

PART II
POLITICAL THEORY

CHAPTER 2

SCOPE AND NATURE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

References :

- * Garner—Political Science and Government, Ch. 1.
- Gettel—Political Science, Chs. 1, 2.
- Rodee, Anderson Christol and Greene—Introduction to Political Science, Ch. 1.
- Barker—The Study of Political Science and its relation to co-ordinate studies.
- Bryce—Modern Democracies, Vol. I. Ch. 2.
- Gilchrist—Principles of Political Science, Ch. I.
- Alan R. Ball—Modern Politics and Government, Ch. I.
- Austin Ranney—Governing : A Brief Introduction to Political Science.

Introduction. The English poet Lord Byron once said that he awoke one morning and found himself famous. In the same way it may be said about the late twentieth century man that he awoke one morning and found himself politically conscious. This sudden political awareness in place of an indifferent and neutral attitude towards matters political characteristic of men even half a century ago was born of an unprecedented political situation created by the two World Wars, especially, the second one which shuffled and reshuffled the then existing states in such a way that the very existence of the individual as a citizen was violently shaken. Most of the nations groaning under colonialism and imperialism succeeded after bitter struggle in freeing themselves. Thus the post-war atmosphere was sarcharged with a revival of the twin principles of liberty and equality for all individuals as well as for all nations.

The War brought about a change in the outlook of all states—old and new. All post-war states assumed the role of guardianships over their citizens and as a guardian the modern state regulates the life of the individual to such an extent that the individual has been compelled to be alert and acquainted with state-activities. The state now follows an individual from his birth to his death. The United Nations—a by-product of the second war—is enforcing through member-states its numerous rules, regulations, directives and recommendations upon the individual for preserving peace and security of the world and for promoting international co-operation. Thus the national state and the international United Nations have forced men to be political animals though not by nature but by necessity. His citizenship today claims prior allegiance to all other occupations of life. The contribution of the state-controlled press, the state-owned or controlled radio, the cinema and the modern device of television is no less important in making the modern man hundred times more politically minded than his grandfather. The influence of periodic elections on the basis of universal franchise and the activities of political parties and various pressure-groups have today changed the most apathetic man to an arden participator in politics. Thus we find the busy housewife in the kitchen, the pedlar in the street and the student in the class-room—none of them—is immune from the influence of politics. Politics has grown so much important today that a sizeable section of the people of almost all countries have taken to politics as the principal avocation of their life.

Thus a man today must know what is a state and what is a government and what are their functions. He must know something about the constitution

which is the mainspring of his rights and therefore of his existence. Unless he cares to know, he lags behind and suffers. Knowledge of political science has now become a must and as such the study of political science has become necessarily imperative upon every single individual.

Terminology. The study of the state as a form of human organisation is the main subject-matter of political science. But there is no precise and commonly accepted name with which the science of the state may be christened. Aristotle used the term 'Politics' to designate the science of the state and some of the modern writers still adhere to the Aristotelian nomenclature. But objections may be raised against the use of the term 'Politics' on various grounds. First, as has been pointed out by Gilchrist, the word 'Politics' is no longer used as a proper designation of the science of the state. Modern usage has given the term a meaning which is quite different from its etymological sense, viz., science of the city-state. The word 'Politics' as ordinarily used today refers to current problems of a country which engage the serious attention of the Government. The word is now invariably employed to mean a political or administrative problem with which the government of a country is confronted at a particular time, as for example, the Kashmir problem, the Labour problem, the Indo-Pakistan relation, the Centre-State relation etc., constitute some of the Indian current problems. Secondly, there are writers who have used the term in two senses,—theoretical and applied Politics. The former is a study of the state in its fundamental characteristics while the latter deals with the actual administration of the affairs of the Government. Gilchrist, therefore, is rightly of opinion that the word 'Political Science' will be a better substitute for the word 'Politics' inasmuch as Political Science covers the whole field of state-life, theoretical as well as practical.

