in political theory they would not otherwise undertake.

THE QUEST FOR THE REAL

The 'quest for the real' is related to self-criticism. How one defines 'reality', i.e. one's metaphysical position, determines what it is important or useful to study and the methods appropriate to such study. Controversy is continuous. What one applauds as a trend, another deplores. What one hopes, another fears. What is phenomenal to one is epiphenomenal to another.

No student of politics ever set out, presumably, to study the unreal. Yet so certain are some contemporary political scientists that for the first time the 'real' problems of politics are being explored in a 'realistic' way that they tend to speak as though the long history of political study—excepting only a few students, such as Aristotle and Machiavelli—were a record of wilful self-delusion or deliberate obfuscation.

THE TREND TOWARD SCIENCE

The most consistent and significant trend in American political science for more than two generations has been toward 'science', and this trend is the one most easily distinguished today. So far as can be discerned its force is not spent, but rather, while always challenged—and divided within itself—it is still gaining in momentum and penetration.

By 'science' is meant what are understood by students of politics to be the conceptions and techniques of the physical and biological sciences. Science has typically been conceived as addressing itself to the real as against the ideal, to the existential as against the conceptual. Its procedures have typically been thought to be careful observation of phenomena, full and accurate collection of data, classification, experimentation, careful formulation of hypotheses, cautious statements of findings, quantification and the use of mathematical apparatus where possible.

Within the framework of general acceptance of science in this sense, as providing the agenda and rules of procedure for political study, there have been both evolution of ideas with the passage of time and differing opinions at any particular time. The scientific world-view has itself changed significantly within the lifetime of political science, with the impact of relativity, quantum mechanics, and the uncertainty principle. It is a natural result that political scientists have been hard put to try to keep abreast of 'accepted' scientific thought—and have often been unsuccessful. And it is to be expected that there should be varying
levels of knowledge and sophistication as to what science is and what its methods are.

It will be useful to indicate the nature of some of the differing opinions within the scientific frame of reference. An essay reporting on, say, an aspect of the nationalization of industry in a European country may be thought by some to be good political ‘science’. The author, we will assume, has made a first-hand study, has carefully collected data (some presented in statistical tables), has observed and reported on the relationship of the nationalization project to the governmental system, to class structure, and the political situation generally; and concludes with some generalizations on the ‘success’ or desirability of the nationalization project. All the requirements of good and useful work will be present, so far as some political scientists are concerned. Others, however, while they may concede that such studies are ‘necessary’, will argue that there is precious little science in them: that they are much too loose in the theoretical formulation, too large to be dealt with by a single individual in a short time, too much concerned with immediate, practical problems, too much enveloped in and shaped by ‘value’ considerations.

Let us take an actual example. In 1952 the American Political Science Association sponsored a study of presidential nominating politics. Seeking to be empirical and scientific about phenomena too much talked about and too little observed, a large co-operative research project was undertaken, involving political scientists in all the 48 states. The results of the study have been published in five volumes entitled *Presidential Nominating Politics in 1952* (Baltimore, 1954). To some, this is a great achievement in developing American political science, making new data available, training scholars in careful observation, in techniques of collaborative research, and so forth. Others have been very critical, finding the study ‘traditional’ in its methods rather than abreast of the times. One writes of the studies that they are ‘raw’ rather than refined and sharpened empiricism, that they are ‘untutored by any theoretical concern more profound than that to be found in any woman’s club’—in short not fully or genuinely scientific.

**BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCE**

The more recent, ‘harder’ conception of science is associated with the term (or some variant of the term) ‘behavioural science’ and the cluster of ideas and interests designated thereby.

Behavioural science is not strictly a political science term. In fact, most of the so-called behaviouralists are trained primarily in some other discipline. They are devoted to a very strict interpretation of the meaning of science. The focus of their attention is sharply upon “what can be observed”—the behaviour of humans. This does not necessarily mean gross, somatic behaviour; the probing of the minds of subjects by ‘depth interviews’, for example, is included. Nor does the term necessarily imply that the behaviour studied must be directly observed by the student. The distinguishing or characteristic features of the behavioural approach are: an attempt to avoid all ‘oughts’, care in the formu-

---

1. It is interesting to note, and a reflection of a trend, that of the articles reported below in Tables 1 and 2 only three used some apparatus of quantification in the period 1925-29. This increased to only seven for the period 1939-41, but up to 30 for the period 1952-54.
3. Often the plural is used: ‘the behavioural sciences’. But what disciplines, or sub-disciplines, or aspects of disciplines are meant to be embraced is not firmly established.
lation of hypotheses, preoccupation with fashioning analytical 'models', meticulous attention to 'research design', use of quantification where possible, concern for leaving a trail that can be followed—'replication'—and caution in conclusions drawn from particular studies together with the expectation of an ever-growing body of established generalizations.

As indicated, behavioural science extends far beyond political science; it is an interdisciplinary movement or focus. In it are met and joined students from other social sciences, such as anthropology, sociology, social psychology, and economics, together with mathematicians, clinical psychologists, physiologists, geographers, and zoologists. In a sense and in some aspects it is a 'unity of science' movement; its boundaries are indistinct and fluid. Not only are comparatively few of the behaviouralists political scientists, but the phenomena studied by them are not necessarily political phenomena. Indeed, the whole realm of human behaviour is taken as the province of the movement—including many studies of subjects of traditional interest to political scientists (e.g. voting 'behaviour'). Though inter-disciplinary, probably the disciplines that have been most prominent in supplying central concepts and 'tone' are psychology and social psychology.

POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

'Political behaviour' designates the application of the behavioural approach to political phenomena, that is to say, it is a more limited term, customarily used by political scientists who are behaviouralists to describe their subject matter and approach to it. The following quotation, from an unpublished and unsigned memorandum titled 'Political Behavior' prepared at the University of North Carolina in a recent self-inventorying study, both indicates the focus of the political behaviouralists and summarizes their credo:

'As a focal area the study of political behaviour is not set apart from other aspects of the study of government or of politics by virtue of a unique body of subject matter. In other words, political behavior is not a new “field” within political science comparable, for example, to constitutional law, public administration, or comparative government. Rather, political behavior can be more accurately characterized as one “approach”, or “way”, to study most of the customary subject matter of political science. This “approach” is concerned alike with the formal institutions of government as well as with the informal relationships among leaders and followers, government officials and private citizens, influential business men, lobbyists, political party “wheel horses”, and plain voters. In summary, the student of political behavior is interested in the whole range of behavior patterns which reflect power and influence in the relationships of men to men and, therefore, lie at the heart of the process of governing. . . .'

1. Recently organized under Section L (philosophy of science) of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the large all-embracing organization of physical and biological sciences, is a Social Physics group; and apparently about to be organized and thus affiliated is a Society for the Advancement of General Systems Theory. The basic idea of both groups is similar; that there is an important range of concepts and methods equally applicable in physical, biological and social science. It is thought significant, for example, that the same formulae that describe the diffusion of gases describe the diffusion of rumours in a social group; or that the patterns of evolution in biology seem to apply in other realms, such as the evolution of languages. See Alfred E. Emerson, 'Dynamic Homeostasis: A Unifying Principle in Organic, Social, and Ethical Evolution', Scientific Monthly, LXXVIII, 2, February 1954, pp. 67-85.

The author of the memorandum goes on to ask how this range of patterns should be studied. 'Here the controlling factor is the basic objective of political behavior research—to discover uniformities in the actual behavior of men and groups of men in the process of governing, and to determine the nature and extent of these patterns of behavior. This orientation toward the development of generalizations and, in time, the formulation of theory about political behavior imposes two requirements: major reliance must be placed upon empirical methods and the research must be rigorously systematic. Emphasis upon empiricism means a departure from the normative character of much research in political science. The political behavior 'approach' is, thus, concerned with what men actually do (did), rather than with what they should do (should have done). Its focus is not upon laws, upon constitutions, upon formal governmental organization as such, but upon the study of human behavior. The data must always be reducible to units of observable behavior. This emphasis upon 'observable behavior', however, does not mean the rejection of historical scholarship as irrelevant. . . . Clearly certain types of essential data become available only after the passage of some . . . time; other types can be understood and interpreted only in the context of social habits, traditions, or significant past events calling for historical analysis. . . .

'The requirement of systematic research means simply that the search for uniformities in political behavior must be based upon an explicit statement of hypotheses to be tested and assumptions made, and furthermore that the testing of propositions shall be through the careful ordering of empirical evidence in a fashion that can be validated by successive research efforts. In such research quantitative techniques obviously have an important place, but the student of political behavior cannot limit himself to any one set of methods. He must be prepared to handle his data both quantitatively and qualitatively, to draw upon and adapt whatever concepts seem relevant to the analysis of political phenomena.'

THE UNEVEN PENETRATION OF THE BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH

The areas of study in political science differ significantly in the extent to which they have thus far been subjected to the behaviouralist approach. The area which has been subjected to the greatest influence is probably that of public opinion, voting, and elections. Politics, parties, and pressure groups, international relations, and public administration have also been rather strongly affected. Foreign and comparative government probably stands in an intermediate position, while the least studied are perhaps public law, jurisprudence, and judicial affairs—though even here there are some important examples of the new behaviouralism.

Why is there this disparity in receptivity or popularity? Accidents of personality are undoubtedly important, but in some cases the roots of the difference undoubtedly lie deeper. In the case of pressure groups, for example, those conditions of American life that have made the 'voluntary association' so notable a part of the scene, and the factors that led in the early decades of the century to an emphasis upon the pressure group as a clue to the understanding of policy making, have led by an easy and natural development to the present emphasis. In the case of public opinion, voting, and elections, two types of factors seem obviously relevant. One is the concern in the U.S.A. with democracy. If a constitutional theory that all legitimate authority flows from the people is combined with a strong emotional commitment to democracy, the 'flow' becomes a matter
of obvious concern (Are the springs drying up? Are the channels clear?) The other factor is quite different, namely in this area there are many units of observed or observable behaviour; many comparative data recorded or easily recordable—if one wants to apply quantitative and comparative methods, here is the sector of political science which lends itself most obviously or impressively thereto.

The applicability of quantitative techniques suggests an important factor in determining the selective emphasis of behaviouralism. Many, indeed most, of the concepts and research techniques of the political behaviouralists are derived from some other discipline, and, fashioned for the special purposes of these disciplines, may not be equally applicable to the various problems and interests of political science, at least until refashioned. Indeed, it has been suggested that there is a ‘tyranny of the instrument’, that much research is being conducted neither because of the importance of the problem nor the significance of the results, but simply because the project selected lends itself to research by a fashionable tool—or worse, will be supported by a ‘foundation’ grant. The behaviouralist reply to this is that the development of the ‘hard’ sciences is intimately related to the use and perfection of instruments, from the water clock and compass to the cyclotron and electronic computer, that the ‘tyranny of the instrument’ is no more characteristic of behavioural studies than of any other, and that behaviouralists are not interested in techniques for techniques’ sake, but because any advance in treatment of substantive problems awaits the development of better techniques.

FOCI OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR STUDY

To a significant degree the concepts and techniques of the behavioural approach are cutting new channels of thought within and between the familiar ‘areas’ of political science, such as public administration and comparative government. There are certain dominant concepts and clusters of research techniques which give direction and tone not only to single areas, but cut across several areas or (to their devotees at least) the whole range of political phenomena. It will facilitate understanding in the discussion below to call attention here to some of these foci of interest and research.

POWER AS A FOCUS

One of these foci concerns ‘power’ or ‘political power’. This is not, of course, an exclusively American concept. (For that matter, none of the others discussed are either.) Various Europeans of the present generation, prominently G. E. G. Catlin and Bertrand de Jouvenel, have seen power as the central reality of politics; and power might be said to be the central concern of some traditional political theories, such as those of Machiavelli and Hobbes. But in recent decades some of the most prominent and influential of American political scientists, including Charles E. Merriam and Harold D. Lasswell, have campaigned on behalf of the power approach to political study; and they have found many followers.

Power, for all its suggestion of hardness and explicitness, is hard to define and identify. Often ‘influence’ is coupled with it; indeed the study of power may be equated with the study of ‘influence and the influential’. There are some who assert that power is not a prime factor, but derivative, a secondary manifestation, a reflection of more basic social or moral factors; and that would-be empirical studies centred on identifying and measuring power have been and are bound to be shallow and unproductive. This is no place to outline, let alone to judge, the long debate concerning the usefulness and validity of the power concept, and the matter will be left with this observation or judgment. It is hard to find individual works of power analysis or a growing body of empirical theory concerning power to justify the continued enthusiastic advocacy; yet there is no doubt that a generation of advocacy and popularization have affected the tone of American political science—most American political scientists think readily, if loosely, in power terms; it has helped to shape an idiom and point of view; and there is no doubt that power thinking has increased the amount of empirical research and given much of it its theoretical orientation.

GROUP AS A FOCUS

Another focus of behavioural study is ‘group’ analysis. This is a point of view, an emphasis, very difficult to define or delineate. By groups may be meant the ‘organizations’ generally that intervene between family and ‘society’ or ‘state’. Or what may be meant is the entire complex of organizations in society (‘the whole structure of modern society is associational’), beginning with family or other face-to-face groups and embracing all large, formal organizations, including government. Or what may be meant is some particular, familiar aggregation, such as a party or pressure group. In any event, some American political scientists—and some of the ablest—place emphasis upon inter- and intra-group phenomena. Research on group phenomena, they find, is ‘operational’; it deals neither with an individual abstracted from his social environment, nor with abstractions such as society, institutions or state which cannot be directly approached.

In any discussion of group theory in American political science it is customary to cite Arthur F. Bentley’s The Process of Government (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1908, 501 pp.). However, this precocious essay did not much affect political study in its own day though attention was already being directed to ‘corporations’ and ‘interest groups’ in the Progressive Era (indeed, the Constitutional Fathers were concerned with ‘factions’). The work of John Dewey, especially The Public and Its Problems (New York, Holt, 1927, 224 pp.), is also frequently cited as giving force and shape to the group approach. As the group approach has developed it has drawn heavily upon the concepts of the other social sciences, and there is now a voluminous and often rewarding literature, which can be only briefly indicated.

Peter Odegard’s The Story of the Anti-Saloon League (New York, Columbia University Press, 1928, 299 pp.), Pendleton Herring’s, Group Representation before Congress (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1929, 309 pp.), and E. E. Schattschneider’s, Politics, Pressures, and the Tariff (New York, Prentice-Hall, 1935, 301 pp.), may be cited as important pioneering books. Oliver Garceau’s, The Political Life of the American Medical Association (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1941, 186 pp.) is an outstanding example of a study of a particular group, and Avery Leiserson’s, Administrative Regulation: A Study in Representation of Interests (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, 292 pp.) a successful attempt to apply group analysis to one sector of the governmental
process. David Truman's *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion* (New York, Knopf, 1951, 544 pp.) and Earl Latham's, *The Group Basis of Politics: A Study in Basing-Point Legislation* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1952, 244 pp.) are not only prominent 'group' books, but both contain full introductions to group theory and its bibliography.1

**DECISION-MAKING AS A FOCUS**

Another focus of behaviouralist study is upon 'decision-making'. In accordance with the behaviouralist emphasis upon 'process', what is stressed in such studies is the process by which decisions get made, not the validity or invalidity of specific decisions. Decision-making is viewed, by those who wear these spectacles, as a sort of common denominator of the political process; here come to a synthesis the complex of persons and power; all political agents and organs make decisions—legislators, judges, executives, bureaucrats, voters, politicians, interest groups and parties.


**POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AS A FOCUS**

Still another focus of behaviouralist study is 'political participation'. At the centre of attention in this case is the political atom, the individual, although there is no sharp cleavage between studies which are centred upon individuals and those centred upon groups, processes, and so forth. The origins and motives of political participation studies have largely been suggested above: concern over the phenomena of non-voting, desire to know political trends and predict election

---

results, worry over the influence of mass media of communication on political opinions, curiosity about the role of rank-and-file members in interest groups, and so forth. The abundance of quantitative data and the rich resources of presumptively useful research techniques have also been cited as stimulating work in this area. In the latter connexion it is worthy of note that not only is the amount of borrowing from other disciplines very great in this area of research, but much of the research has actually been done by persons trained primarily in other disciplines social psychology, sociology, statistics, etc.

There is a rich, varied and controversial literature concerning political participation studies. Perhaps both the weaknesses and the promise of the behavioural emphasis are best seen here. On the one hand there are studies that, despite a ponderous apparatus of concepts and a plethora of data, are "practically barren and theoretically sterile"; there has been some gaucherie in the wholesale borrowing from other disciplines and little or no development of accepted general theory. Still, there is undoubtedly an increasingly higher level of sophistication in theory and growing skill in use of the research tools; and there is movement from the descriptive to the analytical—"from the geographical to the geological".

OTHER FOCS OF BEHAVIOURAL STUDY

The foci of behavioural study discussed above may be the most significant, but they are not the only ones. 'Status' and 'role' studies, using concepts from sociology or social psychology—or actually conducted by sociologists or social psychologists—might be cited. Likewise, a full discussion would give attention to the concept of 'community', as used by some political scientists—again borrowing from other social sciences, largely sociology. 'Elites' and 'symbols' have been the centre of some research and theory, 'communication' is still another focal or seminal concept; behind the use of this term lies the recent rapid development in the U.S.A. of communication as a field of specialization, or discipline, in itself.


2. See the book Power and Society, by Lasswell and Kaplan, cited above, for an explanation and delineation of these terms as they appear in behavioural research. See also earlier books by Lasswell, who has been more prominent in the political behaviour movement than any other individual.

THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

Still another focus or trend is 'comparativeness'. To be sure, the comparative method is not new to political science. Study of European governments, from their constitutional histories to their municipal administrations, was a prominent aspect of American political science in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; it was a natural result of the fact that many of the founding fathers of the discipline pursued postgraduate studies abroad.

For a generation, however, no advance was made in the use of the comparative method, and in some ways it became stultified. In the field of 'comparative government' there was very little study which went beyond Western Europe and institutions of Western-European type found elsewhere. In its study of these the method used was one of formal comparison within such accepted categories as elections, parliament, and local government. There was little serious attention to the context—historical, social, economic, and so forth—within which the governmental institutions were set, and substantially no attempt was made to arrive at empirically based generalizations.

At present the comparative method has a new emphasis and new tools; and it is being applied in new areas (such as comparative—i.e. foreign—administration). One stimulus has been the second world war and the altered position of the U.S.A. in world affairs as its aftermath. Attention to the culture and institutions of other regions, non-European as well as European, has become more natural or necessary: the technical assistance programmes of today are a far cry from the preoccupation with a sick domestic economy characteristic of the thirties. Another type of stimulus comes from the behavioural science movement. Here it is not simply that new types of research tools have been made available, but that contact with other disciplines has revealed new dimensions and problems through concepts such as class and culture. While not much has yet appeared in the way of specific research products as a result of the new interest in the comparative method, there is much ferment.

INTERRELATEDNESS AND INTERCHANGEABILITY OF FOCI

In the interests of clarity, the major foci of behavioural study were separated in the above discussion. In the contents in which these foci are found, however, their separateness or distinctness varies greatly.

