

II. A SURVEY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A PROFESSION AND DISCIPLINE: AssignmentsOctober 1:

Waldo, "Political Science: Tradition, Discipline, Profession, Science, Enterprise," in Greenstein and Polsby, pp. 1-73..

Comments: Using the sources cited in McCarthy's Research Guide, locate and read three articles in your own field of interest. Choose one published before World War I, one published between the wars, and one published between 1950 and 1970. Select only articles published in professional journals--not Time, Harper's etc. Analyze the articles in light of Waldo's observations on political science during these periods. In no more than two typewritten pages, concisely evaluate the intellectual orientations of these articles to determine whether they support or contradict Waldo's observations. At the top of the paper, give the complete citations to the articles you selected, typed in correct bibliographic form. (Check the Turabian references in the previous assignment if you are unsure about correct form.) On a separate page, report the results of a search through the Social Science Citation Index for 1975, 1976, and 1977 to determine what impact, if any, these articles have had on subsequent research on the topic. This need not be more than one paragraph and need only summarize what you found from your search.

Submit the paper and the page to me at the beginning of the October 1 class period.

October 4:

Waldo, pp. 73-130.

Nelson, "What's Wrong with Political Science," Washington Monthly (September, 1977), 13-20. (On Reserve)

Van Dyke, Vernon (ed.). Teaching Political Science: The Professor and the Polity. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: The Humanities Press, 1977. (Excerpts on Reserve)

Comments: In the second half of his article, Waldo looks at political science as a profession. What do political scientists do and who employs them to do it? How do your interests and aspirations relate to the profiles that Waldo constructs? How does political science relate to the other social sciences in terms of size, employment, and financial support? Waldo also discusses the "post-behavioral" reaction to "behavioralism." If you are unfamiliar with these terms, be sure you study his discussion, for these two intellectual "movements" have been very important in political science since World War II.

Contrast Waldo's views on political science as a science with Nelson's view of "What's Wrong with Political Science." With whom do you agree?

One of Nelson's complaints is that there is little that political scientists can do except teach, although they avoid teaching about politics. The excerpts from the Van Dyke volume on Teaching Political Science come from nine prominent political scientists asked to confront the question of the role of the professor in dealing with normative or "political" issues in the classroom. They range from the value-free to the value-advocate positions. Come to class prepared to talk about the positions you especially favor and those which you particularly oppose.

II. A SURVEY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A PROFESSION AND DISCIPLINE: Other Readings

Waldo's article on the development of political science barely surveys the topic. Some may be interested in pursuing other aspects of political science as a profession and discipline. Although the objectives of the course do not allow us to spend more class time discussing other readings, you should be acquainted with several prominent items which you should know for one reason or another.

Somit, Albert and Joseph Tanenhaus. The Development of Political Science: From Burgess to Behavioralism. New York: Irvington, 1967.

This engaging volume covers much of the same ground as Waldo does, but it does so in greater depth and in a cleverer style of writing, dealing with the personalities involved in the development of political science. This short history of political science is perhaps the most frequently cited account.

Somit, Albert and Joseph Tanenhaus. American Political Science: A Profile of a Discipline. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

When people speak about Somit and Tanenhaus' study of political science, this is often the book they mean rather than **the one above**. This book reports the results of a questionnaire sent to political scientists in the early and optimistic 1960s. That study is quite interesting (who is in political science's "Hall of Fame"?) but now quite dated.

Easton, David. The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.

Despite its age, this book can still contribute to your education. It has had a considerable impact on political science. The definition of political science as "the study of the authoritative allocation of values as it is influenced by the distribution and use of power" comes from Easton (p. 146). The distinction between "singular generalizations, synthetic or narrow-gauge theory, and systematic or broad-gauge theory" also comes from here (pp. 55-57). The thrust of Easton's book is to argue for more conscious development of conceptual and theoretical frameworks to guide political inquiry.

Hyneman, Charles S. The Study of Politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959.

This is one of several books written about the state of the discipline in the late 1950s and early 1960s, but is one with special relevance to the history of political science at Northwestern, having been written by a former chairman of the department and growing out of the "behavioral revolution" that became so clearly identified with NU (see Somit and Tanenhaus survey of political scientists). Hyneman's style is colorful, and he organizes his book around the big questions: How Scientific? How Shall We Treat Values? What Shall We Do with the Classics? His definition of Political Science--as the study of legal governments--is much more conventional than Easton and, incidentally, probably more accurate.

Young, Roland (ed.). Approaches to the Study of Politics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1958.

No Northwestern University graduate student should go through our program unaware of this collection of papers delivered at a series of four conferences at Northwestern in the 1950s. The conferences and this book helped give Northwestern its national reputation. Most of the essays are still worth reading.

II. A SURVEY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A PROFESSION AND DISCIPLINE: Other Readings
(continued)

Graham, George J. and George W. Carey (eds.). The Post-Behavioral Era: Perspectives on Political Science. New York: David McKay, 1972.

In the past I assigned some readings from this book, which is in general an excellent source of material on the post-behavioral movement. (In particular, you might be interested in the article by Leo Strauss on political philosophy.) It is, I think, no accident that both Graham and Carey are former students of Hyneman, who had the capacity to stimulate people into thinking about the course of political science.