The term 'Political Philosophy' has been suggested by some writers as the proper title for the science of the state while a majority of writers prefer the term 'Political Science'. Although the two terms are often used synonymously, a distinction must be drawn between the two for the sake of scientific exactitude. The term 'Political Philosophy' includes a study of the nature, attributes and theories of the state, while 'Political Science' is to deal with concrete political institutions. Thus Political Philosophy is concerned with generalisations; Political Science with particulars. But the majority of writers are of opinion that as Political Philosophy is concerned with theories only, it should form a part of Political Science which deals with theoretical as well as practical politics.

There are other writers, notably among the French, who prefer the plural form '*political sciences*' to the single term '*political science*'. These writers lay emphasis on the complexity of the modern state organisation and rightly point out that the different aspects or forms of manifestations of the state have developed a history and dogma of their own and should therefore be studied quite distinctly from one another. Thus Sociology, Political Economy, Public Finance, Diplomacy, Constitutional History, may be designated political sciences because each of them deals directly or indirectly with particular aspects of the state. But as against this view, it may be pointed out that the above-mentioned sciences are so inter-related to, and inter-dependent on, one another that their treatment as independent sciences will be wholly unwarranted. Viewed from the stand-point of either their scope or purposes these political sciences are too similar to justify their claim to be treated as separate sciences. Hence the majority of writers use the term 'Political Science' to designate the subject-matter of our study.

Greek → Broadly
16-20 → narrow
20 → broader

Nature of Political Science

"Politics and Government are among the oldest and most universal of all human activities and institutions." (Austin Ranney) The term 'Politics' refers to a particular type of human activity as well as a systematic study of that activity. So far as we are aware, politics as a distinct branch of activity and also as a separate and specialized branch of study had its origin in the ancient Greece during the fifth century before the christian era. 5th

* The term politics itself arises from the Greek word 'Polis' which means 'city-state'. Thus from the very beginning politics came to be associated with the state. The Greek philosopher Aristotle first adopted 'The Politics' as the title of his celebrated work. The Greeks understood politics in a broad sense. Aristotle started his Politics with the famous observation that man is by nature a political animal. By this he understood that the very essence of social existence is politics and two or more human beings interacting with one another are obviously involved in some kind of political relationship. *

The term 'Political Science' (Science politique) was coined by the French writer Jean Bodin in the sixteenth century and since then 'Politics' and 'Political Science' are used as interchangeable nomenclatures.

* Between the sixteenth and the twentieth centuries 'Political Science' or 'Politics' was not understood in broad sense like the Greeks. During this period it was understood narrowly as the science of the state and most of the writers have analysed the nature of a perfect or an ideal state. 16 to 20th century

But almost from the beginning of the twentieth century a number of the contemporary writers have moved back towards the Greek concept of politics. Thus they regard any aspect of social life directly or indirectly connected with the institution of the state to be the proper sphere of inquiry of political science. From 20th century

Definition of Political Science

Bluntschli } Traditional
Garner }
Janet }
Bodin - Behavioural
Marxist

It is almost impossible to give any definition of Political Science which will be accepted by all. Political philosophers and political scientists of different ages have defined Political Science in various ways.

The existing definitions on Political Science can be classified into certain categories. First, a group of writers define Political Science from the standpoint of the state. Among them the names of Bluntschli and Garner may be mentioned. Bluntschli defines Political Science as the science of the state. * According to Garner "Political Science begins and ends with the state." *

Second, another group of writers define Political Science more elaborately stating that Political Science deals with the state and the government. French Writer Paul Janet states "Political Science is that part of social science which treats the foundations of the state and the principles of government."

The above mentioned definitions are regarded as traditional definitions. In the twentieth century, particularly since the second world war, the Behaviouralists gave Political Science a new dimension. The main theme of Behaviouralism is the shift of emphasis from institutions or structures to functions, processes and activities. Political Science is thus regarded an activity or as a process. J.D.B. Miller has pointed out that 'Politics, to be distinguished as a recognisable activity, demands some initial disagreements between parties or persons and the presence of government as a means of resolving the disagreement in some discretion' *

David Easton says, "Politics is the process by which scarce resources—human, material, spiritual—are allocated with a social limit, be it a city, a state, a nation or an organisation for the purpose of providing human needs and desires".