If the subject to which attention is directed, for example, is an economic 'interest group', and its effect on the formulation of certain public policies, the research may be formulated in terms of the power or influence exerted by the interest group; or in terms of the 'participation' of persons in and out of the interest group; or in terms of the group vis-à-vis other groups; or in terms of the decisions and decision-making process. Whichever focus is chosen, there may be some supplementary use of one or more alternatives, consciously or unconsciously.

'Political power', as a focus, is especially pervasive and flexible. Indeed, while power is certainly in some sense and for some purposes a 'focus', it is in another sense more general or basic than decision-making or group theory; that is to say, the presumption is likely to be that what 'lies back of' decision-making and group politics is power, and that these are studied as embodying or exemplifying power. Hence the phenomena of decision-making and group activity are likely to be described in terms of power—ultimately if not in each instance.

This matter is well explained or illustrated in the following paragraph from
an essay on group theory. The language illustrates also some other points in the above discussion:

'The conclusion emerges from an inspection of the literature dealing with the structure and process of groups that, insofar as they are organized groups, they are structures of power. They are structures of power because they concentrate human wit, energy, and muscle for the achievement of received purposes. They are of the same genus, although of a different species, as the state. And so we come by still another route to the insight which the philosophical pluralists demonstrated, that the state as an association (or group) is not different from other associations, like churches and trade unions. That which puts both state and non-state associations in the same category of forms is the common factor of power. Both are associations of people for the achievement of ends common to the members, and the means of achievement is the application of the power of the association to the obstacles and hindrances which block the goal. It is true that the state and other group forms represent power in different packages, that organized groups may be regarded as systems of private government while the organs of the state represent a system of public government. However, the ubiquity of power in human relations, with its manifestations in other group forms than the state, is the reason for believing that the subject matter of politics is power; contrary to the view that its subject matter is the state, which is one of the engines through which power is exercised. Private government is not only a legitimate but a much neglected subject of inquiry by political science.'

THE BEHAVIOURAL VOGUE

Behavioural science is at present 'in vogue'. As a movement it has captured some of the best minds among younger generation political scientists, and its influence extends far beyond its acknowledged adherents. Impetus is given to it by a disposition on the part of some of the larger 'foundations' to support empirical study in the social sciences, as against more traditional studies (thought to be less 'scientific', or at least already well supported). Impetus is given also by the considerable amount of 'operations research' being carried on by the federal government or under contract with the federal government by universities and research institutes. At the same time, the behavioural current is not carrying

---

2. A word of explanation concerning the 'foundations' is in order for those not familiar with the American scene. A 'foundation' in the present meaning is a private, non-profit organization. Foundations are brought into legal existence under general corporation statutes, and are governed by boards of directors composed of citizens interested, though their day-to-day activities are carried on by a staff of officers and employees. Besides such large and famous foundations as the Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, one of special importance to our subject is the Social Science Research Council, an organization which performs a 'clearing house' function, stimulating, guiding, and co-ordinating empirically oriented research in the social sciences. Among the committees of the Social Science Research Council is an important Committee on Political Behaviour, which has sought to mark out 'behavioural' studies in various areas of politics and to stimulate work thereupon.
3. This term is military in origin, meaning research on military 'operations'—e.g. the tactical and strategic application of radar in air defence. Operations research, sometimes called operations analysis, is now a broader concept, however—three is an Operations Research Society of America of some 600 members, more than half of whom work in the field of business and industry. R. F. Rinehart, in a paper entitled 'The History and Development of Operations Research' (Seminar Paper No. 29, The Johns Hopkins University Operations Research Office) gives as a 'minimum definition' the following: The exterior application of the methods and tools of science. By exterior application, I mean to imply the application of the methods and tools of science outside of their usual habitat. . . . Scientific method is here restricted to the methods and tools of science which lead to quantitative results, . . . included as tools, . . . are the conceptual tools of science—such concepts as symmetry, conservation (of energy, etc.), critical experiment in testing of hypotheses, etc., are examples.
Operations research is not identical with behavioural science as that term is used here, but, while 'behavioural', is narrower, there is a large area of overlapping interests, concepts, research interests and techniques. There is an element of strain, however, between the 'practical' orientation of operations research and the 'free curiosity' and 'follow the hunch' bent of students with an academic orientation. Operational research has a natural emphasis upon results, whereas academic behaviouralists prefer to emphasize general, and generalizable, theory. The fact that much operations research is 'classified' (i.e. not made public in the interests of national security) makes for further strain, difficulty in communications—and difficulty in assessment.
all before it. There are many who would be scientific—and indeed, thought that they were—but are simply bewildered by the formidable terminology, the multitude of unfamiliar concepts from other disciplines, and the stress upon mathematics. There are those who see the movement as diverting political science from important to trivial matters simply because the latter lend themselves to study by the fashionable techniques (‘what counts can’t be counted’). And there are those who see behaviouralism as a dangerous threat to the essential moral core of the Western political tradition, a barbarian fascination with gadgetry to the neglect of important values. To the charge of ‘trivialization’, the behaviourists reply that genuine science develops slowly, that one must learn to walk before learning to run; and to the charge of ‘barbarization’ that science itself is a part of the Western moral tradition, and that if civilization is to be saved from destruction by the stresses of the modern world genuine social science must be pursued with rigour and ardour.¹

INCREASING CONCERN WITH POLICY PROBLEMS

American political science is increasingly concerned with problems in public policy. This is evidenced in three ways: (a) an increase, proportionally, in the number of articles and books on this subject; (b) an enlargement of the range of policy problems of interest to political scientists, either in their capacity as ‘producers’ (research activities) or their capacity as ‘consumers’ (teaching and other opinion-forming activities); (c) a growing depth of penetration and understanding, arising from continued study, practical experience, new research tools, and an appreciation of interrelations brought about by increasing knowledge of other social sciences.

There are elements of paradox, inconsistency, and strain connected with the increasing involvement with policy questions, the sources and general nature of which may be indicated briefly.

At no time has American political science been unconcerned with policy problems. In fact, it has characteristically—if not always obviously—been rooted in practical problems, such as municipal or legislative reform; and sometimes been inspired by an obvious reformist zeal. In the first decades of the century the drive toward science was not, on the whole, seen as being in conflict with the practical and reformist orientation; the separation between ‘fact’ and ‘value’ had not been felt;² science was conceived as a new and better way of problem-solving—substituting fact for fancy, firm principle for guess and guile.

It is in the past two decades that the ‘paradoxes, inconsistencies and strains’ have developed. Their development has to do with the rise of the behavioural science movement: with the increasing contact with the ‘more advanced’ social sciences, the advocacy and popularization of logical positivist philosophy, and the desire to create a ‘real’ or ‘pure’ political science. If a value-free, generalized and descriptive political science is the objective, and if, as some have come to

¹. That behaviouralism has its own moral tone is indicated by such passages as this: ‘In classroom consideration of American political parties there has traditionally been over emphasis upon myths and normative judgments concerning the “evil” boss, the “admirable” independent voter, and so on. By greater reliance on the political behaviour “approach”, the political scientist can now teach “real life” party politics, replacing myths with analysis of observed behaviour in the political process. The value of such teaching for future party leaders, public officials, and citizens alike is obvious. This is one way the political scientist can serve the cause of working for a more rational process of public decision-making.’

To say the least of it, an approach which argues fervently that we ought not be concerned with oughts poses interesting problems in philosophy and logic.

². Somewhat of an exception to this generalization was the field of public administration. Here the tendency was to make a distinction between ‘politics’ and ‘administration’. This was far from a rigid value-fact dichotomy, however, as the writings of such students as W. F. Willoughby show.
believe, through the eye of science all values are equally 'data' and nothing more, then any overt concern with policy is misguided and naïve, or at best a form of 'social engineering' of less ultimate importance than the search for behavioural uniformities. In general terms, the issues involve the conflict between a policy problem- and reform-orientation on the one hand, and a conviction that value questions should be avoided on the other. Seldom have the issues involved been sharply posed and publicly debated¹ (logical positivist thought came into political science not by exposition and acceptance at the philosophical level, but by 'back door' routes for the most part) but they nevertheless lie close to the surface of much political science activity during the past quarter-century.

Why has there been a growing current of concern with policy problems? First of all, one may say that in the thirties there began a critical re-examination of many problems thought previously to have been solved. Many of these were 'machinery of government' problems—such matters as administrative, voting, and party arrangements—and what were increasingly called into question were the 'solutions' of the previous generation. In the field of public administration, for example, the 'principles' of administration believed to have been firmly established were searchingly questioned, and the very term 'principle' was thrown into disrepute. The result of the new spirit of scepticism was that many matters were reopened for examination both at the 'policy level' and the level of scientific inquiry.

Another reason for the growth of concern with policy questions has been—not surprisingly—the growth in the size and magnitude of the problems. The crises of depression, war and threatened war brought a natural change in outlook as against the rather withdrawn and complacent outlook of the twenties. The second world war especially brought political scientists into active, sometimes even compulsory, concern with public policy matters, not only 'machinery of government' problems but a vast and disparate range of policies in such areas as social welfare, public finance, foreign affairs, and natural resources.²

It is instructive to consider the work of Harold D. Lasswell, acknowledged leader of the political behaviour movement, in connexion with the development of policy studies. Lasswell's earlier work was characterized by a rejection of value problems in favour of a 'realistic', empirical approach. First, psychological themes, particularly those derived from psycho-analytic thought, and then, 'elitist' themes derived from such writers as Pareto, characterize his early writings. Behind these is the notion of 'power', posited or asserted as the central theme or differentiating subject matter of political science. In proper positivist fashion he regarded values simply as objects of desire, and the question of the relative 'value of values' as beyond solution. Traditional political philosophy he saw as merely 'derivational' thinking, serving at best the psychological function of mitigating the 'consequences of insecurity in our unstable world'.

Coinciding roughly with the outbreak of the second world war, and almost certainly related to the course of political and military developments, Lasswell's viewpoint underwent a change. He became convinced 'that the social sciences are doomed to sterility unless they accept the contemporary challenge and say

¹. Bernard Crick, op. cit., p. 312. 'The fashion changed overnight from pragmatism to positivism... The change was largely uncritical, less an act of intellectual judgment than a chastening of reformist hopes in the political temper of the twenties. Like Darwinism and then Freudianism, a second-hand logical positivism was illegitimately extended into a general theory of society.'

². Perhaps paradoxically, the behavioural science movement has contributed to the increased concern with policy. By increasing the knowledge of and interchange with the other social sciences it has brought the problem areas of these social sciences within the purview of political science. Perhaps even the new tools with which the behaviouralist movement has brought familiarity have contributed to the same end: new tools reveal new problems and give new facets to old ones.
something about our ultimate social goals'. He remained firmly committed to science, but sought now to embrace policy as well: in fact, both to implement the goals of one type of society—'democratic society'—as against others, and to validate by means of science the goals of this society.

This turn in Lasswell's thought is largely responsible for the popularization of a new term, 'the policy sciences', defined as 'the disciplines concerned with explaining the policy making and policy executing process, and with locating data and providing interpretations which are relevant to the policy problems of a given period'. 'Policy science' is conceived as standing in the relationship to 'behavioural science' that applied science stands to pure science. Since the 'policy scientists' happen to be in American democratic society it is the goals of this particular society that policy science primarily concerns itself with achieving. These goals for the most part are simply 'accepted' as data, but the language often suggests and sometimes makes explicit an emotional commitment; and sometimes, as in the case of Lasswell himself, there is the further suggestion or statement that liberal-democratic values are firmly rooted in the data of the science of man and probably susceptible of ultimate validation.

The development of Lasswell's thinking is important because in it are brought together the two strains of (a) increasing emphasis upon rigorous empirical research—behaviouralism—and (b) the simultaneous increasing recognition of and emphasis upon policy problems. It is thus by virtue of the very fact that he is a leader that possible dilemmas, strains, and inconsistencies of contemporary political science are best revealed in his writings, which bring together two dominant currents. Whoever wishes to know both some of the most characteristic achievements and the methodological and philosophical problems of contemporary political science cannot do better than study Lasswell.

THE GROWTH OF THE THEORETICAL COMPONENT

A significant trend of recent and contemporary American political science is an increasing attention to theory. The increase is apparent as a sheer quantitative and comparative matter (see tables on pages 38-42), in terms of essays and books written in traditional or customary categories of 'political theory'. But more important is the increasing attention to theory in the various subject areas of political science study, such as international relations and public adminis-

1. David Easton, 'Harold Lasswell; Policy Scientist for a Democratic Society', Journal of Politics, XII, 9, August 1950, pp. 450-77, p. 451. This is an excellent essay on the subject under discussion. Easton attributes the change in focus of Lasswell's research interests from elites and symbols to decision-making to Lasswell's awakened interest in democracy. The latter equally with the former presupposes that politics is 'power'; but it is a perspective which recognizes the 'capacity of every person to contribute to the common life'.
2. This validation is sought primarily in psychological and anthropological data, in an attempt to prove that 'democracy is subject to the fundamental laws of human behavior'. This, as Easton notes, is a return to an older tradition, an earlier positivism. In essence, this attempt to remarry science and philosophy through the bond of human nature is symptomatic of the pressure to which social scientists are subjected today to solve the crucial problem of the relativism of values. By training, social scientists have refused to pass beyond relativism; by necessity they are seeking to do so. . . op. cit., p. 455.
3. Daniel Lerner and Harold D. Lasswell (eds.), The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method, Stanford, Stanford University Press, California, 1951, 344 pp., p. 14. The subject area covered by the 'policy sciences' is in general that of the behavioural sciences, i.e. including but somewhat broader than the traditional or conventional 'social sciences'. There is the same tendency to substitute new categories and terminology for old.
4. An example of this type of approach is found in Robert A. Dahl and Charles E. Lindblom, Politics, Economics and Welfare, New York, Harper, 1953, 557 p. Here the authors state (p. 25) that: 'This book proposes to describe and analyse different politico-economic techniques, and to appraise them. If we were concerned only with description and analysis, we should have no need to discuss values. But to appraise, one needs criteria.' The authors then proceed to list the goals of liberal-democratic society as they conceive them. They acknowledge a personal, emotional preference for these goals; but explicitly state that they have no intent of trying to demonstrate their 'rightness'—and suggest, at least, that this is an impossible task.
5. In this connexion, see Crick, op. cit., as well as Easton. Crick also briefly traces for Charles E. Merriam a comparable development from a narrowly structured concern with behavioural problems in the twenties and thirties to a broad, troubled—and tangled—concern with policy questions in the forties.
tration. There is increasing self-consciousness of theoretical presuppositions; a
greater effort to start from and to return to a carefully stated theoretical frame-
work, increasingly sophisticated use of theory as an instrument of analysis and
criticism. This increase in the awareness and use of theory applies to both
'ought' and 'is' categories, to normative theory and to descriptive or causal theory.
Moreover, the evidence indicates that the majority of political scientists, whether
or not they are 'theorists' as a matter of conventional label, regard theory as
the 'core' of political science.

These generalizations must now be qualified and some complications explained.
It should be noted, for example, that, while most political scientists state that
they regard theory as the core of the discipline, to many this is perhaps but
obeisance to a polite fiction, a reflection of a lingering desire for the historical
prestige of liberal education; or an expression of hope or faith that somehow
their own particularistic endeavours are given significance by some kind of theore-
etical framework which, under an academic division of labour, is the proper
concern of a section of the profession composed of 'political theorists'. It should
be noted also that theory is a 'fighting word' because it signifies different things
to different political scientists. To some the term signifies moral inquiry, some
associate it with causal inquiry, others use it to embrace both the moral and
the causal. Moreover, there are other emphases and shades of meaning: some
may associate the term with historical studies, others with philosophic or scienc-
ific inquiries. The result is confusion and friction. For example, one student
may defend the importance of moral as against causal inquiry in the name
of political theory; another, accepting the same definition of the term but inter-
ested in causal inquiry, may attack 'political theory' while himself engaged in
construction of highly abstract theories about political behaviour.

For those unfamiliar with the American political science scene, a word of
explanation on the conventional role of theory and the theorist is appropriate.
In the course of specialization within the discipline in the early decades of the
century, political theory became a 'field' of specialization. But on the whole it
has not proved to be like the co-operative and mutually beneficial division be-
tween the theoretical and experimental or applied in the physical sciences.
Rather, strain and antagonism developed. As a result of personal factors and
historical accidents, 'political theory' as a field of inquiry became associated
primarily with value inquiry. It also became or remained strongly interested
in the history of ideas and, to a lesser degree, in the traditional pursuits of philo-
sophy. On the other hand, the orientation of other political scientists was in-
creasingly toward the contemporary scene, toward the 'non-philosophic' philos-
ophies, and toward 'science' and behavioural studies. To these political scientists
political theory as a field and political theorists as a category became increasingly
obscure or dangerous to progress. Still—as suggested above—a
respect for the tradition of polite and liberal learning might beget a certain res-
pect or the appearance thereof. And some, though substantially ignorant of what
the political theorists were about, fully accepted the idea of a division of labour
along value-fact lines and assumed that theorists were actively and fruitfully
engaged in value inquiry. This latter assumption is not necessarily true.
This paradox can best be explained by reference to a recent book by David Easton, *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science* (New York, Knopf, 1953, 320 pp.). Addressed to the status and prospects of theory in political study, this book is one of the most provocative and important works of recent American political science.

Easton's thesis is that the 'state of political science' is lower than it should be because the theoretical function within the discipline is inadequately performed. Both ethical and causal theory are weak and confused, and the sharp distinction between value and fact categories prevents each from giving light and strength to the other.

The key to inadequacy in the creation and clarification of values lies in 'relativism' and the 'decline into historicism'. By relativism is meant the idea that because all values are historically conditioned they are equal as values—which Easton believes ridiculous. By the 'decline into historicism' is meant a bent toward antiquarianism, toward history for its own sake, which is related to its false conception of relativism: ‘The contemporary historical approach is historicism ... because it believes that very little more can be said about values except that they are the product of certain historical conditions and that they have played a given role in the historical process.’

Easton thus sees the political theorists as followers of a tradition of historical scholarship which continues of its own momentum though it has been devitalized by an erroneous, defeatist philosophic notion. But while the theorists claim value inquiry as their function without actually fulfilling the function, equally important is their neglect of current causal inquiry, amounting occasionally to a supercilious disdain. The result is semantic confusion, hostility between ‘theorists’ and ‘non-theorists’, and a failure to achieve a discipline in which the various fields support and enrich one another.

Easton presses his two theses so ardently that he comes close to self-contradiction: ‘it is clear that contemporary political theory is not particularly concerned with empirically oriented theory. Indeed, if anything, it conceives of itself as primarily a moral enterprise, interested particularly in the history of moral ideas’.1 The historical approach to values, which I am calling historicism, has led theorists to concentrate, first, on the relation of values to the milieu in which they appear; second, on a description of the historical process through which such ideas have emerged, and third, as a part of these two objectives, on the meaning and consistency of the ideas expressed. ... They have in effect assimilated political theory into empirical and causal social science and have thereby abandoned its genuinely moral aspect.'

The author accepts Easton's description of the situation in the main, but would qualify and modify it in some respect. Eager to describe the disease, Easton has neglected the evidences of health and vitality—of which his own writings are evidence. The author's appraisal of the situation would include the following.