Wasby, Stephen L. Political Science: The Discipline and Its Dimensions. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.

This has become a standard introductory text at the undergraduate level. For your purposes, its several chapters on the "fields" of political science may be of value, as they rather succinctly review the major research thrusts and provide useful classified bibliographies. The fields covered are (a) political theory, (b) political behavior and public opinion, (c) political parties and interest groups, (d) the legislative process, (e) public administration, (f) public law, (g) comparative government and politics, and (h) international relations.

Greenstein, Fred I. and Nelson W. Polsby (eds.). Handbook of Political Science, Volumes 1 to 8. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975.

Wasby's survey of political science occupied approximately 500 pages. The Handbook of Political Science in eight volumes is many times larger and certainly more important, but some its review articles are sadly less informative to the reader than the counterpart chapters in Wasby. Others are excellent, however, and those of you with definite substantive interests should read the relevant chapters in Greenstein and Polsby to see what that "authoritative" source has to say.

Apter, David E. Introduction to Political Analysis. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop, 1977.

Apter, a one-time Northwestern faculty member who starred in George Blanksten's famous underground movie of "The First Revolution," takes a different cut in dissecting political science. Instead of reviewing its activities by conventional "fields," he focuses on "institutionalism," "behavioralism," "pluralism," "structuralism," and "developmentalism." If any of these "isms" strike your fancy; here is the book for you.

Dahl, Robert A. "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest," American Political Science Review, 55 (December, 1961), 763-772.

Dahl sees behavioralism as a protest movement within political science, for behavioralists shared "a mood of skepticism about the current intellectual attainments of political science, a mood of sympathy toward 'scientific' modes of investigation and analysis, a mood of optimism about the possibilities of improving the study of politics." (p. 766). He concludes that the revolution is over, because it was successful. The mood had been incorporated within the main body of the discipline.

Easton, David. "The New Revolution in Political Science," American Political Science Review, 58 (December, 1969), 1051-1061.

In his APSA Presidential Address less than a decade after Dahl declared the end of the behavioral revolution, Easton declared that a new revolution was underway. This post-behavioral revolution also was fueled by dissatisfaction with political research and teaching, but its "battle cries are relevance and action." (p.1051) According to Easton, post-behavioralism "supports and extends behavioral methods and techniques by seeking to make their substantive implications more cogent for the problems of our times." (p. 1061)

Lowi, Theodore J. "The Politics of Higher Education: Political Science as a Case Study," in George Graham and George Carey (eds.), The Post-Behavioral Era New York: David McKay, 1972. Pp. 11-36.

Post-behavioralism was expressed organizationally by the Caucus for a New Political Science, formed during the APSA meetings in 1967. Lowi was active in the Caucus at the early stage. But he left because he felt that its intellectual revolt was replaced by an organizational revolt, as the Caucus challenged the Association with its own set of officers. Lowi concluded that the Caucus wanted to use the APSA to pursue social and intellectual biases of its own. In this article, Lowi argues against the "technocratization" of the profession, in which "the intellectual agenda of the discipline is set by the needs of the clientele, not by the inner logic of political science." (p.32, emphasized in the original).

Lipsitz, Lewis. "Vulture, Mantis, and Seal: Proposals for Political Scientists," in Graham and Carey, 171-191.

Contrary to Lowi's position, Lipsitz urges a greater involvement on the part of the profession in matters of public policy. He proposes adopting the Caucus' platform as a guide for research priorities and professional action. His article outlines what is to be done.

Carey, George. "Beyond Behavioralism in Political Science," in Graham and Carey, 37-53.

Carey notes the traditional association between liberalism and behavioralism. The stress on equality in liberalism led to ethical relativism: that ultimate values are beyond proof and that they are not susceptible to verification. This harmonized with the fact-value dichotomy of behavioralism. Both ideas led to the decline of classical theory. But much of behavioral research showed that society fails to meet liberal values, and behavioralists/liberals called for knowledge applied to social problems. Carey says that behavioralists denied that they were normatively oriented in the past but promise to become so in the future.

II. A SURVEY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A PROFESSION AND DISCIPLINE: Other Readings
(continued)

Nelson, Michael. "What's Wrong with Political Science," WASHINGTON MONTHLY, (September, 1977), 13-20.

Nelson is concerned that about all a political scientist can do after his training is teach, for the non-academic world does not value his skills as they do those of economists and psychologists, for example. The problem Nelson contends, is that political scientists failed to build upon their classical philosophical foundations, while the sister social sciences did. Instead, Charles Merriam lured political scientists down the avenue of behavioralism beginning in the 1920s, when he obtained handsome foundation funding. Voting behavior research, despite the millions poured into it, has failed to tell us much. The current fad is policy studies, which is little more than public administration. The best option left for political science is to take the fork in the road that we bypassed in the 1920s, when Thomas Reed strived to make "better minds for better government." "That fork, of course, leads to a political science dedicated to education for democratic citizenship' . . ." (p20) We must return to the study of philosophy, history, and literature as well. This will improve our work in the classroom and will make us more valuable outside of the classroom, "helping people fend for themselves against their grossly overgrown government." (p20)