

perception of the world through a study of his language suggests the germ of cognitive anthropology. Throughout the work is the insistence that the "philosophical traveler" who makes scientific observations, and indeed the entire Western world, recognize the savage as a fellow human being to be neither idealized nor denigrated.

As Moore relates in his introduction, the Australian expedition came to little, the scholar charged with the investigation of native peoples totally ignored Degérando's guidelines, and the essay apparently had no part in the later development of anthropology. Why then, apart from purely historical interest, is an isolated beginning toward a study of anthropology significant? First, it brings out in a graphic manner the fact that even the most brilliant proposals tend to be discarded if the political and intellectual conditions of the time are not favorable. Indeed, this is the general theme of Moore's treatment of the work, and he points out that interest in primitives quickly declined as French leaders lost interest in colonization. A second point arises from the vaguely uncomfortable feelings that this little volume stirs in the modern ethnologist. We see an impressive number of techniques, viewpoints, and concepts virtually identical with those so laboriously developed by anthropologists over more than a century of trial and error but which in this case were apparently easily formulated before anthropology began by a writer from another discipline. Can there be better evidence for the essential unity of scientific thought?

THOMAS B. HINTON

*Department of Anthropology,
University of Arizona, Tucson*

Disciplinary Problem

Politics and the Social Sciences. SEYMOUR MARTIN LIPSET, Ed. Oxford University Press, New York, 1969. xxiv + 328 pp., illus. \$7.50; text ed., paper, \$2.75.

This book is a collection of essays purporting to show the past and prospective relationships of the discipline of political science to the other social sciences. The reader is likely to conclude that the achievements growing out of this interdisciplinary contact appear rather modest in comparison with the promise that the contributors to this volume foresee.

The appearance of a book of this kind reflects the fact that political science has for the last 40 years been working its way through an identity crisis from which it has still not emerged. Political science originated in political philosophy, and its tradition is historical, legalistic, and normative. Despite an attempt during the 1920's on the part of some of its leaders, especially those at the University of Chicago, to turn the discipline toward more objective methods of study, it remained for the most part, in Harold Lasswell's term, "trans-empirical." The New Deal and the Second World War drew many political scientists into problem-solving activities, and it was not until after the war that the discipline began to concern itself seriously with the quantitative analysis of political data. The development of the "behaviorist approach" attracted many younger scholars and created an important reorientation within the political science profession. In 1965 some kind of landmark was reached when the Social Sciences Division of the National Science Foundation, which had previously regarded political science as outside its purview, began to accept applications for research support from political scientists. Since that time they have shared the same underprivileged status in that agency that other social scientists enjoy.

In the very recent past the profession has experienced yet another internal division, identified by the retiring president of the American Political Science Association as "the post-behavioral revolution," the essence of which "consists of a deep dissatisfaction with political research and teaching, especially of the kind that is striving to convert the study of politics into a more rigorously scientific discipline." The battle cries of this new revolution are "relevance and action." This confrontation between science and action is a heated issue at the present time with all the social sciences, but it seems to be especially serious among the political scientists.

Political science has not only had problems in defining its mission, it also has had difficulty in establishing its disciplinary boundaries. Politics is an intellectual domain which has attracted freebooters from the entire range of the social sciences. In this book the editor asks representatives of these disciplines to project the probable developments in the study of politics within their own fields. The collection does not inspire

confidence in the ultimate unification of the contributions these various disciplines may make. The economist, the psychologist, and the sociologist all treat political science as though it should properly be subsumed under their own theoretical orientation. The two political scientists in their turn object that those disciplines tend to leave out of their political analysis most of what is truly "political," constitutions, electoral systems, ideologies, party structures. The anthropologist and psychiatrist hopefully predict that something good will come from collaboration between political scientists and themselves while admitting that nothing much has happened yet. The historian is willing to "open lines of intellectual exchange" but expects the first contacts to prove frustrating to both sides. The editor himself places a good deal of faith in system theory, which he believes has produced "a real movement" toward a single social science.

In the recently published report of the National Academy of Sciences-Social Science Research Council study of the social and behavioral sciences we find the following statement: "Political science is a well established discipline, but it is also a discipline in a phase of rapid transition, whose promises are still greater than its performances." This statement could also be applied in some degree to the other social sciences; and because this is true it will probably be some time before these various disciplines converge on a common theoretical understanding of their scientific problems. Some individual social scientists have achieved an impressive interdisciplinary competence, but the disciplines themselves continue to display a high degree of self-conscious autonomy. Political science undoubtedly touches all the other social sciences at its borders, and some of these points of contact have proved productive. The contributors to this volume are generally optimistic about the future of these cross-disciplinary developments, and in some cases they are rather specific as to what they expect these advances to look like. They do not inform the reader, however, as to how these activities at the edges of political science will help that discipline develop a distinctive science of politics, and indeed they leave some question as to whether it can or will.

ANGUS CAMPBELL

*Survey Research Center,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*