**THE POLITICAL THEORISTS AS A GROUP**

Those political scientists designated by self and colleagues as political theorists are roughly divisible into two groups, although there is no sharp cleavage. One

---

2. Ibid., pp. 236-7.
of these, the smaller, is characterized by an orientation toward a theological foundation, toward philosophy in the grand manner, or toward natural law. These are not exclusive categories, neither are they identical. What gives them a unity of sorts or at least a relationship is their common antagonism toward the position of the other theorists. The position of the main body of theorists can perhaps best be designated by the term naturalism. Some would accept the label of empiricist, some of pragmatism; others would accept another label from contemporary philosophy, while some would accept no label except perhaps eclecticism. Significantly, few if any would accept the label logical positivism, despite the popularity of this school among those with a behavioural science orientation.

Confining attention for the moment to the political theorists, one can say that both of the groups delineated are very vigorous. Recent books by Eric Voegelin, John H. Hallowell, and Leo Strauss are evidence of vigour among those with a theological, philosophic or natural law orientation. On the other hand evidence of vigour among the 'naturalists' is given in the books (cited above) by Louis Hartz and David Easton. There is also much evidence in the journals in recent years to suggest that the 'decline into historicism' is not as serious as represented. Many of the recent essays, though concerned with historical writings, are impressive in their incisiveness and their relevance to current problems; certainly there is relatively little that might be labelled 'antiquarianism'.

**THEORY IN THE SUBJECT MATTER FIELDS AND IN BEHAVIOURAL STUDIES**

To confine attention to those designated as 'political theorists' is to constrict the inquiry undesirably. In two important aspects advance is being made largely without benefit of 'political theorists'.

In the first place, even a horseback survey of several of the subject matter areas of political science reveals a substantial advance in the use of theory over the past decade or two. This generalization applies both to quantity and to quality (if such terms may be permitted) and to both valuational and descriptive categories. There is more time and space consciously given to theoretical problems, greater and greater sophistication in the application. The study of international relations, for example, has been transformed during the past twenty years (see below), and theory is the key to this transformation. The same is true for public administration. In both cases theory has been used both procedurally and substantively; that is to say, both as an instrument of self-criticism in developing 'methodology' and as an instrument for analysing and attacking problems (for

1. *The New Science of Politics: An Introduction*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1952, 193 pp. This has been a highly controversial book. It argues for a return of political study to theological-philosophical bases; the 'new science' is thus beyond or away from positivism and, in fact, back to Plato and St. Augustine. Not merely the naturalists among the theorists, but the 'behaviouralists' generally have regarded the book as at best misleading in title and at worst as dangerous in thought. Even some with a religious orientation find the position stated so extreme that it is unacceptable; Voegelin's interpretation of 'gnosticism' is such as to condemn essentially all developments during the past thousand or fifteen hundred years.


3. *Natural Right and History*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1952, 527 pp. This study in the history of natural right doctrines is the most notable recent work in political theory, from the viewpoint of traditional scholarship. Though it contains a vigorous essay (on Max Weber) against positivism and is sympathetic in tone toward natural right doctrines, the book is certainly not a straightforward argument for natural right, and Strauss' position is perhaps best described as 'centre'.

4. As a case in point may be cited Sheldon Wolin's 'Hume and Conservatism', *American Political Science Review*, XLVIII, 4, December 1954, pp. 995-1016. One of the current trends (stimulated by the behaviouralists) is to study past theorists with a view to extracting from their writings—and putting into rigorous form with a view to empirical verification—their descriptive or causal theory. See Fred Kort, 'The Quantification of Aristotle's Theory of Revolution', *American Political Science Review*, XLVI, 2, June 1952, pp. 486-93. See also Andrew Hacker, 'Capital and Carbuncles: The "Great Books" Reappraised', *American Political Science Review*, XLVIII, 3, September 1954, pp. 775-86.
example, problems of ideology and propaganda, in the case of international relations).

In the interest of accuracy it should be noted that the division between theorists and non-theorists is not as sharp as is implied. Substantially all American political scientists receive training in political theory (at least in the sense of courses in the history of political ideas) during their preparation for higher degrees. Thus they come to their subject matter specializations more or less prepared to 'theorize', though they may not actually think of themselves as theorists, but rather as 'scientists'. Moreover, those who bear the label 'theorist' may choose to pursue theoretical inquiry in a subject matter area, addressing themselves to current problems. There is probably less of this than a completely 'healthy' situation would require, but there are important examples.1

The other important respect in which confining attention to nominal political theorists is misleading is in appraising the status of theory concerns behavioural studies. Here we confront the anomaly of significant political theory being developed by students who neither in their own view nor in that of nominal political theorists are 'political theorists'. The demarcation between the political theorists and the behaviouralists, in fact, is rather sharp, in terms both of issues and of personal relations. This is scarcely less true of the 'naturalists' than of the others. Behaviouralists are likely to regard political theorists as pedantic, moralistic, uninterested in and a hindrance to the development of science; political theorists are likely to regard the behaviouralists as philistine and 'technique happy'. (On the other hand, the impression must be avoided that there is a sharp distinction between the behaviouralists and those who, in the various subject matter areas, are responsible for theoretical advance as described above. Some of those responsible for the advance in the subject matter areas are behaviouralist in their orientation,2 some are not.)

The political theory being developed by the behaviouralists is largely descriptive or causal. It often takes the form of model construction and explication, of refining hypotheses, of drawing out the implications for political study of concepts from other areas of study. This is done with the presumption that such activities lie within the realm of science instead of political theory. It is the author's view that such a sharp distinction is impossible, that a method of analysis or a framework of inquiry is inevitably also a programme of action which, so far as it pertains to politics, becomes political theory; and that this connexion is empirically demonstrable.

This view would be disputed by some political theorists, by most behaviouralists. But here at the line of division between value and fact would appear to be both lacunae and friction. The connexion between value and fact supplied by natural law patterns of thought has been largely destroyed, and no new connexion which is widely accepted has appeared in its stead. Indeed, a highly popular philosophic position among the behaviouralists holds that any 'organic' connexion is at the same time undesirable and impossible.

1. Power through Purpose, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1955, by Thomas I. Cook and Malcolm Moos may be cited as an example. Cook's, Democratic Rights Versus Communit Activity, New York, Doubleday, 1954, 35 pp., is also in point, as a discussion by a leading theorist of a problem in current public policy.

2. As a case in point, Herbert A. Simon, who takes a strictly behavioural approach, and whose writings have had considerable influence on the development of public administration.
In order that 'impressions' might either be affirmed or questioned, studies of the comparative quantity of writings in political science were made for this report. Three tables summarizing the findings appear below. Comment on various specific points follow the tables, but some questions concerning their validity and usefulness should be discussed at this point.

**GENERAL COMMENT ON TABLES**

Three periods were selected for comparison, 1952-54, 1939-41, and 1925-29. The period 1952-54 is, of course, the most recent for which records are available. The other two were selected partly on the basis of time-span as they are roughly a half-generation and a generation ago. The precise dates 1939-41 were selected, however, because they are as far removed as possible from the depths of the Great Depression without also reflecting the involvement of the U.S.A. in the second world war. That is to say, while perhaps there is no 'normal' period in national life, it was thought best to choose years which were presumably less likely to reflect unusual or transient interests. For this reason, the first period, 1925-29, ends with the advent of the Great Depression. This first period is five years rather than three because of the smaller number of essays per year at that time—i.e. to get an adequate sample.

Two studies were made, one of articles in general political science journals, and one of books as reflected in reviews. The former covers all three periods, the latter only the two more recent periods.

As indicated, only general political science journals were included in the study of articles. The journals studied were these: American Political Science Review, for all three periods; Political Science Quarterly, for all three periods; Journal of Politics, 1939-41, 1952-54; Review of Politics, 1939-41, 1952-54; Western Political Quarterly, 1952-54.

Only two of the general journals were in existence in the twenties, and the fifth listed did not begin publication until 1948. While these five are general journals, accepting for publication a wide range of materials, each has its own distinctive character. The American Political Science Review is the organ of the American Political Science Association. The Journal of Politics is the organ of the Southern Political Science Association, and the Western Political Quarterly of the Western Political Science Association (neither, however, is regional in the content or authorship of articles). The Political Science Quarterly is associated with Columbia University, and the Review of Politics with Notre Dame University. Much could be said about the 'representativeness' of the journals, in general or for particular periods (e.g. concerning the predilections of the editors, and the time lag between research and publication). Though aware of this, the author feels nevertheless that in a general way they collectively reflect American political science in the three periods.
A more serious problem concerning the value of the data in Tables 1 and 2 concerns the fact that there are specialized as well as general journals in political science. Some of these, such as the *American Journal of International Law* (1907) and the *National Municipal Review* (1912), were in existence for all three periods. However, some came into existence after 1929, and in such cases they affect the comparability of the figures, diverting into specialized publications articles which in an earlier period would have been published, if at all, in general journals. Some of the typical or important of such newer, specialized publications are the following: *Journal of Social Issues* (1945), *Personnel Administration* (1938), *Public Administration Review* (1940), *Public Opinion Quarterly* (1937), *World Politics* (1948).

The newer, specialized journals, on the whole, reflect the same trends revealed in the data from the general journals: In some cases, particularly international relations, an upward trend in the tables is reflected also in a series of newer specialized periodicals. But in some cases, particularly public administration and public opinion, a stationary or declining position in the table is probably more than compensated for by a large number of newer periodicals, as well as by other media of expression.

**Table 1.** Sub-totals of articles in general political science journals for three periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>1925-29</th>
<th>1939-41</th>
<th>1952-54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign and comparative government</td>
<td>67  31</td>
<td>76  29</td>
<td>182  43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political theory</td>
<td>46  21</td>
<td>67  25</td>
<td>116  28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public policy</td>
<td>16  7</td>
<td>44  16</td>
<td>89  21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International relations and law</td>
<td>21  10</td>
<td>34  13</td>
<td>80  19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics, parties, and pressure groups</td>
<td>15  7</td>
<td>27  10</td>
<td>47  11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion, voting, and elections</td>
<td>23  11</td>
<td>25  9</td>
<td>37  9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative affairs</td>
<td>25  11</td>
<td>44  11</td>
<td>29  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public law and jurisprudence</td>
<td>22  10</td>
<td>25  9</td>
<td>28  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American government (other than federal)</td>
<td>51  23</td>
<td>36  14</td>
<td>28  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>51  23</td>
<td>47  18</td>
<td>24  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive affairs</td>
<td>9   5</td>
<td>19  7</td>
<td>19  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial affairs</td>
<td>4   2</td>
<td>9   3</td>
<td>6   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and bibliographies</td>
<td>4   2</td>
<td>6   2</td>
<td>15  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and citizenship education</td>
<td>4   2</td>
<td>3   1</td>
<td>2   *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of articles published</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Less than one-half of 1 per cent.
## Table 2. Articles in general political science journals for three periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles published</th>
<th>1952-54</th>
<th>Percentage of entries to sub-total</th>
<th>1953-54</th>
<th>Percentage of entries to sub-total</th>
<th>1954-56</th>
<th>Percentage of entries to sub-total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of entries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of entries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of entries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign and comparative government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single governments, traditions or areas (other than U.S.A.)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single institutions, processes or problems (other than U.S.A.)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative treatment of more than one government, tradition or area</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative treatment of more than one institution, process or problem</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to construct a general theory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular theorists</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular traditions, schools or times</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular theoretical problems and analytical discussions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science epistemology and methodology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General theories of states, rights, politics, government or organization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil-military relations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and communications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and conservation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, education and welfare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil liberties and internal security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil liberties, other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International relations and law</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular international relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative quantitative treatment of subjects
Formulation or execution of particular foreign policies
Relations between two or more states
International law (substantive studies)
Theories and theorists of international relations and international organization
Executive affairs
Theory of executive functions
Executive institutions
Executive in relation to administration
Executive in relation to legislation
Executive in relation to judicial affairs
Executive in relation to policies, foreign or domestic
Biographical
Legislative affairs
Theory of legislative functions
Particular legislators and legislative problems
Particular bills and laws
Legislative reform
Biographical
Public opinion, voting and elections
Election laws and administration
Political behaviour (voting, etc.)
Political opinion formation and measurement
Communication and opinion formation
Politics, parties and pressure groups
Political parties, organization and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles published</th>
<th>1925-29</th>
<th>1939-41</th>
<th>1953-54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of entries</td>
<td>Percentage of entries to sub-total</td>
<td>Number of entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation or execution of particular foreign policies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between two or more states</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International law (substantive studies)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories and theorists of international relations and international organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive affairs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of executive functions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive in relation to administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive in relation to legislation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive in relation to judicial affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive in relation to policies, foreign or domestic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative affairs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of legislative functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular legislators and legislative problems</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular bills and laws</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative reform</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion, voting and elections</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election laws and administration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political behaviour (voting, etc.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political opinion formation and measurement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and opinion formation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics, parties and pressure groups</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties, organization and activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No percentages have been included for categories comprising less than 15 entries since data are too meagre.
## Comparative quantitative treatment of subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles published</th>
<th>1925-29</th>
<th></th>
<th>1930-41</th>
<th></th>
<th>1932-54</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage of entries to sub-total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage of entries to sub-total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage of entries to sub-total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political leaders and techniques</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure groups and lobbying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of parties, politics, pressure groups and private organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American government (other than federal)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-state relations and regionalism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State politics, administration and law</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (municipal, county, etc.) politics, administration and law</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public law and jurisprudence</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public law (constitutional and administrative)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisprudence (legal theory and philosophy)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative administration and technical assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of particular programmes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative theory and history</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial affairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of judicial functions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial organs and administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and bibliography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and citizenship education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of articles published</strong></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td>418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Books reviewed in American political science reviews for two periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books reviewed</th>
<th>1939-41</th>
<th></th>
<th>1951-54</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of entries</td>
<td>Percentage entered of total number</td>
<td>Number of entries</td>
<td>Percentage entered of total number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign and comparative government</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political theory</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public policy</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International relations and law</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive affairs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative affairs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion, voting, and elections</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics, parties, and pressure groups</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American government (other than federal)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public law and jurisprudence</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial affairs</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and bibliographies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and citizenship education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of books reviewed</strong></td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Books written by foreign scholars are included if published in the U.S.A. Introductory texts are excluded. A number of books were excluded because the authorship or content was deemed to make them unrepresentative. Books written by scholars primarily identified with another social science are included. In the period 1951-54, there were 3 books written by sociologists, 3 by psychologists, 5 by economists, and 8 by historians.

The classification system used is one devised by the author for this purpose, and has no 'official status' of any kind. In constructing the classification system the author had to decide whether to proceed by 'levels of government', i.e. international, national, province or state, and local; or by main organs or branches, i.e. executive, legislative, and judicial, or by customary statements of 'fields' for curriculum purposes. The plan adopted is a compromise (as are all classification schemes for political science, for curricular or any other purpose). For example, there is no separate heading for federal government, to avoid too much overlapping; for the reason noted below there is a separate heading for sub-federal studies. Some questions regarding the appropriateness of the classification scheme are raised below; other questions may be pertinent.

A system of multiple classification is used. If an essay did not fit neatly into just one of the sixty-seven classes, it was assigned to two or more classes, as seemed appropriate in view of its content. An article might, for example, be tabulated or 'entered' in two classes under the category International Relations and Law, and in one class under the category Political Theory. In other words, the total number of entries exceeds the total number of articles in Tables 1 and 2 and the total number of books in Table 3.

The percentages in Table 1 represent the ratio of the number of articles in a given category to the total number of articles examined, in the time periods specified. In Table 2 the percentages represent the ratio of the number of articles in each class or sub-category to the number of articles in the category. In Table 3, the percentages represent the ratio of the number of books in a given category to the total number of books reviewed (as explained in the table) over the time periods specified.

In the discussion following the tables, comments on shifts in total emphasis or attention given to a category or 'field' are based primarily on Table 1, and to a lesser extent on Table 3. Comments on changes within a category or field are based on the data found in Table 2.
COMMENT ON DATA SHOWN IN TABLES

Comment here is brief and intended merely to help the reader interpret the tables. Many matters to which attention is called are discussed at greater length above or below.

Foreign and Comparative Government

The fact that a great amount of attention is now given to foreign and comparative government is not surprising; this might be presumed to be a natural result of world politics in mid-century. What is surprising is that a great amount of attention was so given as early as the twenties, when the U.S.A. was in a mood of 'isolationism'.

It will be noted, however, that the data in Table 2 seem to indicate increasingly greater specialization; that is to say classes overlap less, articles are more narrowly focused.

Various articles that are the product of so-called area studies are included here, though this is somewhat arbitrary; they might with equal justification have been placed under the heading 'International relations and international law'. Unfortunately, the data do not reflect the broadened geographical scope of American political science study.1

The appearance in the most recent period of 'attempts to construct a general theory' reflects a mood of self-criticism, a methodological inquiry, an attempt to achieve 'genuine comparativeness'.

Political Theory

In general the data here underscore the emphasis—both above and below—on political theory. The fact that among the individual categories there is no significant increase for 'political science epistemology and methodology' casts some doubt upon the author's emphasis (above) upon the recent intensity of methodological inquiry. But other evidence, such as convention programmes, helps in buttressing this opinion.

Public Policy

Public policy is not ordinarily thought of as an area or 'field' of political science in the same sense as, say, international relations. Certainly few university departments of political science offer it, as such, as an area for specialization or 'major' work, though it is not infrequently—and probably more and more frequently—combined with a field such as public administration or legislation. It is, in a sense, a cross-classification.

In any event, the tables indicate an increased attention to policy questions and at least suggest an increase in concern with 'substantive' issues of public policy, as distinguished from issues of policy dealing with 'machinery of government' problems. (The distinction is that between, say, a question of regulation of air transport in interstate commerce and a question whether such regulation is best effected by an independent regulatory agency or a regular department. The latter has always been regarded by political scientists as a proper question for their attention; the former is somewhat marginal in terms of traditional

1. As observed by Hawley and Dexter, cited above, one of the things learned in the course of a study such as this is how to do it better next time.
interests and expectations.) The catch-all classification ‘General’ includes more or less analytical or philosophical essays, some ‘substantive’ treatments not falling within the classifications specified, and some ‘machinery of government’ treatments.

Several of the classifications are worthy of a word of comment: That there is no great percentage increase in the number of articles dealing with foreign policy can be attributed to the rise of specialized journals. The absence of any consideration at all of civil-military relations is startling, but must be largely discounted. A considerable number of recent books deal with this subject, and the work-in-progress in this area is known by the author to be very substantial.¹ The author has no explanation for the absence of treatment of problems in transportation and communications—other than sheer accident. The sharp increase in treatments of civil rights reflects not only the problems created by increased demands for ‘internal security’, but more solicitude generally; for example, for equal treatment of minority groups. (The new concern with civil rights in relation to security seems somewhat at variance with the author’s statement, below, that civil rights matters have not been given much attention by political scientists. But this opinion is based upon a comparison, not with political science in past periods, but with the response by those in other occupations or professions.)

International Relations and Law

What seems evidenced here is an increase in studies of international politics and of the theoretical aspects of international relations, as against studies in international organization and law. The figures do not tell the whole story of the transformation of this field, however, as there is now also more attention to politics and theory in or in connexion with studies of international organization and law.