* Apart from the traditional and Behaviouralist definitions of Political Science there is another definition given by the Marxists. Both as an activity and as a process politics is concerned with the use of power. The Marxist definition also regards politics as a conflict, but there exists a difference. The Marxists regard this conflict as an irreconcilable clash of interests between two classes—the 'haves' and the 'have nots'.

But none of these definitions is either complete or comprehensive. By making a reconciliation of the existing definitions we can arrive at a comprehensive definition of Political Science. This definition will be thus: Political Science is a branch of social science which is concerned with the study and analysis of political activities, processes and institutions, these being political in the sense that imply social situations involving the use of force.

Scope—the Subject-matter of Political Science

By the scope of an academic discipline is meant those matters which fall within the jurisdiction of its study and research. From this view-point each academic discipline has a scope which is special and distinct from that of other related subjects. Political Science as a social science is mainly a study of human beings in society. It specially deals with those social relationships which has a political content.

(Traditionally, Political science was concerned only with the phenomena of the state. For more than two thousand and five hundred years there has been speculative study about the state—its origin, necessity, functions, limits, types and problems.) According to Prof. Gettel the scope of Political Science is very wide. It includes a study of the historical development of the state, an analytical and comparative study of its present form and a philosophical study of the state as it ought to be. For a scientific study, Gettel has subdivided it into the following heads:—

- (i) Historical Political Science which deals with the history of the gradual coming into being of the state.
- (ii) Political Theory which is a politico-ethical discussion about the fundamental concepts of the state.
- (iii) Descriptive Political Science which is an analysis and examination of the fundamental nature and characteristic of the state with the classification of the constitution of the state into legislature, executive and judiciary.
- (iv) Applied Political Science which is a study of the state as it should be, i.e., the proper sphere and the ultimate ends of the state.

According to Garner "the phenomena of the state in its varied aspects and relationship, as distinct from the family, the tribe, the nation, and from all private associations or groups, though not unconnected with them, constitute the subject-matter of political science". According to him, the essential problems with which political science is concerned are three in number. First, it investigates into the nature of the state as the highest form of political organisation for the furtherance of social welfare, secondly, it is an enquiry into the nature, history and forms of political institutions and finally, it endeavours to deduce the laws

of political institutions.) Dr. Garner is further of opinion that the fundamental problems of political science remain almost unchanged although the emergence of new political conditions gives rise to new problems which in their turn influence the course of practical politics. The growth of the state has been considerably influenced by the social, economic and cultural environments which in their turn change from age to age. The political scientists must take note of these changes and their effects on state organisation. The investigation of political science should therefore be of a dynamic and not of a static character. Prof. Laski asserts that a new political philosophy is necessary to a new world. The ideas and ideals of the old world are badly in need of re-orientation in the light of modern political development.)

(*) Until the second world war the state was the focus of discussion in Political science. But after the war many political scientists, particularly in the U.S.A., began to argue that the emphasis on the state as the focus of study of the discipline created problems in the analysis of political phenomena and political activity. Thus, there began a shift of emphasis from the state to the political system as a whole.) Until now the state exists as an important concept but it is losing its significance in political science texts. Some of the books, published after the 1950's discuss the state only to show that it cannot be regarded as the main subject of attention in political science, while some others, do not refer the state at all.)

(There are a number of reasons why the state is not accepted as the primary subject of discussion in Political Science—First, if political science in regarded as the study of the state, can there be said to be any political life to analyse in those communities where the state has not yet appeared? Second, even nowadays, there are a few primitive tribes which do not have a state but this does not necessarily imply that they do not lead a political life. Third, according to the Marxists the state will ultimately wither away.) If at some future stage in history * the state goes out of existence will the study of political science also cease with that?

(The political system is a concept which has gained wide acceptance in recent times and has replaced the state from the focus of discussion in political science. This is because it is regarded as a better way of analysing political phenomena than the state.) The formal and the informal institutions taken together constitute the 'political system', a concept meant to show that politics is obviously a complex process involving behaviour of citizens, activities of groups, elections and lobbying as well as enactment, enforcement and explication of law. Thus according to most of the contemporary political scientists any aspects of human society that directly or indirectly influence the institutions of the state is the proper sphere of their inquiry.)

