

Book Reviews

The Study of Politics. The present state of American political science. Charles S. Hyneman. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1959. xi + 232 pp. \$4.50.

Political scientists, according to Charles Hyneman, are "unhappy about the state of their discipline." We are unhappy for any one or all of four reasons which fill Hyneman himself with apprehension: (i) fear that we engage too much in activities which divert us from scholarly study and adversely affect the quality of the studies we make; (ii) fear that we have set ourselves too great a task in scholarly study: that we have committed ourselves to objectives of inquiry which in magnitude and diversity are too great to be encompassed in a discipline; (iii) doubt that our scholarly enterprise promises to achieve results worthy of a place in the total structure of learned literature; (iv) doubt that we have fitted our efforts adequately with the efforts of other disciplines that share with us the whole study of social relationships.

Heaven knows, political scientists are engaged in a multitude of activities ranging from expository writing on the "classics" to advising governments here and abroad on the technical aspects of a great variety of managerial problems. In between times and almost incidentally, they participate in teaching undergraduates in the liberal arts curriculum, and in training specialists in everything from public accounting and budgeting to recondite theories of power politics. Hyneman expresses a legitimate concern lest their preoccupation with extramural and extracurricular matters, with training rather than education, and with public affairs and applied research rather than the cultivation of basic learning and research, may dull the edges of their scholarly interests and competences. For scholarship, including teaching and basic research, is "the primary task of the political scientist." Participation

in public affairs can no doubt enrich and enliven both his teaching and his scholarship, but sound scholarship will bring more to public affairs than participation in public affairs will contribute to scholarship. Moreover, although scholarly study "can be carried on effectively by political scientists who remain aloof from the public forum, . . . the reverse is not true." The "political scientist cannot take expertise as a political scientist to the public forum except as he carries with him the fruits of scholarship."

Hyneman is careful not to push the distinction between participation in public affairs and scholarship too far. They are not mutually exclusive fields of endeavor. There are enough reservations in his forebodings to acquit Hyneman of the fallacy of an excluded middle term. It is, after all, a matter of emphasis. Scholarship in political science which ignores the world of everyday public affairs can easily degenerate into arid scholasticism, just as an undue involvement in so-called "practical politics" can transform the scholar into a journalist or a ward boss. Hyneman, who obviously favors the scholar over the activist, would avoid these pitfalls by infusing scholarship with moderate doses of active statesmanship. But just how this is to be done, he does not say. Nor does he offer any substitute for the very substantial contributions to both scholarship and statesmanship of activists as varied as Aristotle, John of Salisbury, Machiavelli, Locke, J. S. Mill, Edmund Burke, Thomas Jefferson, and Woodrow Wilson, to mention but a few.

Although Hyneman avoids making the choice between scholarship and statesmanship an *either-or* proposition, he poses other equally difficult alternatives even for those political scientists who share his own preference for scholarship. As scholars, he says, political scientists are normally concerned with one or more of the following types of inquiry: (i) the "description

of legal governments"; (ii) the "examination of ideas"; (iii) the "construction of a science"; (iv) the analysis of "normative doctrine and proposals for social action." In successive chapters he examines these types of inquiry at some length and, in doing so, seems to suggest that the true scholar must not only eschew participation in public affairs but, if he is to make any significant contribution, must specialize in one or another of these "fields." To encompass more than one such "field" is to attempt too much and, by doing so, to run the risk of being superficial and unscientific.

Hyneman finds the publications of American political scientists pretty discouraging. Although their major preoccupation for many generations has been with the "description of legal governments," Hyneman finds serious gaps even in the literature of this field. "Our literature," he says, "does not provide a full account of the organizational structure for deciding constitutional issues . . . [or] a full description of the processes of judicial decision and action. . . . We have made little exploration of the relationships of lower federal courts to constitutionality of legislation. . . . We have not, as a discipline, won any praise for comprehensive, accurate, illuminating accounts of court-made policy which stems out of language in state constitutions. . . . Finally, our writing about constitutional law and the judicial process does not provide thorough descriptions of the human environment that provides the setting for or conditions the process which is the central point of attention in this literature."

Nor have we done much better in the "examination of ideas," or in the "construction of a science." Concerning the first of these, Hyneman concludes, "as is the case with our efforts at description, our accomplishments in examination of ideas fall far short of our commitment." In this area we lag sadly and badly behind our European colleagues. Nor can it be said that, except for a few examples of what Hyneman calls "variable analysis," we have made any very substantial progress toward the "construction of a science" of politics. Since the controlled experiment is, for all practical purposes, unavailable to the political scientist, he is compelled to rely mainly on careful observation, description, classification, and analysis of political "entities." But, says Hyneman, "Descriptive studies that meet

stern requirements of scientific method are as yet too few to support much hope that the findings they report will ultimately add to other findings and so contribute to generalizations worthy of a place in scientific literature."