Executive Affairs

Executive affairs is again something of a cross-classification, in the sense that it is not a customary division of political science for curriculum purposes. Note that the heading ‘Administration’ is separated from ‘Executive affairs’. Administration is a customary field or area for curriculum purposes, though there is considerable overlapping between the two categories, administration and executive affairs. It should be emphasized that neither the nature of American government nor the conventions of writing and teaching make possible more than rough, working classification schemes.

The small rise in attention to executive affairs in the middle period is presumably attributable to the fact that the mid and late thirties were a period in national history in which the Presidency was held by a vigorous and controversial figure, and the Presidency was a centre of scholarly as well as of popular attention.

Legislative Affairs

The figures here, registering a decline of interest following the twenties, are probably related to those on executive affairs; that is to say, the increase of interest

¹. As indicative of present studies in this area see Journal of International Affairs, VIII, 2, 1954. The entire issue is given to the theme ‘The Military and U.S. Foreign Policy Planning’. 44
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in (and sympathy for) the executive is probably correlated with a decrease in interest in (and sympathy for) the legislature. In the thirties political scientists generally became strong partisans of the President and since, under the separation of powers system the President is frequently posed against Congress, this often led to hostility toward Congress and depreciation of its legislative function. Other factors were undoubtedly important in this decline. Probably one has been the strong emphasis upon pressure groups studies—i.e. the tendency to regard the ‘real’ decisions as made within pressure groups or by the process of group conflict, rather than by legislative deliberation. Another factor was probably the rise of administration as a field of study; in this case too the presumption was made that important decisions on policy were being made in a place outside the legislature, namely, in administrative organs.

There are evidences that the field of legislative affairs is about to experience a re-emphasis. The signs of this are new or proposed courses in legislative procedures or ‘legislative representation’, and programmes in legislation and public affairs.

Public Opinion, Voting and Elections

The author feels that the figures here are deceptive because of the evidences of great activity and the large amount of publication in specialized organs.

It will be noted that there is a sharp decline in attention to election laws and administration. This probably does reflect a trend. Though this classification is put under the same heading as the following three, it is perhaps an unfortunate decision, for the newer ‘political behaviour’ studies of opinion have little in common with traditional studies of election machinery.

Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups

Though a small percentage increase in both articles and books is registered here, the author feels that perhaps there is more activity and vitality in this area of study than the data here indicate.

Incidentally, note may be taken of the relative unpopularity of the biographical approach to the study of politics, though the data certainly give some indication of growing interest in this approach.

American Government (other than Federal)

This category was included to try to get some measure of a presumed or ‘felt’ decrease in attention to state and local affairs. What strikes one here is the sharp decline in the number of articles dealing with the state and local level of government and politics. New specialized periodical publications would not appear to account for the decline, and the increase in books is slight. There are probably a number of causes for the lack of vigour, but the central factor would appear to be easily discernible: the Great Depression, the New Deal, the exciting events of national politics, the ‘federalizing’ of problems by such factors as the growth and integration of the economy, the emotional appeal of the New Deal to social scientists and the lavish opportunities afforded them to participate in federal programmes.

It will be noted that studies of ‘federal-state relations and regionalism’ have gone sharply upward, in contrast to state and local studies. The increase here reflects the emphasis upon the federal level, in terms of the interests and emotional attachments of the students concerned.
Public Law and Jurisprudence

The figures here indicate that public law has been declining in attention, relatively speaking. The figures for jurisprudence (legal theory and philosophy), though not sharply upward, suggest again an increased emphasis upon the theoretical.

Administration

The customary academic rubric is 'public administration', but 'administration' has been used here as the main heading because the field of public administration, in the American interpretation, is but one approach to a body of phenomena of organized, collective endeavour which include also 'private' administration; students of public administration are interested in 'general principles' of collective enterprise and in experience in private administration (or 'private government') as it may exemplify or illustrate these principles.

Public administration as a field of study within political science was born in the mid twenties, in the sense that the first general textbooks then appeared; and the thirties were a period of rapid growth. Public administration as a field or complex of interests has a strong bent toward autonomy, however, and since several specialized journals, in addition to the general Public Administration Review, furnish channels of publication, it is difficult to know how serious is the relative decline shown by the figures for 1952-54. In any event, important qualitative changes in the field are in progress.

Note yet again the decided shift toward the theoretical, shown in the last item.

Judicial Affairs

Judicial affairs are, of course, closely related to public law and jurisprudence, and in general they present the same picture in the tables. The thirties were a period in which the Supreme Court was frequently a storm-centre of national politics, and the upward curve for the period 1939-41 is presumably a reflection of these controversies.

Research and Bibliography

'Research' is distinguished here from 'methodology' as used above, and is used to refer to more mechanical, less philosophic and controversial matters. There is obviously little literature dealing with the ordinary 'tricks of the trade'; much of the basic information concerning 'how' and many of the emotive orientations concerning 'what' and 'why' are passed along on an informal personal basis. There is a small but growing body of 'how' literature associated with the behavioural movement. The book cited above by V. O. Key on statistics for political scientists illustrates this literature (it is perhaps the only one specifically addressed to political scientists, however, and it appears too late for inclusion in Table 3). Many of the items in the last figure in Table 2 are accounted for by a recently inaugurated series of bibliographical essays in the American Political Science Review.

Teaching and Citizenship Education

On the whole, American academic political scientists carry a heavy load of teaching; in fact, teaching and preparing to teach occupy the entire working time of
many. Also, the teaching of citizenship has been a very important function, in a population so largely and so recently composed of immigrants. Nevertheless, the figures indicate very little self-conscious concern either with the techniques or the philosophy of teaching and the inculcation of citizenship. Rightly or wrongly, the political scientist seems oriented toward his subject-matter rather than toward his students—judging from the literature.¹

CONCLUDING OBSERVATION ON TABLES

Viewed from the perspective of two generations rather than one, some of the data in the tables would perhaps present a different appearance. It is at least arguable, for example, that several fields of political science achieved a high level in the first quarter of the century—or before—and that what appears in the tables as lack of vitality is but comfortable maturity. The author suggests that this claim may have some plausibility with respect to the fields of public law, municipal government, and parties and politics.

¹ The volume Goals for Political Scientists, cited above, is of value in studying this matter. Strangely, in view of the small amount of publication on the subject, the evidence produced in that study indicates that most political scientists regard the teaching of citizenship as their most important function. One clue to this puzzle is that the 'citizenship' course is in most curricula the introductory course, often required—and for most students their only course in political science. And how the introductory course should be taught is a perennial subject of discussion; as a study of convention programmes will disclose.
CHAPTER IV

POLITICAL THEORY

This discussion of political theory should be read in conjunction with the discussion above of the increase in the ‘theoretical component’ of political science. In brief, it was argued above that increasing attention to theory is a contemporary trend; that this is true as measured both by the amount of increased writing in familiar categories of political theory and by the increase in theoretical attention and penetration in subject matter areas; and it is true with respect both to ‘ought’ and ‘is’ categories. Various aspects of theory pertaining especially to subject matter areas is discussed elsewhere in this report in connexion with these areas. What follows here is a closer look at political theorists as a group, and notice of some trends of thought not particularly connected with subject matter areas and not treated elsewhere.

POLITICAL THEORISTS AS A GROUP

Those who bear the academic label ‘political theorist’ were described above as roughly divided into two groups, a smaller group whose orientation is toward religion, idealism, or natural law concepts, and a larger group whose orientation is toward some form of naturalism. In some ways the difference in orientation is important and the controversies between the two wings may be severe; on the other hand, in some ways the lines are not at all sharply drawn, for reasons advanced above (and below as well). Neither is there a sharp division between ‘theorist’ and ‘non-theorist’; some political scientists write specialized and even outstanding books of political theory, and also in one or more subject matter areas—for example, Carl J. Friedrich or William Y. Elliott. (Sometimes the term ‘generalist’ is used in referring to such political scientists.) An attempt further to characterize the theorists and to indicate their functions is in order, though for reasons suggested in part there is considerable risk of misrepresentation or distortion.

First, the function of the theorist in American political science is primarily to provide criticism and perspective for other political scientists. The theorist is dedicated to the longer, broader view; he transmits to fellow political scientists ideas from other areas; he acts as an informed critic; he occasionally exhorts. For two reasons suggested above, namely the ‘decline into historicism’ and the antagonism to behavioural studies, perhaps this function has not been as satisfactorily performed in recent years as it should have been. Of course, it may be, especially with respect to the resistance to behaviouralism, that the theorists are ‘right’, and no judgment is here attempted. Rather, the breach is simply

noted and reported. The resistance to behaviouralism is nearly as great among the naturalist as among the non-naturalist group. Though certainly not opposed to science, the naturalists regard the approach thereto of the behaviouralists as too narrow and fanatical; the slogan of the naturalists might be said to be ‘Science without scientism’.

Second, political theorists are not—with a few exceptions—philosophers; nor do they—with a few exceptions—attempt large creative or synthetic works of political theory. Certainly few political theorists write for philosophical publications, and though many are learned in philosophy, seldom does a work in political theory consciously and carefully rest upon an explicit philosophical base. Nor on the whole are substantial synthetic works—one thinks in comparison of the works of A. D. Lindsay or Sir Ernest Barker—the aim and style of the political theorist. To be sure, there are possible exceptions; perhaps, for example, Charles E. Merriam’s, Systematic Politics (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1945, 348 pp.), or J. Roland Pennock’s Liberal Democracy: Its Merits and Prospects (New York, Rinehart, 1950, 403 pp.). But many of the possible exceptions—to the statement concerning philosophy as well—are by students trained abroad, and thus are atypical.

Third, many of the better known or more influential—or more controversial—of the political theorists have been trained abroad, and to the extent that this is true the atypical must be regarded as typical. Certainly the roster of names of well-known foreign-trained political scientists is impressive—Carl J. Friedrich, Herman Finer, Leo Strauss, Eric Voegelin, William Ebenstein, Hans Morgenthau, Hans Kelsen, to name but a few. A considerable number of these foreign-trained students teach and write ‘political theory’, and many more have had a notable effect upon theoretical development in subject matter areas.

One is tempted to think in terms of a ‘native’ tradition in political study, extending from the Founding Fathers to the present day, a tradition on the whole ‘practical’, experimental, pragmatic, and to pose against this tradition the ‘foreign’ influences, since so many of these, one way or another, are of a contrary nature. But though there is perhaps a core of truth or usefulness in this interpretation, there is great danger of oversimplification. If American political science is ‘unique in Western intellectual history’, it is so because it is a unique combination of Western currents of thought, not because it is simply American.

Fourth, it is difficult to classify political theorists, using such ideological labels as Liberal or Conservative. Most would accept the label Liberal-Democratic. What is more likely to divide theorist from theorist is either a general philosophic orientation or a concrete proposal. In particular there is no necessary correspondence between philosophic or religious orientation and ideological orientation. Both Liberals and Conservatives—so far as these are meaningful labels in America—are found (and in roughly equal proportions) in both of the groups of theorists delineated. For example, it is argued with equal fervour in the name of democracy that religion provides the only base upon which a democratic society can be reared and sustained, and that religion is a threat to democratic survival.

1. What is involved in this conflict is partly the ‘level’ of study. Certainly Hartz would not regard his book cited above as ‘unscientific’, but rather would regard his hypothesis regarding American liberalism as one developed from empirical evidence and to be subjected to scrutiny to determine whether or not it is in accord with the facts of historical and contemporary America. To the behaviouralist, however, such a hypothesis is much too broad, and too loosely developed to be subjected to test; and he would regard Hartz’ book not as a contribution to ‘science’, but an essay in history and philosophy.

2. As noted above, logical positivism has penetrated American political science rather deeply, at least in loose or modified versions. But the penetration is deepest in the behavioural science area of activity, and political theorists on the whole have not been receptive. There has been comparatively little concern among the theorists with logical construction and semantic analysis. Possibly this situation is due for a change. The author is aware of manuscripts in preparation in which the tools of logic and semantic analysis are applied to familiar categories of political thought.
MISCELLANEOUS THEMES OR TRENDS

Various currents in recent thought not discussed (at least fully) elsewhere deserve some notice before passing on.

Perhaps a current trend is an attempt to escape from ethical relativism. But this is an ‘impression’ of the author and may be incorrect; certainly it would be disputed by many political scientists, and it would not apply to much of the behaviouralist movement—which was observed to be in an ascendant phase. On the other hand, it was noted that political scientists are giving more attention to problems of public policy, and this practical concern with ‘ought’ questions provides stimulus to find ‘answers’ not purely expediential or instrumental.

It was noted above that Harold D. Lasswell, certainly a leader in the profession, had developed the idea of ‘policy sciences’; and that David Easton has argued that the idea of ethical relativism is a false conclusion from a correct observation that all ideas are related to a particular historical situation. Such straws in the wind suggest a trend from relativism. Leaders in political theory seem generally to have put aside both Marxian and Mannheimian relativism. The naturalists seek a naturalistic base for ethics, and the base most often searched is ‘human nature’. The author even hazards the observation that across the social sciences generally (including many ‘strict’ behaviourists) there is an attempt to find standards of conduct based on the ‘constants of human nature’. The movement is even broader, and includes—or seeks to include—the biological sciences, and to find the bases in the constants of organic existence.

A recent trend noted by some observers is a ‘natural law revival’. Evidence for this exists, though certainly it is not massive and conclusive. In the author’s opinion there is such a trend. If this opinion is correct, the revived respect for natural law thought is presumably related to and a part of the movement away from relativism. Indeed, while the differences of opinion between the two groups of theorists are very important to both, there may often be more similarity than is presumed. Naturalists seek a ‘natural “natural law”’, but no person (presumably) has ever sought an unnatural natural law, and natural law adherents have been much concerned historically with basing their belief upon the nature of man.¹

SUPPORT OF DEMOCRATIC THEORY BY BEHAVIOURAL DATA

One trend in political theory of great significance is toward an examination and support of the theory of democracy in the light of the findings of behavioural study. This trend is related in tone and outlook to the trend away from relativism—and can be more positively asserted.

The examination of democratic thought and institutions in the light of data from ‘realistic’ political study and from psychology and related disciplines is well over a generation old; it dates back to and is reflected in such works as Graham Wallas’ Human Nature in Politics (1908) and to Walter Lippmann’s Public Opinion (1922). The early works were received (though not necessarily written)

¹ The recent impressive work of scholarship by Leo Strauss, Natural Right and History, cited above, is evidence in support of this trend—though, as noted, it is a sympathetic treatment of the natural law in an historical study rather than a direct argument for or development of the idea. However, its very ‘secular’ tone emphasizes the possible closing of the gap between the two branches of anti-relativism. See also, Yves Simon, Philosophy of Democratic Government, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1951, 324 pp.; John H. Hallowell, The Moral Foundation of Democracy, op. cit. The natural law is, of course, accepted and emphasized by Catholic students. Hallowell, however, is a Protestant. It is worth noting, incidentally, that the writings of Reinhold Niebuhr, prominent Protestant theologian as well as writer on social problems, have had a significant influence in some areas of political study (for example, the ‘realism’ in international relations has some roots in his writings). See: Christianity and Power Politics, New York, Scribner’s, 1940, 226 pp.; The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness, New York, Scribner’s, 1944, 190 pp.; and The Irony of American History, New York, Scribner’s, 1952, 174 pp.
in a mood of disillusionment and cynicism. The 'discovery' that reason is a 'very late and uncertain product of evolution' and the full description of the differences between democratic ideals and democratic reality led to a literature of disillusionment or defeatism.¹

The change in mood from defeatism to cautious optimism is probably related to the ideological and military challenges of recent history; again, the awakened concern for democracy of Harold D. Lasswell may be taken as significant and indicative. In any event, recent political science has tended to take as a working hypothesis that the aims and methods of democracy are reconcilable with human nature; and much of political science has taken as a working programme the bringing of fact and institution into closer accord with theory and ideal.²

An illustration of the rapprochement between behavioural study and political theory is given in 'Democratic Theory and Public Opinion', by Bernard Berelson.³ Political theorists, he writes, 'tell us how a democratic electorate is supposed to behave and we public opinion researchers claim to know something about how the democratic electorate in this country actually does behave. . . . I am convinced that each side has a good deal to learn from the other and that joint work on this common problem can be valuable both for social science and for public policy'. Having made this point, the author asserts that: 'The normative theory of political democracy makes certain requirements of the citizen and certain assumptions about his capacity to meet them. The tools of social research have made it possible, for the first time, to determine with reasonable precision and objectivity the extent to which the practice of politics by the citizens of a democratic state conforms to the requirements and assumptions of the theory of democratic politics (insofar as it refers to decisions by the electorate). The closer collaboration of political theorists and opinion researchers should contribute new problems, new categories, and greater refinement and elaboration to both sides.

There follows a survey of theory and research findings with respect to personality structure, interest and participation in elections, information and knowledge about public affairs, normative principles held by citizens and applied by them to public affairs, ability of citizens to make accurate political observations ('to perceive political realities clearly and objectively'), political communication and discussion, and ability to relate political means to political ends ('rationality'). Berelson concludes with a plea for a fruitful interaction of theory and research: 'The study of public opinion can make a telling contribution in the basic, continuous struggle to bring democratic practice more and more into harmony with the requirements and the assumptions—that is, with the ideals—of democratic theory.'¹

CONSERVATISM

American intellectual life in recent years has been agitated by a conscious concern with the word conservatism. The advancement of conservatism as a theory

---

¹ In political science such literature is prominently represented by Edward M. Sait, Political Institutions: A Preface, New York, Appleton-Century, 1938, 548 pp., which finds democracy in 'decline' because it is based on false presumptions about human nature.
² J. Roland Pennock's Liberal Democracy, cited above, may be given as indicative of the change of mood and conclusions. It is a work similar in subject and level of treatment to Sait's work. To this author the difference in mood and conclusions is not merely one of the accidents of personality.
³ In Public Opinion Quarterly, 16, 3, Fall 1952, pp. 313-25, Berelson is not a political scientist, but the trend crosses the lines of discipline. The quotations given at this point are from p. 313. See also Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign, by Bernard Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1954, 395 pp.; and Angus Campbell, and Warren E. Miller, The Voter Decides, Evanston, Roe Petersen, 1954, 242 pp., especially Ch. 12 and Appendices A, B, and C.
or programme and the resistance thereto have involved political scientists, though as spectators rather than participants, more in the spoken than the written word. It is very difficult to assess the significance and importance of the conservative ‘movement’ for American political theory, but certainly the phenomenon deserves some comment.

Prominent among the advocates of conservatism have been Russell Kirk and Peter Viereck, both identified primarily with literature. Editors and publicists, such as Gordon Harrison, Russell Davenport and Walter Lippmann, have also participated. A few ‘conservatist’ books by political scientists, Francis G. Wilson and Clinton L. Rossiter, have appeared, and there has been a light sprinkle of essays on the subject in the professional journals. In all, a large literature on the subject has developed in the past ten years.

This is not the place for a thorough examination of the subject of conservatism, the reasons why it has been advocated, the varieties that have been offered, the replies that have been made, and so forth. A few observations and clues to the interpretation of the literature for those who may wish to peruse it must suffice.

In the first place, the reason why conservatism has come to the fore presumably has something to do with a general shift to the ‘right’ in American political life. How much of a shift has taken place, whether the shift is cyclical or secular, such questions cannot be explored. Suffice it to say here that there would be no dissent from the statement that the political climate is different from that of the thirties, when the social experimentation and economic reform of the New Deal registered the dominant mood, but were opposed vigorously by a minority of the population. (These reforms are now ‘accepted’, and made permanent by Republican acquiescence and even advocacy.)