(Thus with academic independence and with the application of the sophisticated methods of observation and measurement political science has developed various subdiscipline or fields. The subdisciplines of political science may be identified under the following heads: 1. Political philosophy, 2. Political theory and methodology, 3. Executive, legislative and judicial process, 4. Nature and application of power, 5. Comparative politics, 6. Economic foundations of politics, 7. Political socialization and political culture, 8. Voting and public opinion, 9. Political parties and pressure groups, 10. Political development and 11. International politics and organisation.)

Methods of Political Science. Physics, Chemistry, and Astronomy which are rightly called natural sciences have developed various mechanical instruments for conducting a systematic study of the subject-matter within their scope. But political science possesses no such mechanical apparatus for studying the political phenomena. Nevertheless the scientific method applied to the study of the state is the all-important fact and this methodological approach to the study of the political phenomena has largely compensated for the absence of mechanical apparatuses used in natural sciences. The scope of political science is expanding. The subject-matter of political science is dynamic in character. Its character and contents are changing so much so that today it is no longer looked upon as a study of a number of *a priori* postulates but its scope extends to investigations into actualities like the psychology of the voters, the influence of various pressure groups, etc. Thus writers on political science today have become, so to say, over-conscious of methodological approach to the investigation of the political phenomena and this methodological investigation has given to Politics the character of a science. The study of the political phenomena has acquired the status of a science and various methods have been suggested for the investigation of the science.

(a) The Historical Method. This method consists in the observation of historical facts and it attempts to explain and interpret the inner connection between the past and the present. This method makes generalisations from the study of historical facts. These generalisations are helpful for future guidance. But in applying the method, it is absolutely necessary to make a careful selection and analysis of historical facts on the one hand and to avoid any bias or prejudice on the other.

The historical method touches the comparative method on the one hand and the experimental method on the other. In fact, the historical method is a particular form of the comparative method inasmuch as the value of political institutions that exist today can be fully comprehended only through a comparative study of their past and present. It is only on the basis of a true knowledge of the past and the present that we can build up the ideal institutions for the future. Constitutions grow instead of being made and therefore political institutions should be studied not only historically but also comparatively, a comparison between the past and the present being essential for discovering the ideal institutions.

The historical method also supplements the experimental method. History may be said to be the laboratory of political experimentations which rest on observations and experience. All changes in the form of government, law and international relations may be said to be experiments in Political Science.

Historical method has its value. It enables us to make certain conclusions arrived at by a study of historical facts. Conclusions drawn from history may be subjected to a process of verification. The lessons of history act as a guide to politicians and statesmen to shape their policy and action.

Aristotle may be said to be the father of the historical method who said that to comprehend fully the significance of anything, the study of its origin and growth is essential. Sir John Seely and Prof. Laski are modern exponents of this method.

(b) The Philosophical Method. The philosophical method follows the reverse process of the historical method. Its chief exponents were Rousseau,

Mill and Sidgwick. The philosophical method starts with abstract principles, then seeks to harmonise them with the concrete realities of history. It first assumes an abstract ideal of the basis of which the nature, functions and end of the state are determined. Thus the philosophical method has given rise to a number of political doctrines not substantiated by facts and having nothing to do with political realities. Political science is a study of the state—the state as it is and also the state as it should be. The historical and the comparative methods lay too much stress on the political actualities without any reference to the ideal while the philosophical method indulges too much in theoretical abstraction giving scant attention to political realities. But the philosophical method baffles its purpose when it indulges in abstract speculation without paying any regard to actual political facts as is seen in Plato's Republic and in Moore's Utopia.

(c) The Comparative Method. This is a modified form of the historical method. It consists in a study of present politics and those that existed in the past and tries to find out some general principles by a process of selection, elimination and comparison. In using the comparative method, one must take care in the selection of facts and also in the avoidance of superficial resemblances. In deducing generalisations, allowance should be made for diversity of conditions and circumstances. Aristotle, Montesquieu and Lord Bryce were the chief exponents of this method.

(d) The Experimental Method. It is of less importance in its application to the science of politics because 'We cannot do in Politics what the experimenter does in Chemistry'. The science of the state is so complex and is influenced by so many extraneous factors that scientific experimentation is inapplicable to the study of the state. Hence politics is not a perfect science like other physical sciences. It deals with the complex motives and actions of men which are constantly changing. It is a progressive science inasmuch as the physical and social environment in which men live, act and think are subject to constant changes.