It is perhaps ironical that the major contributions of political scientists to our civilization have been in the fields of "normative doctrine and proposals for social action," fields which Hyneman would have them deemphasize if not avoid entirely. "Political scientists," according to the late Leonard White, "took a major responsibility for the reconstruction of municipal government. . . . They led the way in the reorganization of state governments. . . . They were influential in the drive for a short ballot and better election procedures. They were chiefly responsible for educating the American public to the necessity of a budget system. They began the long process of discussion that finally . . . reversed the historical direction of American foreign policy. . . . Suffice it to say that where good works are to be done on the body politic, there political scientists are to be found." These are no mean achievements, and they have been accomplished by men and women who were unafraid to mix scholarship with active statesmanship.

Hyneman has a good deal to say about how *scientific* political science can be without sacrificing a legitimate concern for political values. He calls for a more rigorous analysis of means and ends and for a more pragmatic use of political theory, and especially of the so-called "classics," in this analysis. Unless I misread what he has to say, Hyneman takes a dim view of those who, in their zeal for scientific method, would focus the attention of political scientists on such concepts as "power" and "influence," "behavior" or "decision making," to the exclusion of their more traditional concern with "legal government" and political ideas. "If," he asks, "the study of influence offers high hope of arriving at generalizations, why isn't the traditional study of political scientists right down the line? Legal governments are great systems of influence; they provide readily accessible demonstrations of power, which is influence backed up by compelling sanctions."

There is much in this volume that is confusing and even contradictory. Much of Hyneman's own terminology shows the same lack of careful definition for

which he takes his colleagues to task. He appears to be impatient with those who indulge in detailed textual exegesis of political classics, although it is hard to see how the real meat of these great works can be extracted without such analysis. Time and again he uses *power* and *influence* as synonymous terms, although they refer to profoundly different aspects of political behavior. He does less than justice to the so-called "behavioralists" and seems to assume that somehow "legal governments," "ideas," and "normative doctrine and proposals for social action" can have meaning and significance apart from the political behavior of living men and women. He correctly criticizes political scientists for being fuzzy-minded generalists but pleads for greater and greater breadth in those specialized fields to which he would direct their efforts. And while taking political scientists to task for attempting too much, he calls upon them repeatedly to do more and more.

Nevertheless, Hyneman has done political scientists a notable service in holding up this mirror to their achievements and their shortcomings. This volume deserves a wide, careful, and critical reading by all those who profess what has long been described as the "queen of the sciences," the ancient and honorable science of politics.

PETER H. ODEGARD

Department of Political Science,
University of California, Berkeley

Complete Field Guide to American Wildlife. East, Central and North. Henry Hill Collins, Jr. Harper, New York, 1959. xix + 683 pp. Illus. \$6.95.

The World of Living Things. Paul Griswold Howes. Duell, Sloan and Pearce, New York, 1959. xix + 232 pp. Illus. \$4.50.

Curious Naturalists. Niko Tinbergen. Basic Books, New York, 1959. 280 pp. Illus. \$5.

These three books are quite dissimilar, but they have in common a primary focus on the animal kingdom. The first is a field identification manual, the second is a series of reflective essays on natural history themes, while the third blends, in a highly intriguing fashion, a series of glimpses into the fascinating and bewilderingly diverse lives of various creatures with an informal account

of the experiences and joys the author has had in the course of his studies.

Collins' book *Complete Field Guide to American Wildlife*, covers, in its 683 pages, all the species of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, food and game fishes, shells, and principal marine invertebrates of North America east of the Rocky Mountains and north of Mexico. The use of the word *wildlife* is thus restricted to animal life aside from insects. Not only are about 1400 species of animals treated in some detail in the text, but 700 of them are shown in color and 800 in black-and-white. Over 2000 maps and other illustrations are included in this ambitious and seemingly well done manual, which is intended to be a "one-book-library" for use in the field. A rapid sampling of the contents gives me the impression that it will prove to be a reliable and handy guide.

Howes' book, *This World of Living Things*, is intended for reading, rather than for field use. While the creatures described are as varied as collembolans, the tropical forests of British Guiana, infusorians, and the human species, Howes tells us that these are not random sketches, but were carefully chosen from a great many that, at one time or another, occupied his attention. The 10 chapters and their documentation are uniformly good and hold the interest of the reader. The book is written in such a way that it introduces the nonnaturalist to various aspects of the world of living things and shows him, in simple and straightforward descriptions, what a wonderful and richly rewarding world it is. Howes has worked for many years in the field of popular education as writer and lecturer, and as curator of the Bruce Museum in Greenwich, Conn. The present book shows an experienced hand and an ever-alert and receptive mind.

The third book, *Curious Naturalists*, by Niko Tinbergen, the great animal behaviorist at Oxford University, takes its name from the last chapter, in which the author defends his curiosity about nature. He writes that, ". . . no man need be ashamed of being curious about nature. It could even be argued that this is what he got his brains for and that no greater insult to nature and to oneself is possible than to be indifferent to nature." Tinbergen's curiosity has embraced all forms of animal life—birds, insects, fishes. His studies, only partly reflected in the almost autobiographical essays presented here, have not only