Second, the thesis of Louis Hartz’ book (cited above) should be borne in mind: that, as compared with Europe, the spectrum of political thought in America is a short or restricted one. For historical reasons there has not been developed a well-reasoned, widely-accepted conservative political philosophy—certainly not by that name. Rather, such key terms as liberal and progressive, words suggesting optimism and democratic values came to the fore and gained wide and deep emotional attachment. In such a climate, upon what philosophic basis and using what idiom, can those favouring a return to past policies, the status quo, or ‘less change’ develop their case?

Third, there is the well-known confusion and controversy involving the word liberal: do the programmes and connotations of the classic definitions of the nineteenth century properly pertain to the twentieth century? Can programmes of economic control and social reform be called ‘liberal’? In what sense, if at all, can Socialism be called liberal? Or Communism?

Fourth—and related to these questions—is the condition of competition and of more or less hostility between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union during the past ten years. Can a programme of opposition to Communist activities within the U.S.A., for example, be justified within the four corners of a ‘liberal’ position?

Some of the opportunities for controversy, confusion and symbol manipulation
are now apparent. There are important issues and deep differences of opinion in America; but he who uses the words liberal and conservative as his guides in this situation must be on his guard—and even then risks getting lost. As a programme with a Liberal label may be thought by most ‘liberals’ to be reactionary, so today a programme with the label Conservative may be thought by many Americans to be radical. Indeed, the suspicion comes easily, not only that many ‘liberals’ are not liberals, but that some ‘conservative’ pleas are but strategic manoeuvres by liberal-spirited writers.

With regard to the interpretation of the conservatist movement in and by American political science, it should be borne in mind that among political scientists ‘liberalism’ has been a highly honorific word, that a very substantial majority of political scientists are members of the Democratic party, and that the tendency has been to equate liberalism with the programme and ethos of the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Fair Deal of Harry S. Truman. Conservatism therefore has generally been regarded as a ‘bad’ political philosophy, and doubly bad when associated with undesired public policies under a Republican administration. Hostility to ‘conservatism’ is therefore great among political scientists—though little of this has found its way into professional print—and conservatism is likely to become popular only if the dialectical development is such that Burke becomes the companion or protector of Thomas Jefferson and Adlai Stevenson.1

CIVIL RIGHTS

In recent years there has been an outpouring of literature on the subject of ‘rights’. This development is related in many ways to the development of a literature on conservatism.

Both phenomena are related to the swing of the political pendulum toward the centre or the right—though it is a much too simple interpretation that they represent opposite responses to that movement: some ‘conservatives’ are very ardent in the defence of civil rights, ‘liberals’ are by no means united in their view on crucial civil rights issues, and some of the ‘civil rights’ literature argues the case for narrower or stricter policies in this field. Political scientists have been engaged only marginally, as in the case of conservatism. Comparatively little of the large literature has been produced by political scientists—most of it on legal aspects of the subject—though civil rights matters have received a large amount of their attention in one way or another.2

Recent civil rights controversies have covered a broad area, including such subjects as equal rights and privileges for Negro citizens, and deportation of

1. Perhaps it should be noted that while political scientists have been concerned recently with many liberal causes or ideas, for example, civil rights, they have not been much given to writing books and articles addressed to liberalism as such. Note, however, the book by Pennock, cited above. See also, Carl J. Friedrich, The New Belief in the Common Man, Boston, Little Brown, 1942, 345 pp. A debate concerning ‘majoritarianism’ engaged a number of political scientists in recent years, and certainly this may be interpreted as an inquiry into the meaning of liberal democracy. For an introduction to this literature, see Francis W. Coker, ‘Some Present-Day Critics of Liberalism’, American Political Science Review, XLVII, 1, March 1953, pp. 1-27.

naturalized citizens convicted of crimes. However, the central area has been freedom of expression, and the crucial problem that of the proper treatment of Communists' activities within the U.S.A. In sharpest form this is the dilemma: Shall we tolerate the intolerant, those who would use civil liberties to destroy civil liberties? The 'central area' and the 'crucial problem' are closely related. International tensions and revelations of certain Communist espionage and conspiratorial activities are certainly the main cause for movements (for example) to require 'non-Communist oaths' from teachers and for what have come generally to be regarded as the infringement of private rights by Congressional investigating committees. Nevertheless, there are 'free expression' questions having no relevance to Communism, and problems concerning Communist activities that pose no important questions of rights.

This is not the place, of course, to review the civil rights controversies, which are many and complex—on the side of fact and law as well as of political or moral issues. It is appropriate, however, to speculate on the limited nature of the political scientists' involvement, and to comment on the nature of that involvement.

To the author, the clue to the limited involvement is to be found in the divorce of ethics and science, value and fact, noted above. Heirs of the Enlightenment—and of a moral tradition much older and deeper, for that matter—political scientists have a highly favourable attitude toward rights. They 'believe' in them strongly. However, the older intellectual foundations for their beliefs have eroded seriously, and newer foundations have not been accepted. Whether naturalism, following lines sketched above, can provide acceptable foundations is an open question; it has not yet done so for most social scientists, or for intellectuals generally. The result is that political scientists (aside from those with a religious or natural law orientation) lack a general or generalizable theory of rights, and, in conscious or unconscious recognition of the situation, turn either to legal studies—i.e. a defence of civil rights in terms of the Constitution and statutes—or to the study of the history of the development of rights, seeking to protect them by the 'sanctity' of tradition. To find American liberals, certainly not oriented toward historical studies in the past, taking a leaf from Burke's Reflections is surprising—and is a commentary on the danger of using the labels Liberal and Conservative in contemporary America. The present paradoxical situation is that liberals can find little to appeal to except tradition, and that conservatives are hard put to find a respected conservative tradition to which appeal can be made.
In the past two decades the study of international relations not only has received increasing attention, it has greatly changed in emotional tone, scope, and methods.

Before the first world war international relations studies consisted largely of international law and diplomatic history, the first shared with legal specialists and the second with historians. Indeed, most of the work in these studies was by legal specialists and historians, and the perspectives and methods of law and history predominated. The key to the emotional-intellectual climate of that period is to be found in such words as progress, democracy, rationalism, optimism. Progress toward peace and democracy was for the most part assumed as inevitable. As war seemed a manifest evil and man was assumed to be rational, the problem of making peace universal and perpetual was seen primarily as a problem in education and law. The self-image of America's role in world affairs was also a conditioning factor. The special circumstances of achieving nationhood in a 'new world' and the absence of strong, aggressive neighbours encouraged a presumption that European patterns of diplomacy and 'power politics' were mischievous and evil, a heritage of barbarous ages which America had abandoned. The phenomena of diplomacy, war, and international conflict short of war, it was presumed, both should not and need not be studied seriously; as evils they should be shunned, and in any case they soon would be abolished.

New fields and dimensions were given to international studies by the first world war, but the prevailing emotional-intellectual climate was in some ways intensified rather than altered. Study of international organizations was given a tremendous impetus by the creation of the League of Nations and its agencies; study of international law was much enlarged and intensified; international economic studies grew in number and importance; a 'current events' approach to recent and contemporary phenomena arose to complement the old diplomatic history. But the catastrophe of the war appeared, in the American view, to have demonstrated the evils of the traditional nation-state system, which had originated in and centred upon Europe. The evils of such things as diplomacy, nationalism, and balance-of-power arrangements seemed now writ large and irrefutably. Americans might differ heatedly on a policy of isolationism versus international co-operation through the League, but they were generally agreed on the evils to be avoided. Students of international relations for the most part...

---

chose the option of international co-operation through the League, and conceived the problem of achieving peace as a problem in proper organization at the international level. Other students, though not necessarily opposed to the League, continued to place first emphasis upon international law, and to them the problem of achieving peace appeared primarily as a problem in perfecting such devices as arbitration tribunals. Among students of international relations generally 'power', 'politics', and 'national' were 'bad' words. Power and politics connoted the opposite of organization and law. National connoted the old and undesirable, international the new and desirable. 'In summary, one could say that the analytical model used for investigative purposes was a world commonwealth characterized by universal peace. The real world was described in terms of its deviation from the model.'

THE CHANGE OF TIDE: IDEALISM TO REALISM

The beginnings of a shift toward the orientations and methods of the present decade are discernible in certain publications issued and researches undertaken in the thirties. Two types of factors appear responsible for the new-type publication and research. One was the deteriorating state of world politics. In some cases this was only an invitation to shriller repetition of old themes, but in other cases the lack of congruency between high idealism and harsh reality led to a sense that familiar thought-patterns were inadequate, must be discarded, and a fresh start made. The other factor was the advance of the behavioural sciences and the diffusion of behavioural concepts and methods. Publications of the period which illustrate and lead the new trends are those of Frederick Schuman, Charles A. Beard, Harold Lasswell, Arnold Wolfers, Quincy Wright, and Nickolas Spykman.

While the beginnings of the reorientation are visible in the thirties, the 'Great Divide' in international relations studies is clearly the second world war. The old methods of study seemed obviously invalidated by this new catastrophe, a mood of disillusionment and cynicism prospered. Indeed, in the mood of the day the work of the interwar years was perhaps discounted unduly.

International relations study in the post-war decade is characterized by a movement away from 'idealism' toward 'realism'; by a bringing to the centre of study the concepts of power and politics; by a closer relationship with other fields of study, such as economics, history and especially sociology; by a strong infusion of thought-ways and techniques from behavioural science; by a decided increase in attention to theoretical problems; and by an eclectic and expansionist spirit.

2. 'Just as it took the bitter experience of the interwar period to dramatize the fact that democratic institutions would not automatically flourish once democratic constitutions had been adopted, so it took the breakdown of the Versailles order to make clear how much more there is to creating a world commonwealth than drafting its charter.' Fox, op. cit., p. 74.
3. International Politics, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1st ed., 1939, 922 pp. These several works have little in common except that they all indicate themes later to be emphasized. Schuman's book put a new emphasis on power, but was not behavioural in orientation. On the other hand, the works by Lasswell and Wright draw heavily on other social sciences—and are behavioural in orientation.
9. One of the foci of common interest to sociologists and students of international relations is group solidarity, intergroup relations, etc., with special reference to the phenomena of nationalism. There is a growing disposition neither to applaud nor to condemn nationalism, but rather to understand it. See: James S. Coleman, 'Nationalism in Tropical Africa', American Political Science Review, XLVIII, 3, June 1954, pp. 404-426, and citations therein.
The movement from idealism to realism has meant the abandonment of the mood of optimism, a new or keener appreciation of the role and scope of the irrational, surrender of the assumption of a natural harmony of interests at the international level, a new sensitivity to the existence of politics and power struggles, a determination to get beneath formal rules and institutions to the functional and dynamic, and a decision to pursue problems of international relations as far away from traditional interests as may be necessary to 'get to the bottom of things'. One is misled, however, if he infers from the talk about the 'new realism' and the public depreciation of idealism that all idealism is dead. That is to say, the ideal objective of the student remains harmony and peace. It is rather that he no longer believes that harmony is natural, but can only be achieved by much hard work and the development of much more knowledge; and that 'peace' and 'war' are much more complex phenomena than once was dreamed.

Both 'politics' and 'power' have come to the centre of focus in international studies. They are related and overlapping, but not identical concepts, politics being more general, 'looser', than power. There is a large body of literature in American political science dealing with 'politics' in domestic affairs. International relations students, previously not accustomed to thinking of either international law or organization in terms of politics, have now come to do so. That is to say, there has been a 'borrowing' by international relations students of categories and conclusions (concerning pressure groups, for example) from a different branch of political science.

But from various sources, 'power' concepts have been added to politics. One source is the political behaviour movement, which has usually taken power as its orienting political concept; another is the more general tradition in political theory emphasizing power. Still another is various bodies of European writings, particularly the literature of geopolitics. Writers of European background have been influential in increasing the strain of 'power' thinking.

'International politics' has come to the fore as a common term. Books are written, courses taught, and curricula organized in this idiom. In fact, international politics now competes with international relations as the common name for international studies. Writings and courses in international law and organization suffered a decline in the post-war years, at least compared with new writings and courses in international politics. One of the major movements and preoccupations of the present day is the 'revitalization' of the study of international law and organization, largely but not solely by the application thereto of new thinking about the political process as it operates in (or affects) international affairs. An attempt is being made, that is to say, to place the study of law and organization within the context of knowledge of the theory and practice of international politics. Nor is this a one-way process. There are signs of an admission that organization and law influence politics as well as the reverse.

Probably it would be correct to say that at the moment the study of international law is not as far advanced toward 'recovery', toward re-establishment of the economic, the social and the political at the same level of awareness as is the study of international organization. Certainly both studies languished.

1. The talk of movement from reform to realism is 'misleading . . . if it suggests that researchers today are not motivated by desires for improving the state of international affairs. Most of them seem quite as bent upon finding new ways of maximizing values as were their predecessors'. Frederick S. Dunn, op. cit., p. 80-1.

2. Perhaps, chronologically, 'power' precedes 'politics'. In the early and mid forties, Yale and Princeton universities were centres for the 'new' thinking in international relations, and the widely used books edited by Harold and Margaret Sprout, Foundations of National Power: Readings on World Politics and American Security, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1945, 774 pp. (2nd ed., 1951), as well as the book by Spykman (cited above) at Yale, are indications of the change in tide.
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in the post-war period of emphasis upon politics and power. In recent years, however, new currents are discernible. There is a trend to emphasize economic and social organizations as against security organizations, and—compared to the thirties—to emphasize the political and behavioural as against the institutional and legal.¹

THE IMPACT OF BEHAVIOURALISM

In a mood of exploration and experimentation, international relations is seeking to bring within its boundaries new data and techniques from sociology, history, economics, other areas of political science, and indeed from all disciplines and subdisciplines that seem to bear upon 'the division of the world into a number of autonomous political units'. Especially important has been the reception of behaviouralist ideas; the behaviouralist influence is probably greater here than in any other area of political science except that of the study of public opinion.²

The more 'behavioural' disciplines, psychology and social psychology, anthropology, and sociology, have been scrutinized for relevant ideas and methods. And the foci of behavioural study discussed above are identifiable in recent and contemporary research.

One of the foci identified is the decision-making process. A series of studies centred upon decision-making was inaugurated by the Brookings Institution in 1946,³ and in the fifties this approach has been carried forward with a much stricter behavioural bent by a group of scholars at Princeton University.⁴ Another focus is 'elite study'. The case for behaviouralism in international relations has been stated cogently by Frederick L. Schuman: 'The serious investigator of world politics cannot begin to answer the more vital and incisive questions which confront him, nor even to formulate meaningful questions in answerable form, unless he draws from the biological sciences what is known about Man as a mammalian organism and a problem-solving animal; from the psychological sciences what is known about stimulus and response, about the structure and dynamics of personality; from anthropology and sociology what is known about comparative cultures; from the new history what is in process of becoming known about the life-cycles of the major civilizations; and from all these and other sources whatever is known about adaptation of personality to tension and crisis, the externalization of hostility in unstable societies, the specific ways in which "wars arise in the minds of men", the symbolic and institutional prerequisites of reducing aggressions and deflecting them into relatively harmless channels, and the nature of the problem of the political unification of the world commu-

---


² Lest a false impression be given perhaps it should be said that though the behaviouralist impact upon international relations is comparatively large, strict behaviouralist studies—as distinguished from those that merely bear some mark of the 'new realism'—form a comparatively small amount of the material now being published. On the other hand, it is known that a considerable amount of 'classified' (i.e. secret) international relations research is being done by the federal government or under contractual arrangements in universities or special research institutes, and probably much of this research is behaviouralist—though not necessarily of appropriate type or sufficient scope to make it of general significance.

³ The interest in the Brookings studies was decidedly 'substantive', not behavioural, though there was consideration given to institutional procedures best suited to making 'good choices'.

⁴ On decision-making see: Richard R. Snyder, H. W. Bruck, and Burton Sapin, Decision-Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics, Princeton University, Organizational Behavior Section (Foreign Policy Analysis Series, No. 3), 1954; Edgar S. Furniss, Jr., The Office of the Premier in French Foreign Policy-Making: An Application of Decision-Making Analysis, Princeton University, Organizational Behavior Section (Foreign Policy Analysis Series, No. 5), 1954, 67 pp.
nity. A series of elite studies has been produced at the Hoover Institute in its programme of study of ‘Revolution and the Development of International Relations’.2

One of the most significant developments of a behavioural nature is the bringing together of public opinion study techniques and an interest in problems of international relations.3 For national self-understanding, if not for development of general theory, this has been a fruitful union. Still another important development in international relations research in which behavioural data and concepts are prominent may be designated as ‘community building’ or ‘expanding community’. In this case there is a marriage of the traditional interest in international organizations and the desire for a ‘world commonwealth’ with the concepts and techniques of ‘community’ research in such disciplines as social psychology and sociology. It is an endeavour in ‘realistic idealism’, an attempt to find the psycho-social bases of community and to chart present communities, as expressed in formal organizations or otherwise, with the aim of intelligently guiding the growth of communities which sustain and forward desirable international objectives.4

As international relations has been hospitable to behaviourism, so it has been hospitable to the growing interest in theory. Much of this growing interest has been incidental to other concerns. For example, interest in behavioural science brings with it an interest in the theories justifying it as an approach, and in particular theories, such as those concerning communications. There is additionally, however, a conscious striving toward theory—an attempt to reach new levels of generality, abstractness and clarity. ‘Theory of international relations’ as a term to designate a special field or aspect of international relations study has come into use,5 and in some institutions separate courses with this title are offered.

The eclecticism and expansionism of current international relations must be emphasized. Deeply convinced in the forties that their task had been conceived too narrowly and shallowly, students of international relations seem now determined to embrace every datum and idea that may conceivably bear upon their problems. This of course has good aspects; stimulating interchange at the growing periphery is one. But some fear that an attempt is being made to

swallow more than can be digested.\(^1\) And, as noted above, the desire for separate status, a divorce from political science, is strong enough to have found some expression in special curricula, degrees, and research organizations.

**THE 'GREAT DEBATE'**

The reorientation of international relations study which has been described has been accompanied by the growth of a large literature of controversy. This reorientation has, of course, taken place concurrently with major international events; and at the same time that methodological problems have been at the fore, there has been great and acrimonious debate in the nation on the foreign policies appropriate to the U.S.A. Among students of international relations, debate on proper foreign policies has been intermingled with debate on questions of appropriate concepts and procedures for their discipline—indeed, as indicated above, international events and questions of foreign policy largely stimulated the reconsideration of methods. The literature of controversy, sometimes referred to as the 'Great Debate', deserves the attention of anyone wishing to understand the change and travail of the past decade.