(e) The Method of observation. Lord Bryce was a brilliant exponent of this method which consists in the observation of the world of political life and then separates the essential from the non-essential features. Human nature being fundamentally the same everywhere, the political scientist may deduce generalisations from such observation, making allowance for local variations. In making his conclusions, the observer must be sure of his sources of information and superficial analogies should not be allowed to prejudice his conclusions.

(f) The Sociological, Biological and Psychological Methods. These three methods are closely related to one another. The sociological method seeks to account "for the origin, growth, structure and activities of society by the operation of physical, vital and psychical causes, working together in a process of evolution." In studying social and political phenomena, sociology utilises the theories formulated by biology and psychology. The advocates of the biological method apply the theory of evolution to the life of the state and draw an analogy between a living organism and the state which follows the same law of its origin, growth and decay as a natural organism. But it should be remembered that laws governing the growth and change of a biological organism are not always applicable to the state.

The psychological method attempts to study the motives of the behaviour of man individually and collectively in groups and associations and on the basis of this study, it attempts to analyse and explain political phenomena with the help of psychological laws. The psychological method is helpful in explaining the causes of international disputes and also the issues on which political parties are organised.

(g) **The Juridical Method.** The juridical method, like the above three methods, seeks to consider the state from a particular point of view and as such cannot be regarded as a perfect method. This method describes the state as a juridical person whose main function is the formulation and enforcement of laws. The view is as vicious as that of the German idealists who described the state as a 'moral entity'.

(h) **The Method of Analogy.** This inductive method of analogy was made use of by Herbert Spencer who invented the biological doctrine of the 'Survival of the fittest'. This method seeks to establish a truth on the basis of analogy. Herbert Spencer, in his book, 'Man vs. the State' draws a number of analogies between the state and a biological organism and on the basis of those analogies jumps to the conclusion that the state is a biological organism. He argues that as the state has its methods of production, the means of transportation and a seat of government corresponding respectively to a sustaining, distributing and regulating system of a biological organism and as both of them exhibit some common features of development and decay, the state is, accordingly, an organism.

The defect of this method lies in the fact that it seeks to establish identity on the basis of mere analogies. The method fails to distinguish between probability and certainty and thus leads to conclusions which often prove to be misleading.

comparing two things on being alike

Conclusion. On an analysis of the different methods of study of Political science, it is apparent that for a clear understanding of the nature and purpose of the state, both inductive and deductive methods are necessary. Deduction and induction are not mutually exclusive rather they are inter-dependent as historical and philosophical methods supplement each other. Historical method must be blended with philosophical method; realism and idealism must go hand in hand. Gilchrist rightly remarks, "The genuine historian must recognise the value of philosophy, and the true philosopher must equally take the counsel of history." We must also remember that the state is a human institution which exists for the promotion of human welfare and as such no method of study of Political science can be true unless it has for its aim the correct solution of man's political problems.

Is there a Science of Politics? In naming the subject-matter of our study as Political Science, we have assumed that politics is a science. But the claim of politics to be ranked as a science has been rejected by eminent writers like Comte and others who refuse to recognise politics as a science mainly on three grounds. In the first place, there is no unanimity among the writers on the subject as to its methods, principles and conclusions. This lack of uniformity makes political hypothesis and prediction, if not impossible, at least difficult. Secondly, it lacks the elements which help us in making correct generalisations about the future trend of events. Thirdly, others point out that politics is not

and cannot be a science in view of the fact that its premises are uncertain and its conclusions are inexact. Besides, every subject,—every problem of politics admits of different interpretations and hence of different views. Thus the speculative character of the subject coupled with the lack of order and continuity in the phenomena of the state is pointed out by those writers who deny to it the character of a science.