The Great Debate has been pressed, on the one side, by the 'realists', who pose themselves against 'utopianism', 'sentimentalism', 'moralism', and 'legalism'. Those who stand under attack by the realists are not as readily designated by a single word; while many argue the case for the validity and even the utility of ideals, they resist the implication of the label 'idealist' (even more of the rhetorical 'utopian') that they are without practicality—and even realism. The central concepts of the realists are interest and power: 'The main signpost that helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the concept of interest defined in terms of power.\(^2\) In general, the realist position is the would-be 'tough' position that expectation of too much goodness or rationality in man is likely to lead through the dialectic of events to less of either; that the struggle for power in human affairs must be regarded as endless, not something which, at the international level and at the present stage of history at least, can be brought to an end by such devices as 'world parliaments' or such concepts as 'extending the jural order'; that it is morally justifiable to place the 'national interest' of the USA ahead of abstract, universal moral principles in policy decisions. The position of the 'idealists' is more diffuse, less easily summarized. Those who have taken the idealist position in the debates are not persons who were leaders of institutionalist-legalist studies in the interwar years, but (on the whole) younger scholars who themselves represent the newer currents of thought and activity. It is rather that they regard the realist argument in its most vigorous and extreme forms as itself dangerous or unrealistic, or at least irrelevant to immediate research problems.\(^3\)

---


In the essay by Edgar S. Furniss, Jr., cited above, is an excellent brief summary or 'skeleton outline' of what American scholars conceive international relations or international politics to consist of. There are presented 'four interrelated categories. The first... the factors underlying state power, the second the aims and objectives of states, the third the tools and techniques of statecraft, and the fourth, the mechanisms for regulating inter-state relations', p. 79. The first three of these were not significantly treated in international relations before the second world war; expansion into these new areas has brought both friction and fruitful co-operation with political scientists who have other specializations.


For an introduction to this literature, see the following: On the realist position, Hans J. Morgenthau, op. cit.; *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1946, 244 pp.; *In Defense of the National Interest*, New York, Knopf, 1951, 383 pp.; *What is the National Interest of the United States*, *Annals of the American Academy*
The realist-idealist debate has been highly complex, and confusing if not confused. For example, though the foreign policies of the U.S.A. have certainly been at issue occasionally and in some sense, it may be admitted by a participant in the debate that the disagreement is not over specific policies, but over their rationale. This seems to move the argument to the level of general theory, philosophy or ethics; and certainly most of the debate has proceeded at this level rather than at the level of policy itself. Methodology is certainly involved, since the realists profess to present a new, hard, realistic approach to data. Yet there is certainly no clear-cut division with respect to science, empiricism and behaviouralism. The real issues, in fact, are difficult to discover, and the author's sense of the situation is that there is a growing feeling of weariness with the debate, a desire to find a tenable centre position, using what is 'practical' in both realism and idealism. The final task of clarifying the issues awaits to be done.
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of Political and Social Science, 282, July 1952, pp. 1-7; and 'Another “Great Debate”: The National Interest of the United States', American Political Science Review, XLVI, 4, December 1952, pp. 961-88; George F. Kennan, American Diplomacy, 1900-1950, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1951, 154 pp.; Realities of American Foreign Policy, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1954, 119, pp; John H. Herz, Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study in Theories and Realities, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1951, 275 pp.; Charles B. Marshall, The Limits of Foreign Policy, New York, Holt, 1954, 126 pp. Morgenthau has been the leading 'realist', as the citations suggest. Kennan, an ex-diplomat, pleads for realism as viewed by 'one who was there'; Marshall, formerly with the Department of State, makes a related plea. Herz' book is a general work in theory, but sets forth fully the case for 'realism' as against 'idealism'. Perhaps it should be added that the various works of E. H. Carr have been widely read and very influential in the U.S.A.


2. Some of the difficulty is suggested by this quotation: 'It is not without irony that of the two authors who have recently come out for a policy of national interest, the one, George F. Kennan, who calls for a policy of national self-restraint and humility, usually identified with morality, should deny "that state action is a fit subject for moral judgment" ... while the other, Hans Morgenthau ... calling for a policy of unadulterated national egoism, claims to speak in the name of morality.' Arnold Wolfers, op. cit., p. 498 n. The introductory chapter of Morgenthau's revised Politics Among Nations has been interpreted to the author, on the one hand, as 'the Great Retreat', and on the other hand, as 'taking the idealists into camp'. Part of the dispute certainly involves the value-fact dichotomy. One correspondent refers to an attempt to 'discuss values in terms of facts'.
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CHAPTER VI
FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

The study of foreign and comparative government shares with the study of international relations a primary emphasis upon the 'non-domestic'. Moreover, the two fields of study are closely related in some respects; convergence is especially notable in 'area studies' (discussed below). Yet their profiles of development for the past two decades are very dissimilar.

Perhaps in the first four decades of the century the former study outstripped the latter in terms of theoretical and methodological sophistication or some other criteria of 'maturity'. Herman Finer's, *Theory and Practice of Modern Government* and Carl J. Friedrich's, *Constitutional Government and Democracy* were widely used in undergraduate and graduate instruction in the thirties, and certainly it is difficult to call to mind works in international relations in this period which might be claimed to be of comparably high theoretical development. On the other hand, the second world war was not as deeply traumatic for comparative government as for international relations, and the tremendous changes in the latter, described above, were not matched in the former. In the past five years, however, feelings of dissatisfaction have risen to a high pitch in some quarters, extended methodological probing and debate have taken place, and it is possible that comparative government is about to develop rapidly along new lines. Certainly it will if the 'revolutionists', largely younger scholars, are able to advance very far along the lines they project.

It has been noted above that studies of foreign and comparative government are many in each of the three periods studied, and indeed the amount of research and publication (in the general journals) has increased steadily in percentage as well as in absolute terms. The collapse of war-born constitutions in the thirties, the rise of dictatorships, the second round of constitution-making in the forties, and the problems posed in liberated countries and by technical assistance in underdeveloped areas—these have all given new content and direction. However, one of the author's correspondents expresses a widespread feeling when he says that the field has grown 'broader but not deeper'. This negative feeling must be qualified in turn by appreciation of the problems posed by the fast and varied political developments, the voluminous data, the pressure for even very elementary factual reporting on significant new phenomena. Sometimes it is an achievement not to have lost ground. Moreover, the Young Revolutionaries are not necessarily correct in their feeling that, practically speaking, no ground has


3. Boston, Ginn, 1946, 655 pp. This is a revision of the work published in 1937 as *Constitutional Government and Politics*. To classify these two books as 'comparative government' is somewhat misleading. They are wide-ranging books, with a large theoretical component; in a sense they were—and are—political science approached 'whole'.
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A very recent essay on ‘The Study of Comparative Government’ by Roy C. Macridis draws ut the indictment against past approaches to the study of comparative administration and sets forth a scheme for reorientation. On the whole the methodological programme is strongly ‘scientific’ and behaviouralist in nature, though the author neither makes a fetish of avoidance of values nor rigidly insists upon quantification.2

The case against ‘traditional’ study of comparative government is put as follows: that it was culture-bound, limiting itself for the most part to countries of Western Europe or to areas affected by Western political institutions; that it was legalistic and formalistic, limiting itself to examination of documents (often being guided in research choice and design by availability of documents) and of the formal, static aspect of governmental institutions, unduly neglecting informal arrangements and indeed the whole political-social-economic-cultural context of laws and formal institutions; that it was preponderantly descriptive rather than problem-solving, explanatory or analytic; that it failed to probe far enough to discover functional equivalence (i.e. do two institutions, say two assemblies, serve different functions in their respective contexts even though they bear the same name and look alike? Or, contrariwise, do two unlike institutions serve the same function?); and that it was not genuinely comparative—i.e. that its basic descriptive categories were inadequate and confusing, that most students dealt with only one country (or at best proceeded country-by-country), and that there were really no concepts or techniques for determining either similarity or difference, especially if study moved beyond a strict Western orbit.

This is a strong indictment and undoubtedly there is much truth in it.3 On the other hand, the utility of the proposed new scheme remains to be demonstrated, and Macridis, though ardent in advocacy, cautiously suggests ‘justified skepticism’ until a showing of results.4

Macridis is concerned, first of all, with ‘an orderly way of looking at facts’. ‘Comparative study should, he writes, proceed in the following manner: (1) the collection and description of facts on the basis of carefully constructed and generally adhered to classificatory schemes; (2) the discovery and description of uniformities and differences; (3) the formulations of interrelationships between component elements of the political process and other social phenomena in the form of tentative hypothesis; (4) the subsequent verification of such tentative hypotheses by rigorous empirical observation for the purpose of amplifying the original hypotheses and ultimately verifying them; and, finally, the slow cumulative process of “acceptance” of certain basic propositions.’5

Macridis calls upon the political theorist to abandon his ‘exclusive interest’

---


2. The Study of Comparative Government, op. cit., p. 73: ‘The political scientist should be concerned not only with predictability but also desirability and should attempt to study the conditions under which socially desired goals can be realized. The examination of such goals in terms of ethical postulates is also the task of the political scientist.’

3. For what it is worth, the author, in several years of trying to teach comparative administration, arrived at the same conclusions. His feeling is, in fact, that a broader schema than that presented by Macridis may be necessary—that more basic data must be got from or by anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists before judgment on functional equivalence will be more than informed guessing.

4. Op. cit., p. ix-x: ‘I agree that the value of the scheme lies in its utility for empirical work and, since I have not used it for this purpose, it would be presumptuous of me to suggest that it is good.’

5. Op. cit., p. 4. Though Macridis is not explicit on the point, his opinion seems to be that up to this point we have no ‘basic propositions’ with adequate scientific credentials. He looks forward not only to accepted propositions, scientifically warranted, but to ‘general’, and even more generalized, theory.
in the history of doctrines and in value speculation, and to give aid in distilling and refining hypotheses and, eventually, general causal theory.

Macridis proposes that the study of comparative politics (comparative politics he finds a better term than comparative government, as the latter is too formal and institutional in its connotations) proceed with the use of four ‘basic concepts’. One is decision-making. ‘This is indeed the most universal function of politics, performed by different organs in different systems. It involves deliberation and the formulation of decisions. . . . By decisions is meant authoritative decisions, i.e. decisions made by certain official organs with the expectation that they will be obeyed.¹ The second is power, which is ‘one of the most ubiquitous phenomena of politics: the effort to control or influence the behaviour of others. In various systems this will take different manifestations. . . . Elites, economic associations, the army, the church wielders of the communications symbols, and the landowners are some of the groups we ought to study in order to gain a picture of the power distribution in a society.’

The third is ideology, the ‘various political ideologies of a system and . . . the various motivational patterns that characterize the particular behaviour of individuals or groups in a system’. The fourth is political institutions: ‘By political institutions we understand here both the formal organs of the political community as well as some informal structures which bear upon deliberation and decision-making, such as political parties, tribal organizations, or pressure groups. It is through political institutions that the most important and universal function of politics is expressed—namely, decision-making. . . .

‘The interrelationship of the various social and political forces subsumed under the above four categories constitutes the political process. As a matter of fact, we might define political process as the translation of conflict among interest groups into authoritative decisions. In terms of this definition we may consider the power configuration and the ideology of a given society to be the forces that shape the particular conditions under which deliberation and decision-making take place and political institutions are organized. Though they are all mutually interdependent, it is in the power configuration and in the ideology of a system that we shall often find the most dynamic factors that account for change. Yet as they are translated into policy they are altered substantially by the formal organization of institutions and the particular manner in which decisions are made in the system.

Each of the four basic concepts of his scheme or system Macridis develops at the length of a short chapter. He is at pains to point out, however, that, though he believes his categories ‘so vital that there is no problem or process that can be studied and understood without reference to them’, there remains much flexibility of approach within the limits of their acceptance as the proper framework. Various theories concerning groups, classes, leadership, and so forth, can be the basis for particular researches; and even the three traditional teaching-research approaches, namely, the intensive or country-by-country approach, the intensive functional approach (particular institutions or clusters of institutions), and the problem approach, need not be abandoned as long as they are reoriented to the scheme.

¹ All these quotations except the last are from pp. 23-24; the last is from p. 73. As so much attention is given to Macridis’ essay it should be emphasized that, though he speaks only for himself, his conclusions emerge from intensive group discussions on comparative government and hence are not merely private speculations.
CHAPTER VII

AREA STUDIES

A conspicuous development in American higher education in recent years is 'area studies'. Political scientists are participating importantly in this development. In terms of traditional fields of interest, international relations and law and foreign and comparative government are most closely—and about equally—involved in area studies. But the ideas and interests in the current area studies programmes go beyond these two fields and indeed beyond political science.

The recent rapid development of area study programmes was clearly inaugurated by the second world war. Large university-centred programmes of education in the languages and culture of countries and areas of military involvement or strategic importance were hastily organized as a part of the war effort and with special reference to the interests and needs of the armed forces; in fact, the programmes were largely financed and directed as military programmes. The impetus of the war period carried over into post-war years; trained personnel existed and training facilities had been built up, and, as against the retreat into isolationism after the first world war, both the idealism of 'one world' and the realism of international politics encouraged continued development of area studies.

Area studies of various kinds had existed, to be sure, before the second world war. Archaeologists, classicists, linguists, anthropologists, geographers and others had well-developed interests in various or particular parts of the world. Political science, as has been noted, gave considerable attention to Western Europe. What is new is, first, a large quantitative increase in area studies, so striking that it has been humorously suggested that university officers search for 'unclaimed' areas of the globe for the establishment of new programmes. Second, much more attention is given to area studies by some of the social sciences (e.g. political science—anthropology of course has always ranged far abroad). Third, there is a trend toward interdisciplinary co-operation; there is an attempt to study areas 'as a whole'—history, language, art, economics, politics, etc. Fourth, there is a groping for a new integrating or orienting principle, something which will make 'area study', if not a discipline itself, at least more than the sum of the established interests of particular disciplines.

Sometimes area programmes are organized in special 'schools' or 'institutes'. More often, the new specializations have developed within established disci-
plines, and university programmes are organized on a co-operative interdepartmental basis. Political scientists participate in both types of programmes; and some of the larger university political science departments have a staff of specialists—generally, trained political scientists whose professional specialty is an area or even a single country.

As would be expected, area studies suffer from 'growing pains'. For example, there is conflict or tension between the older established interests of history, linguistics, archaeology and art, and the new social science emphasis. There is also the problem of co-operation and adjustment of interests among the various social sciences, each with a distinctive outlook. There is conflict between the immediate practical objectives of training for government service or commerce, and the 'disinterested' motives of scholarship.

Political scientists who are area specialists have problems arising from their need to be deeply immersed (and if possible, occasionally physically present) in the area of specialization, on the one hand, and their need, on the other, to 'keep in touch' with political science and political scientists generally. Jurisdictional problems are rife. 'Area' is ambiguous; and the interests and concepts of various disciplines result in different maps of the world.
Despite the differences in subject matter, the fields of public administration and international relations are in many ways strikingly similar. Though both were late in finding their way into the curriculum, they have grown rapidly and both have secessionist tendencies. Both have been substantially reoriented in the past fifteen years, both have a new-found, self-conscious interest in ‘theory’, both face away from a traditional interest in law and toward the other social sciences, both have been in travail over the roles and interrelation of ‘is’ and ‘ought’ inquiry. Nor does this exhaust the list of similarities.

DEVELOPMENT: FIRST PERIOD

The history of public administration as a discipline in the U.S.A. may be divided into three periods. The first period was from 1887 to 1914. In 1887 appeared a precocious and now famous essay by Woodrow Wilson, titled ‘The Study of Administration’. In it Wilson urged American scholars to divert some of their time and attention from traditional legal and philosophic inquiry to the practical problems of ‘government in operation’. Though the essay had little immediate impact, it foreshadowed with remarkable accuracy many of the ideas and developments of the next fifty years.

During the closing years of the nineteenth century and the opening years of the twentieth, the foundations of administrative study were being laid. A civil service reform movement and a drive to purify and reform municipal government were developing attitudes and skills of importance. In this period private business began to think of itself as a ‘profession’ for which research and even academic training were appropriate. Ideas from the new ‘business administration’ as well as from the related Scientific Management movement, a drive to ‘rationalize’ administration by utilizing scientific methods of study, provided ideas and impetus to those interested in public administration.

By the eve of the first world war public administration as a discipline or at least a ‘point of view’ had been synthesized. Some of its basic tenets were as follows: that ‘administration’ is separable from ‘politics’—is a distinct operation of government; that administration is quite as important as politics and deserves...
equal study; that 'administration is administration', that is, has important
generic qualities, wherever and whenever practised, and whether private or
public; that administration is or can be made a 'science', or at least lends itself
to study and improvement by established methods of scientific inquiry; and that
the objective of administrative study is 'economy and efficiency' of operation.1

DEVELOPMENT: SECOND PERIOD

The second period in the development of public administration extends from
1914 to 1940. In this period, the academic 'field' of public administration was
built upon the foundations laid in the first period. The first textbooks appeared
in the mid twenties, and courses and curricula and even 'schools' of public
administration followed. Certain civil service examinations began to reflect
the growing literature, and an interaction between study and practice—begun
actually in the first period, especially in municipal government—developed
rapidly.

The new textbooks reflected a 'management' point of view. The authors
sought to avoid the legalistic and the theoretical; conversely they sought to
be 'practical' and 'scientific', to be concerned with the 'what' and 'how' of
getting the public's business done with economy, efficiency and dispatch. Spe-
cializations within the new specialization developed; and one of these, per-
sonnel administration, soon developed to the point of separate textbook treat-
ment.

In the thirties there was coined a new term, a mnemonic device, to refer to
the central categories of administrative study as then conceived. This term was
'Posdcorb' derived as follows: P. Planning; O. Organizing; S. Staffing; D.
Directing; C. Co-ordinating; R. Reporting; B. Budgeting.

In a swiftly swelling body of literature these subjects were developed, and
public administration specialists in academies entered into an era of strained
relations with their colleagues in other fields of political science. On the one
hand, students of administration felt that they represented an important and
eminently desirable inquiry, insufficiently appreciated—and often disadvantaged
—by traditional 'vested interests'. On the other hand, students of administration
often seemed to their colleagues brash and even 'unintellectual', their 'science'
at best a practical expertise of less than academic standing, and at worst a pseudo-
science.

Partly reflecting these strained relations there was formed in 1940 the Amer-
ican Society for Public Administration. This society has some 3,000 members,
some of them academic researchers and teachers, some of them public admin-
istrators or simply 'interested citizens'. The formation of the new society had
in itself the effect of relieving tensions, and at about the same time other devel-
opments (described below) began which have had the effect of reducing the
estrangement. Public administration as a general academic discipline at present
has what might be described as a semi-autonomous position with respect to
political science.2 Usually it is taught as a 'field' within a political science depart-

1. On the history of the public administration movement, especially on the doctrinal side, see: Dwight Waldo, The
2. Perhaps it should be noted that during the past generation, and as a part of a general movement toward profes-
sionalism in the public service, there have come into existence a great many professional organizations of civil ser-
vants—e.g. accountants, tax experts, and police chiefs. The public service is so large and diverse, and the specializa-
tions within it so intense, that public administration as a general discipline or point of view must resist a strong splin-
tering tendency from this direction at the same time that it seeks to deal with the general requirements and special
interests of its academic environment.
ment; in a few instances it is taught in connexion with a more or less separate ‘bureau’ (which also may have research functions), or in a separate ‘school’, or in a combined school of business and public administration. There is a substantial overlapping membership between the American Society for Public Administration and the American Political Science Association; and sections of the meetings of the latter are given to discussion of administrative subjects.

**DEVELOPMENT: THIRD PERIOD**

The third period in the development of public administration began in 1940 and extends to the present. It is possible to see, in retrospect, that the changes that characterize the past fifteen years had their origins in the thirties, but the year 1940 is as satisfactory as any other from which to date the changes. Certainly the experience of the war years, involving many academic students of administration in important administrative work, were important in challenging older patterns of thought and stimulating new.

Both negative and positive themes characterize the changes since 1940. The period began with the emphasis on the negative, with a challenge to or repudiation of the orthodoxies of the previous generation. As against the view that politics and administration are separate functions or processes, it was asserted that politics—whether thought of as struggle for power or as policy making—is diffused throughout all administrative operations. As against the view that administration is or can be a science or at least that it lends itself to study by established scientific methods, it was asserted that, while this may be true in the abstract, in the concrete the methods being used were too crude or simply erroneous. It was asserted, in fact, that what were confidently advanced in the twenties and thirties as demonstrated ‘principles’ of administration were but rules of ‘common sense’, resting upon normative bases that were often obscure to the administrative student and often, in fact, mutually contradictory.

As against the point of view that ‘administration is administration’ wherever found, and hence that it can be studied ‘in the abstract’ or ‘in itself’, it was asserted both that actual administration is always of something, i.e. has a ‘programme content’, and in a particular personally, historically, and culturally conditioned context; and that to ignore the programme and the context is to cripple the capacity for significant observation and generalization. As against the point of view that the object of administrative study is economy and efficiency, it was asserted that the two cannot in fact be separated, as ‘technical’ problems, from normative decisions.

These questions or ‘repudiations’ might seem so large and fundamental as to have thrown all of the accumulated literature of public administration into the discard. In fact, the effect of the ‘revolution’ was less drastic. The doctrines, categories and findings of public administration in the late thirties have been not so much repudiated as amended and absorbed into larger and more flexible conceptualizations. Compromise has taken place, in the dialectic of debate


2. It has become common to speak of the ‘ecology of administration’, an expression popularized by John M. Gaus. See his Reflections on Public Administration, University, Alabama, University of Alabama Press, 1947, 153 pp.
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and of events. For example, few would now deny that it is proper to select aspects of administration for intensive investigation; but at the same time those doing the investigating proceed at a much higher level of sophistication with regard to scientific method, 'political' factors, administrative environment, and so forth.

RECENT AND CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENTS

There is a considerable number of easily identifiable trends in the study of public administration during the past few years. These constitute the 'positive themes' of the current period.

I. Public administration has entered a period of receptivity and interchange. In the middle period there was a striving for self-sufficiency, an urge to assert or demonstrate that public administration "in itself" is a proper and legitimate area of study. Having successfully asserted itself as a focus of inquiry, public administration turned outward in its interests. As a result, public administration, like international relations, is in an expansionist, eclectic period. Its boundaries are much less distinct than they were twenty years ago, and fear has been expressed, on the one hand, that it will 'evaporate' as a field, and on the other hand, that it is seeking to 'devour its parent', political science.

II. Much new material has been and is being absorbed from other fields of political science and from other social sciences. For example, with the break-down of the idea that administration is separable from politics came a receptivity to that part of political science which had made politics its central concern, and the current view is that 'a theory of public administration means in our time a theory of politics also'. Important borrowing from, or interchange with, the other social sciences is also taking place. Probably the closest relations are those with sociology and social psychology. A number of American sociologists, for example, Reinhard Bendix and Philip Selznick, are making the sociology of bureaucracy a central professional interest; and some students of public administration have sought to view and restate administration in terms of the interests and categories of social psychology.

III. The study and writing of administrative history are a recent and contemporary trend. In their case there is not much 'borrowing' from the historians, but rather an independent development within public administration. For example, students of administration used their influence during the second world war to assure that administrative experience during that enterprise would be 'captured and recorded' for later study; and Leonard D. White, a leading student of public administration, has now published three volumes in a series dealing with federal administrative development. The new-found interest in

2. There is a brief review of the borrowing or interchange in Dwight Waldo, The Study of Public Administration, op. cit., Ch. 5.
3. Related to and overlapping social psychology is the 'human relations' movement. Public administration in its early periods had a strange but pronounced indifference to psychological considerations. In the recent period public administration has been 'humanized'. See: Morton Grodzins, 'Public Administration and the Science of Human Relations', Public Administration Review, XI, 2, Spring 1951, pp. 88-102; Alfred de Grazia, Human Relations in Public Administration (a bibliography), Chicago, Public Administration Service, 1949, 52 pp.
history is another example of the present eagerness to light the subject matter of public administration with more windows.

IV. An interest in and greater receptivity to behavioural science is a current trend. This judgment is not beyond challenge. Interests, some traditional and some new, operate to reduce receptivity to behavioural research and modes of thought. Few students identified with public administration are also trained and interested in behavioural research. Yet in a general way the behavioural movement is affecting the current outlook. Certainly there are many appreciative ‘consumers’ of behavioural research, even if few ‘producers’; and in a general way the interest in an impact of the other social sciences is ‘behavioural’.

V. There is a trend toward consideration of policy matters. As noted above, public administration in its middle period tended to reject policy-making as a legitimate interest, to concentrate on ‘economy and efficiency in operations’. There is now, however, a decided tendency to take the view that much ‘policy’ is formulated by administrators and that the study and teaching of administration cannot afford to ignore this fact. The trend to ‘policy’ has taken various forms. One is in development of curricula to include history and analysis of policy as well as ‘technical’ matters. Another is in a body of writings dealing with problems of ‘ethics’ in government. Another is in the development of the ‘case approach’ to the study of public administration. By this is meant the literary reconstruction of actual administrative events ‘as they actually were’, so that through reading the cases students of administration may gain a sense of ‘administrative reality’ in advance of personal participation. The case method of teaching public administration has gained many adherents in recent years, and in itself is an important trend.

VI. An important development of the past ten years and especially of the past five is an interest in comparative administration. This interest has a number of sources—a widespread new interest in ‘comparativeness’ was noted above—but is most directly stimulated by the post-war interests of the U.S.A. in world affairs and particularly by the technical assistance programmes, in which many students of public administration have been or are participating. This new interest has important connexions and implications. For example, it brings administrative study into contact and more or less familiarity with the data and concepts of anthropology and sociology, and it relates public administration to contemporary currents in the field of comparative government. Apparently there are in the offing foundation-supported studies of comparative administration in which methods of comparative study generally similar to those projected by Roy C. Macridis, and outlined above, will be used.

VII. A substantially enlarged ‘toleration’ of and concern with theory is a trend of the recent past and of the present. The word ‘toleration’ is used because the

1. Outstanding among these is Herbert A. Simon. His Administrative Behavior, cited above, is a major work in the recent period.
4. To a lesser degree, an intensified interest in international administration has been a post-war trend.
field of public administration in its earlier periods was decidedly 'anti-theoretical' in its orientation. It was born of a desire for 'practical' reform and empirical study, and it associated theory with a traditionalism and bookishness which it wished to avoid; it also sought consciously to avoid ethical speculation by confining itself to questions of economy and efficiency.

It is obvious in retrospect that public administration was not able thus to avoid theoretical considerations, but only to obscure them, leaving them implicit in action or discussing them in the guise of 'facts'. In any event, increasing awareness of theory as well as conscious use of theory for criticism and analysis have been characteristics of the present period. Again, the increased concern with theory is true of both 'is' and 'ought' categories. On the one hand, the new 'harder' and 'sharper' empiricism makes theory an important instrument. On the other hand, the revived concern with policy and ethics inevitably brings a seeking for 'respectable' or 'sophisticated' theories of rights, obligations, utility, and so forth. The 'value problem' arising from the disjoining of the 'is' and 'ought'—discussed above—is especially acute in the study of public administration.
CHAPTER IX
PUBLIC OPINION AND VOTING BEHAVIOUR

The discussion of public opinion and voting behaviour here is brief, in part because much in this connexion has already been said in the discussion above of behavioural science and political behaviour. For the study of public opinion and voting behaviour are being greatly affected by these currents. The remarks here should be read in conjunction with and placed in the context of the above discussion.

DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC OPINION

The analysis of public opinion is, of course, as old as Plato, but as a field of American political science 'public opinion' is only about a generation old. In the immediate background are such writers as Tönnies, Tarde, Le Bon, Wallas and Bryce. Two volumes did much to delineate the field in terms meaningful to American political science. These were A. Lawrence Lowell's Public Opinion and Popular Government, and Walter Lippmann's Public Opinion.

Especially following Lippmann's work, and much influenced thereby, public opinion became a field of specialization in political science; courses with this title began to appear in curricula, the journal Public Opinion Quarterly began publication in 1937, and 'textbook' treatment arrived. At no time, however, was public opinion the exclusive concern of political science. Other disciplines, especially psychology, social psychology and sociology, have also been interested, and these disciplines have put their imprint upon this rapidly developing field of study, in terms of interests and techniques. Currently, only a minor fraction of those specializing in public opinion studies are identified with political science (in terms of academic degree or departmental affiliation), and this creates problems and tensions, some of which are noted below.


3. New York, Harcourt, 1922, 477 pp., and also his The Phantom Public, New York, Harcourt, 1925, 205 pp. Charles Merriam and Harold Lasswell have been influential in developments here, as in so many behavioural fields.

4. The Public Opinion Quarterly is published by Princeton University, but is more or less the organ of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. The book by Daniel Katz and others, cited above, was edited for the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. The names of the professional associations indicate the limited involvement of political science. The Preface to Public Opinion and Propaganda (edited by Katz and others, cited above), states (p. ix) that public opinion is one of the few areas which has defied the specialization of the modern academic world. . . . Somewhat the problems here have resisted division into arbitrary fragments.
DEVELOPMENT OF VOTING BEHAVIOUR

‘Voting behaviour’ is a focus of study related to public opinion. It has several roots. One is study of voting data by political scientists. Study of simple participation in voting and of voting data in an attempt to find, for example, correlations between party vote and occupation, or differences between rural and urban political preferences, extends back beyond the first world war. Such studies have been continuous, but have gradually been placed in a new setting and have been more or less transformed. Another is the development of opinion polling and sampling techniques for commercial purposes (for example, to help vendors market products by determining the most effective type of advertising appeal). Another is the complementary development and use of polling and opinion sampling techniques by government (especially the federal government), either for the purpose of making policy by more democratic means or to enlarge the base of information on which decisions on public policy can be made. Still another is the development of polling and opinion sampling techniques in an attempt to gauge political trends and, especially, to predict the outcome of elections. Polling and sampling techniques have developed rapidly during the past two decades, and there is considerable overlapping between ‘public’ and ‘private’: the same techniques may be used in government surveys for official purposes as are used in commercial surveys for commercial purposes, and certain opinion sampling and polling operations are carried on as business, which contract for survey work with both private and public enterprises, or independently try to develop saleable information (e.g. election ‘forecasts’).

The development of polling and sampling techniques just described has had interesting and controversial connexions with political science. Obviously, so far as the polls and surveys have affected or been carried on by, or through, government, they have come within the range of interests of political scientists. And, obviously, attempts to gauge political trends and forecast elections—accurate or inaccurate—have a fascination. So some political scientists have sought to embrace these new interests, activities and skills, to bring them within the discipline, so to speak; they have sought to learn what has been learned, and to turn it to the use of serious political study. On the other hand, some political scientists have reacted negatively. Some have been offended by the commercial or business background or associations of the polls and ‘pollsters’, some have had ethical reservations about the propriety or effects of ‘predicting’ the ‘voice of the people’ in a democracy, and some have felt the techniques used to be crude and inadequate, not up to the standards or demands of modern social science.
In terms of history and motives, public opinion and voting behaviour are obviously different foci of interest; equally obviously, they are intersecting foci today. Some 'pollsters' have little interest in the development of social science; that a technique serves an immediate practical purpose is sufficient. Some social scientists interested in public opinion and voting behaviour have little interest in immediate practical results; they are interested in refining research techniques or testing hypotheses about behaviour. But there is a substantial area of common concern to serious students of public opinion and voting behaviour. Both, for example, are interested in media of communication, especially the 'mass media' of modern society. Both are interested in the mathematics of sampling, and in the development and refinement of interview techniques. In fact, political scientists who are serious students of one are inevitably serious students of both.

The deep involvement of these fields—or this field—of study in the political behaviour movement has been noted above and cannot be further explored. It will be useful, however, to indicate more clearly some of the problems or 'tensions' now existing.

There are problems arising because of a disparity between the customary or traditional interests of political science and the interests of 'behavioural scientists' whose training is in some other discipline. For example, long-standing interests lead political scientists to focus upon certain institutions—party, press, legislature, and so forth—whereas behavioural scientists, whose training, for example, has been primarily in psychology, tend to focus more upon psychological processes, seeing the 'dynamics' of behaviour primarily in terms of perception, motivation, etc. It has recently been observed that public opinion has been 'taken away' from political science; but this, while stating an important feeling or problem, too strongly implies that political science once 'had' public opinion.

There are tensions arising out of a difference in emphasis between the 'substantive' and 'procedural', that is to say, between those interested in knowing the opinions of certain persons on certain particular matters, and those interested rather in devising and refining techniques of opinion measurement. Closely related, there are tensions arising because of the difference in outlook between those who are interested in immediate, practical problems and those interested in 'the development of genuine social science' and willing to wait a generation, say, for some firm generalizations. And, closely related, there is the question whether there has been a 'triumph of technique over purpose'—indeed, over significant theory, or at least political theory.
CHAPTER X

POLITICS, PARTIES AND PRESSURE GROUPS ¹

Much, perhaps most, of what might be said in a report on trends in the study of politics, parties and pressure groups has already been said above. It may be useful, however, to call attention again to some of the points made above, and to give some of them stronger emphasis in the present connexion.

IMPACT OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR MOVEMENT

The political behaviour current is strongly affecting political science in this general area of study. This has meant more use of the idiom and perspective of 'power', more attention to hypothesizing, model construction, and 'causal' theory generally, attempts to study the dynamic and functional as against the formal and structural, use of concepts and techniques from other social sciences, increasing use of techniques of quantification, and so forth.²

The study of pressure groups is an old theme in American political study. But behaviouralism gives the old theme a 'new look'. The development of 'group theory'³ introduces concepts from other social sciences, raises the level of 'theory', hardens and sharpens the attempt to be scientific.

As noted above, 'comparativeness' is a trend in political science generally. In its new phases and applications it is a part of the political behaviour movement, and it is an important aspect of developing studies in the fields of politics, parties and pressure groups. The author knows of a considerable number of current or contemplated comparative studies dealing with state and local politics, all strongly behavioural.⁴

Not only are concepts and techniques being absorbed from other 'behavioural' disciplines, but these disciplines, increasingly and importantly, have been turning to the study of political phenomena. This is notably true of sociology, in which the term 'political sociology' has become accepted in general usage. This development has been noted above in connexion with the discussions of international relations and public administration. Philip Selznick's TVA and the Grass Roots is not only a study in administration, however, but a study in

¹ The author is not aware of any 'trend' essays that might be cited under this heading. See, however, Peter Odegard, 'Factors in the Study of Pressure Groups and Political Parties in the United States', in Contemporary Political Science: A Survey of Methods, Research and Teaching, Paris, Unesco, 1950, 713 pp., pp. 505-55, for 'background' information.
³ See references above, especially items under the names David Truman and Earl Latham.
⁴ Such studies are being encouraged by the Political Behaviour Committee of the Social Science Research Council, which has recently received a grant from the Carnegie Corporation (i.e. 'foundation') for their support.
'politics'; and this dual nature is true of other works cited. Still other works not yet cited are studies by sociologists primarily of parties or pressure groups, or general essays treating political phenomena from the viewpoints of sociology.1

THE 'POLITICIZATION' OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

At various points above it has been suggested or stated that a 'political' point of view has come into acceptance and use in an area of political science where it previously had been absent. This matter deserves emphasis. For this 'politicization' is true of the study of political theory,2 policy making,3 international relations,4 public administration,5 and foreign and comparative government.6 It is true also of fields yet to be discussed, state and local government and jurisprudence and public law. Of the former of these, 'politicization' is more in prospect than in being perhaps; but of the latter it can be said that during the past generation it has become quite customary to look beyond the 'letter of the law' to the political forces which make and shape it.

As noted above, 'politics' is a perspective older, more diffuse, more native or indigenous, than 'power', though the two overlap. But two decades of continuous advocacy of the view that power is the central concept of political science—as wealth is of economics—have had an effect both in forwarding the politicization of political science and in determining its nature. Put the other way around, the politicization of political science is partly a result and to some degree a measure of the advance of the behavioural movement.

CONTROVERSY CONCERNING THE AMERICAN PARTY SYSTEM

American political scientists have tended to divide, historically, between those critical of the American political system and those who find it suitable and good. The critical—including Woodrow Wilson—have tended to compare the American political system unfavourably with the British, or at least with an American image of the British. They criticize American political parties for being loose, sprawling aggregations, lacking in discipline and good leadership, without a coherent programme and even firm general principles, vulnerable to pressure group activity. This critical attitude toward parties is correlated with a critical attitude toward the constitutional system: the separation of powers principle is viewed as at least one contributing cause to the evils seen in politics, and the federal system is likely also to be viewed critically for the same reason. On the other hand, there are those who defend these two constitutional principles as wholesome, and find American political parties both representative and efficient. The American party system, they feel, is nicely adjusted to a nation of continental scope, great diversity, and a rich development of voluntary asso-

2. Through development of 'group theory', for example.
4. See works cited above in connexion with foci of behavioural study in international relations.
5. For example, Herman M. Somers, 'The Federal Bureaucracy and the Change in Administrations', American Political Science Review, 1, March 1954, pp. 311-31.
6. There has been less study of constitutions and much more of parties—and even, as noted above, development of 'theory of parties'.
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associations ("groups"); and it has 'worked' for more than a century and a half. This is not the place to develop the fine points of the arguments, but the two points of view have been sketched because the debate has continued during the past few years—and because so much writing concerning politics in America must be seen in the perspective of this continuing debate. In the forties a Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association was appointed, and in 1950 the Committee reported, under the title 'Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System'. In the specific proposals for reform there were various items upon which partisans of both points of view could and did agree, and indeed in some respects the Report was a document of compromise. Certainly no major constitutional changes were proposed. But on the whole the philosophy and tone of the Report represented the 'critical' view.

The Report and the literature which it stimulated figure importantly in the field of politics, parties and pressure groups during the past five years. At the same time, not only have few of the 'reforms' proposed entered the area of possible accomplishment, but the debate has not been carried forward vigorously. It is possible indeed that the 'debate' is entering a new phase because of the impact of behavioural studies, a phase in which there will be more careful investigation of specific points at issue and less heated argumentation.

THE TRAINING-FOR-POLITICS MOVEMENT

In the late forties there was established (through private donations) an entity named the Citizenship Clearing House, associated with the Law School of New York University (a private university). The purpose of the Citizenship Clearing House is to encourage and train college-educated persons to participate in politics—to put outstanding young college men and women in touch with opportunities for participation in politics on a self-respecting basis. It was felt by the sponsors and participants that well-educated persons tend, unfortunately, to avoid a political career and even active participation in politics as citizens, and that college courses in political science were failing both in motivating participation and in providing practical training in political activity.

Since its establishment the Citizenship Clearing House has encouraged experimentation, and sought to 'educate' teachers of parties and politics courses in various ways, including the sponsoring of conferences at which political scientists meet for discussion of teaching objectives and methods. The author has no way of estimating the impact of the programme, but merely 'reports' it— with the observation that the programme has obviously encountered strong resistance from many quarters. Its 'reform' and 'activist' spirit bring it, for example, into conflict with the behavioural movement.

1. For presentation of a critical view, see Elmer E. Schattschneider, Party Government, New York, Farrar, 1942, 220 pp.; and for presentation of a favourable view see Arthur N. Holcombe, Our More Perfect Union: From Eighteenth-Century Principles to Twentieth-Century Practice, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1950, 460 pp. The two points of view also will be found developed in the comparative government books by Herman Finer (critical) and Carl J. Friedrich (favourable), cited above.

2. Published as a supplement to the American Political Science Review, XLIV, September 1950, 99 pp.


4. The most notable 'event' of recent years in the study of parties and politics was noted above in the discussion of the political behaviour movement, namely, the large all-states study of the politics of Presidential nominations in 1952. See: Paul T. David, Malcolm Moos, and Ralph M. Goldman, Presidential Nominating Politics in 1952, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1954, 5 vols. Co-operative or group research is a 'trend' which perhaps is not sufficiently emphasized in this report. Aside from sheer scope, it is the most notable feature of the 1952 study; and it tends to characterize behavioural research generally. A trend to scrutinize the politics of states, and particularly of regions, is perhaps discernible. See: V. O. Key (with the assistance of Alexander Heard), Southern Politics in State and Nation, New York, Knopf, 3rd ed., 1949, 675 pp.; and Alexander Heard, A Two-Party South, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, University of North Carolina Press, 1954, 334 pp. These illustrate also the influence of the behavioural approach.
A sharp decline in attention by American political scientists to the fields of state and local government during the past generation, as measured by amount of publication in general journals of political science was indicated in Table 1.

Nor would this decline of publication in the general journals appear to be compensated for by new specialized journals.

There is much corroborative evidence to indicate that state and local government have suffered in the amount of attention given to them by persons who consider themselves 'political scientists', as this would be measured by membership in the American Political Science Association. As noted above, American political scientists were strongly interested in state and local governments up to the time of the first world war, and perhaps up to the time of the Great Depression. But as a result of the greatly increased role and size (i.e. of the bureaucracy) of the federal government, the national emergencies of depression and war, the 'federalizing' of many problems once of local or state concern, the political appeal of the New Deal to political scientists, and the opportunities for challenging and remunerative work in federal government, there was a tidal flow of attention to the national and even international levels.

There would be considerable agreement also that fields of state and local government have not only received less attention from political scientists, but have tended to become stagnant, intellectually speaking. Once the centre of intellectual ferment, conceptual growth and institutional invention, they have for the most part recently simply 'carried on' with the basic ideas and institutions of a generation ago. Certainly the current 'trends' delineated above...
have little affected study of state and local government. The political behaviour
movement is scarcely visible, there is little borrowing from or interaction with
the other social sciences, there is little self-conscious attention to or growth
of theory, there is less comparative study than a generation ago (either within
the American context or by Americans of foreign institutions), there is less de-
velopment of a 'political' or 'power' point of view.

To be sure, there is another side of the story. In total amount of research,
measured either in terms of man-hours spent or documents produced, there
may well be more in state and local government than in all the other fields of
political science combined. For a large variety and a large number of insti-
tutions concentrate on research in state and local governmental affairs. But
this research is for the most part addressed to immediate problems; and the
research findings typically are published, if at all, in pamphlet or 'fugitive'
form. The usefulness—indeed, high importance—of such research is not ques-
tioned. The point is, however, that the purpose of such research is to aid in
the solution of particular problems, and that while the data in each case are
unique the recommendations typically follow from the application of accepted
formulae to the unique data. Indeed, much of the research does not advance
to the point of recommendations or conclusions, but consists of a collection of
data and 'possible' solutions only.

Nor is it denied that there is 'progress' in the study of state and local govern-
ment measured in terms of the application of accepted formulae for improve-
ment. There is steady progress, measured in these terms—e.g. the increase in
number of cities using the council-manager form of government or increased
professionalization in state civil service. It is rather that in terms of changes
in ideas or methods of research, so far as reflected in the published word, there has
been comparatively little change; one now returning to international relations
after a twenty-year absence would find his world deeply changed, whereas
one returning to state and local government after the same absence would find
his world changed but superficially.

A REVITALIZATION OF STATE AND LOCAL STUDIES?

A rather dismal picture has been painted of the past quarter century, so far
as 'intellectual growth' can be distinguished from increase in quantity of research,

1. There is a congruency, however, between the public administration movement and the behaviouralist movement
to the extent to which both de-emphasize the study of law, i.e. in the 'traditional' sense of studying court deci-
sions. There is a decline extending over a generation in attention to legal studies of state and local matters by poli-
tical scientists.

2. There is considerable 'borrowing', in the sense of using the data gathered or conclusions reached in the other social
sciences. But there is little absorption of the concepts or borrowing of the research techniques. Conversely, however,
other disciplines and professions have been 'encroaching' upon state and local government. Education, public
health, and social welfare, for example, have developed an interest especially in administration at their levels: it
is studied and taught in connexion with professional training in these subjects. Of especial importance is the fact
that a number of universities now have a city planning department, and here are centred a number of interests
which might have been centred within state and local government divisions of political science departments had
events of the past twenty years taken another turn. Economists and historians have recently been doing important
work in research at the state level, and sociologists, anthropologists, and economists, at the local level. If study of
state and local government are 'revitalized', as suggested below, there may occur another nucleation with poli-
tical science departments.

3. The reference here is to what was described as 'politicization' in the preceding section. The separation of 'admi-
nistration' from 'politics' has tended to linger on in this field of study, with what some feel to be evil results. There
is a feeling that politics is 'bad', being identified with forces that work counter to simplification, consolidation, inte-
gration and professionalization; and because of the intellectual-emotional orientation, the serious, scientific study
of politics at this level is neglected. And because it is neglected, formulae become stereotypes and perhaps even
achievement of reforms is handicapped.

4. A distinction must be made between the research here reported and the decline of periodical publication noted
in the first paragraph of this section. The research here reported is largely 'separated' from the main stream of
American political science as conceived in this report.

5. In the author's estimate this is progress—so far, at least, as present research and institutional development permit
him to judge comparatively the alternatives. Whether the 'problems'—caused by ever increasing urbanization, for
example—tend to advance faster than the 'solutions' is still another matter. As to this, students of state and local
government are of two minds.
advance of institutional reform, and so forth. There are, however, many signs that state and local studies are about to be revitalized. It seems very likely, at least, that state and local studies are about to receive more attention from political scientists, and brought closer to the centre of the present current of political science—if this constitutes 'revitalization'.

Much evidence to support this view has come to the author's attention in the course of this study; it is an opinion widely shared. In the first place, there are tides and rhythms in national life, and the recent and present political circumstances and mood seem appropriate for this development. The change to a Republican administration in 1952 put something of an 'official' emphasis upon state and local government, since the political forces resisting the 'federalization' of the previous Democratic administrations were largely identified with the Republican party. While the Republican administration, once installed, 'accepted' the New Deal and its consequences, rather than 'return' functions to the states, these are not stirring times for political scientists so far as federal government is concerned. And the stage is set, thereby, for a shift of attention once more to state and local government.

In the preceding section there was note of a series of studies being planned of comparative state politics, studies strongly behaviouralist in nature. Upon the author's desk are many other evidences of revitalization, such as letters reporting wholesale shifts of student interest and of new research projects. Some of the new research is actually under way, even completed, though the publication of results has not taken place—new-type studies of opinion leadership, power structure, and so forth. Advance in conceptualization and research design is proceeding rapidly in cognate disciplines—particularly, city planning—and this may be expected to have a stimulating or 'forcing' effect. Some political science departments have more or less official plans to make their immediate political environments the focus of scientific research. What appears as a wave may prove in the event a mere ripple. But at the present the dimensions seem, to the author, those of a wave.
CHAPTER XI

PUBLIC LAW AND JURISPRUDENCE

The study of public law and jurisprudence is at present somewhat ‘marginal’ in American political science. One of the circumstances attending the birth of political science as an independent discipline was the assertion of a ‘political’ as against a legal approach to the study of collective, official life. In this century, the study of law in America has centred in graduate, professional schools of law, usually attached to a university. As political science as an independent discipline grew it usually centred in a separate department in the ‘liberal arts’ or ‘arts and sciences’ division of the university.

To be sure, since law and politics are inextricably intertwined in constitutional government, public law continued to be taught in political science departments, but it competed for time and attention with the growing crop of new interests discussed above. Gradually, in the competition for funds and personnel, the teaching of public law was restricted; courses were either consolidated or passed to other curricula, or a subject that was once taught by or through the legal approach came to be taught by some other method. Meanwhile, the study and teaching of public law itself changed more or less (depending upon the training and outlook of the particular scholar). For the ‘political’ perspective of political science, and the currents of the behavioural movement, have affected legal studies also. Legal study today is less ‘normative’, and less concerned with logical analysis, than a generation ago; conversely, law tends to be viewed as an ‘instrument’ of social policy, or as a manifestation of underlying group and individual phenomena which must be examined in order to discover what law in general ‘is’ or a particular law ‘means’.

LEGAL REALISM AND THE LAW SCHOOLS

As political science in the U.S.A. is concerned only marginally with legal studies, it is desirable to view what is happening in the broader perspective of legal studies in the law schools.

For about three generations, the standard method of learning law in the U.S.A. has been the study of ‘cases’, that is to say the reading and analysis of judicial decisions or opinions, especially those of appellate courts. This method

1. Again, the author is not aware of a ‘trend’ literature, as such, pertaining to the study of public law and jurisprudence in political science. The several dozen law journals published by American law schools are source documents for any detailed study of developments in law and jurisprudence, but they have not been systematically combed for this report. Developments in American constitutional law itself are summarized annually in the American Political Science Review, in the first (March) number. For several years this summary has been made by David Fellman. See also: Charles Eitenmann, The University Teaching of Social Sciences: Law, Paris, Unesco, 1954, 133 pp.

2. Great confusion—and opportunity for argument—surrounds the use of this term. It is often defined broadly to include all law (or ‘cases’) in which the state is a party—thus embracing criminal law and much international law. In American political science the meaning is usually a more restricted one: ‘public law’ means constitutional and administrative law. But these terms in turn are overlapping and difficult to define with precision.

3. An outstanding public law scholar writes: ‘When I was a student . . . political scientists taught many things now taken over by others: e.g. municipal corporations (now in law schools), jurisprudence (the same), public utilities (now largely in economics), history of law or law and society (law schools), taxation (economics), public control of business (law schools and economics departments).’
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was adopted as more 'realistic' or 'scientific' than the study of statute, commentary, or jurisprudential writings, the more so given the *stare decisis* principle of the common law background. Thus legal study in the U.S.A. went into the twentieth century with a 'leg up' on the behavioural study of legal phenomena: what was studied was the behaviour of judges and other judicial officers, even though there remained a strong emphasis upon 'oughts' and the logical derivation of decisions from statute or antecedent court decisions.

The first two decades of the century saw the beginnings of a second step toward 'realism', a movement which came in the twenties and thirties, when it reached its height, to be called Legal Realism.1 Back of Legal Realism and forming its intellectual matrix were the development of pragmatic philosophy, the rise and growth of the social sciences, and the general drift toward empiricism and 'science'. The Legal Realists—in the law schools, at the bar, and on the bench—sought to make law and the study of law scientific: to reduce or eliminate ceremonialism, mystery, traditionalism, and metaphysics. They sought to use law consciously as an instrument of social policy; their perspective was 'social engineering'. While the course of study in the law schools has for the most part remained centred upon 'cases', the Legal Realist movement has had the effect of placing case study in a broad setting of sociology, economics, psychology, and so forth. It has long been generally accepted as true that lawyers and judges do not merely interpret statutes, they *make* law through decision making; and that they must be prepared to perform this function intelligently.

In short, it might be said that legal study became behavioural before political science. In other words, it is not simply that legal study has been forced out of—or stolen from—the political science curriculum; a similar and related movement has been taking place in the law schools, in the study of law generally. 'To study law' means something different than it did a generation ago.2

### THE CONTEMPORARY SCENE

Against the background sketched can now be placed a number of observations on contemporary trends and events—of varying importance and not necessarily related:

1. The case method of learning and instruction remains the most widely used approach to the law, both in the law schools and in political science departments, at least when the course title contains the word 'law'. There is perhaps a trend, however, to study a few cases 'in depth' rather than many cases superficially. (Economic and sociological analysis, study of trial records, of advocates' strategy, of the lives and motives of principals, etc., may be engaged in.) There may also be a trend to pay more attention to statute law; certainly there is more attention given to the legislative process.

2. There is considerable writing on and study of public law history. The past is not studied simply as an antiquarian interest, however, but rather with a 'realist' or behavioural bent. For the most part the motive is to observe

---


2. At least it is likely to mean something different. In fact, law schools and law professors vary widely. In some schools the approach remains little affected. In others, there is much preoccupation with economics, psychology, and so forth. The Yale Law School is perhaps boldest in experimentation. It is worth noting that Harold D. Lasswell holds a chair not in a department of political science, but in the Yale Law School.
the interaction of law with the other factors of community life, to lay bare the roots of judicial behaviour, and so forth.  

3. Within political science proper, while it is difficult to distinguish between ‘old’ realism and ‘new’ behaviouralism, it is the author’s opinion that little that is happening is due to those interested in or affected by behaviouralist thought.  

4. While political science has lost or abandoned several areas of public law, as indicated above, public law students in political science departments have ‘retained and improved their claim’ in the field of administrative law. This is presumably related to the increase in governmental—administrative—activities and the rise of public administration as a field of political science. There is also an expanding literature of comparative administrative law.  

5. There is an important, rapidly expanding interest in so-called ‘international legal studies’. This is centred in the law schools, is very broad and flexible—and might as accurately be called ‘comparative law’.  

6. There is a movement, of interest primarily but by no means exclusively to law school professors, to introduce or expand ‘courses in law’ in the undergraduate liberal arts or ‘arts and sciences’ curricula. The thought behind the movement is that ‘the great heritage of law and legal thinking’ cannot be omitted from a liberal education.  

7. There has recently been much concern with civil rights problems—noted above in the discussion of political theory. The course of history brings now one, now another, problem and aspect of the written federal and state constitutions to the fore, and in the recent period civil rights cases have been pre-eminent in the courts. In some political science curricula a special course on civil rights has been introduced.  

8. The ‘revival of natural law concepts’, likewise noted above in the discussion of political theory, has also taken place in jurisprudence, in some of the law schools. This may perhaps be interpreted as a response to the ‘value problem’, as it has been sharpened by the advance of realism or positivism in legal study.


2. The most likely exception is the recent work of C. Herman Pritchett. Pritchett has extended quantitative analysis in this field by careful compilations of voting records of justices on certain issues. See his Civil Liberties and the Vinson Court, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1954, 207 pp.  

3. There is some disagreement among the experts here. One is impressed with political scientists’ writings on such matters as administrative subdelegation, civil service law, and licensing law. Another finds problem areas inadequately treated. For example: administrative discretion, balancing of interests in regulatory administration, breakdown of enforcement machinery in certain areas (e.g. city fire, building and safety regulations).  

4. See: David F. Cavers, ‘The Developing Field of International Legal Studies’, American Political Science Review, XLVII, 4, December 1953, pp. 1058-75. Five leading law schools have within the past year received substantial foundation grants for the development of such studies.  


6. See (Chap. IV, p. 68 et sq.), citations for an introduction to the literature.  

7. In the several Catholic law schools natural law remained ‘in good standing’ at all times, of course. The point of view is now, however, reflected in some non-Catholic institutions.  

8. The ‘natural law revival’ and the movement for undergraduate law study are perhaps related. In the report of the conference above cited (p. 12), Judge Wyanskis is quoted as follows: ‘It would be my hope that this course, if given, would aim beyond the mere increase in the capacity to reason and to express oneself and would reach so deeply into the values of our society that a contribution would be made to the faith of man. We are all aware that we are living at a time in which the demand for value courses is increasing everywhere. Some think that the way to deal with it is in courses on religion. Some have views with respect to general education in a philosophical sense. Most of us, I think, would feel that this type of value can be contributed by a law course if it is put broadly enough...’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Editions de l'Empire, 28 rue Michelet, Algiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Editorial Sudamericana, S.A. Alatina 509, Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Wilhelm Frick Verlag, 27 Graben, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Librairie Encyclopédique, 7, rue du Luxembourg, Brussels IV, Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Libreria Secciones, Avenida Camacho 369, Casilla 972, La Paz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Librarria Agir Editoria, rua Mexico 98-B, Caixa postal 3901, Rio de Janeiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Librairie Albert Portail, 14 avenue Bouloche, Phnom-Penhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>University of Toronto Press, Toronto Periodica Inc., 5050 avenue Papineau, Montreal 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Libreria Universitaria, Alameda R. O'Higgins 1059, Santiago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>The World Book Co. Ltd., 99 Chungking South Road, Section 1, Taipei, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Libreria Central, Carrera 6-A, No. 14-32, Bogota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Trejos Hermanos, Apartado 1313, San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Unesco Centro Regional en el Hemisferio Occidental, Calle 5 No. 306 Vedado, Apartado 1328, Havana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>M. E. Constantinides, P.O. Box 473, Nicosia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Artia Ltd., 30 Ve smekásch, Prague 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ejnar Munkgaard Ltd., 6 Norregade, Copenhagen K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Libreria Dominicana, Calle Mercedes 49, Apartado de correos 656, Ciudad Trujillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Libreria Cientifica, Luque 233, Casilla 362, Guayaquil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>La Renaissance d'Egypte, 9 Sh. Adly Pasha, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>International Press Agency, P.O. Box 120, Addis Ababa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, 2 Keskkukatu, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Unesco Bookshop, 10 avenue Kleber, Paris-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French West Indies</td>
<td>Librairie J. Bocage, rue Lavoir, Fort de France (Martinique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>R. Oldenbourg, K.G. Unesco Vertrieb für Deutschland, Rosenheimerstrasse 145, Munich 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Librairie H. Kauffmann, 28 rue du Stade, Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Librairie 'A la Caravelle', 36 rue Rose, Boîte postale III, Port-au-Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Swinson Book Co., 25 Nathan Road, Kowloon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Kultura, P.O.B. 149, Budapest 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Orient Longmans Ltd., Indian Mercantile Chamber, Nicol Road, Bombay, 17 Chittaranjan Ave., Calcutta, 36-A Mount Road, Madras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>International National Commission for Unesco, Avenue du Musée, Tehran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>McKenzie's Bookshop, Bagdad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Blumentein's Bookstores, Ltd., 35 Allenby Road, P.O.B. 4101, Tel Aviv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Libreria Commissionaria, G. C. Sansoni, via Gino Capponi, 26, Casella postale 352, Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Sangster's Book Room, 99 Harbour Street, Kingston, Knox Educational Services, Spalding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Maruren Co. Inc., 6 Tori-Nichome, Nikombashi, P.O. Box 605 Tokyo Central, Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Joseph I. Bahous and Co., Dar-ul-Kutub, Salt Road, P.O. Box 66, Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korean National Commission for Unesco, Ministry of Education, Seoul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Librairie Universelle, Avenue des Français, Beirut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>J. Momolu Kamara, 69 Front and Gorley Streets, Monrovia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Librairie Paul Bruck, 33, Grande-rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Librairies Bruck, 33, Grande-rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Peter Chong and Co., P.O. Box 135, Singapore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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