The controversy whether politics may be treated as a science at all came to its end in the nineteenth century when the consensus of scientific opinion was in favour of regarding it as a science. To comprehend really the scientific character of politics, it is necessary, first, to examine the meaning of the word 'science'. A science may be defined as "all knowledge communicable and verifiable, which is reached by methodical observation and experiment and which admits of concise, consistent, and connected formulation." The function of science is therefore the classification of facts and the formulation of laws and principles on the basis of this classification. Judged from the above standpoint, the claim of political science to be treated as science is irresistible. The scientific method of investigations is peculiar not only to the physical phenomena, it is applicable to the social phenomena as well. Writers on political science have collected from various sources immense mass of facts which they have co-ordinated, systematised and classified. The scientific method of examining facts has enabled them to formulate laws or principles which act as basis for wise political action.

But it must be remembered that political science is not as exact as the physical sciences and the conclusions of political science, like the conclusions of mathematics, are not absolute truths. The real fact is that the science of the state is so complex and is influenced by so many extraneous factors that scientific experimentation is inapplicable to the study of the state. Hence it is not a perfect science like other physical sciences which can make correct forecasts inasmuch as they deal with matters which are invariable. Physical sciences deal with natural objects like water, heat, light, etc., which are uniform and behave in the same way under given conditions. Any variation in the composition of the natural objects may be tested and explained. But no two men will behave exactly in the same way under given conditions. Political science deals with the complex motives and actions of men which are constantly changing. Politics is a progressive science inasmuch as the physical and social environments in which men live, act and think are subject to constant changes, making it difficult, though not impossible, to make accurate conclusions. It is for this reason that politics was compared to a relatively less developed and less exact science like meteorology by no less a person than Lord Bryce.

Relation to other Social Sciences.

(i) *Relation to Sociology*—Sociology may be described as the fundamental social science inasmuch as it treats of all forms, civilized and uncivilized, of human associations. Political science, on the other hand, has to do mainly with one form of human association, namely, the state and as such its scope is narrower than that of Sociology. Political science is restricted to a particular aspect of human society while Sociology deals with the social man in all the various aspects of his life, namely, social, ethnic, economic, political, religious, etc. So Political science may rightly be regarded as the (child of Sociology.)

Although the spheres of the two sciences have been separated for a more thorough study, yet they touch at many points, and are in many respects, complementary to each other. (The state, which is the subject-matter of political science, is one of the many associations which have sprung up into existence in every society. Besides, society is prior in its origin to the state and man was found to be social animal long before he turned to be a political animal.) Sociology is a study of the evolution of the state from its very birth and it endeavours to analyse the complex social forces which are responsible for bringing the state organisation into existence. (The relation between the two sciences has been described by Garner in the following words: "Sociology derives from political science knowledge of the facts regarding the organisation and activities of the state, while political science derives in large measures from sociology its knowledge of the origin of political authority and the laws of social control. The political scientist therefore ought to be at the same time a sociologist, and vice versa.")

Political Science has in recent times become so closely associated with Sociology that some thinkers believe that the two disciplines are virtually one, having emerged into a new discipline, Political Sociology. Political Sociologists hold the view that political life is always very close to social conditions and thus they pay attention to the diverse social factors that condition men's association with political activities. Thus many of the contemporary political scientists have been attracted towards analysing informal political processes and institutions. Interdisciplinary investigation of Political Science and Sociology has led Prof. S.M. Lipset to remark "No sociologist can conceive of a study of society that does not include the political system as a major part of analysis." And many political scientists, particularly in recent years, have argued sometimes with others in their own field, that it is impossible to study political processes except as special cases of more general sociological and psychological relationships." The two disciplines (Political Science and Sociology, have not yet merged and perhaps they will never merge. None the less, some of the terms used and concepts devised, like political culture, political socialization, political stability and change, behaviour of voters, legislators, judges, political executives and bureaucrats, role of pressure groups and mass media are often common to both disciplines and are of considerable interest to both.)

(ii) Relation to History—Political science is closely related to History. It is impossible to make any scientific study of any human institution without any reference to its past history. The political institutions that exist today in a particular form have their roots in the past and History which is a record of past events and institutions, furnishes us to a great extent with the data for comparison and induction. All our political institutions are the products of history and the study of political science without its historical significance will turn out to be entirely speculative in character. But it must be remembered that true history is more than a mere chronicle of events. "True history is philosophy teaching by history." The relation between History and Politics has been very aptly described by Sir John Seely as follows:

History without Political Science has no fruit,
Political Science without History has no root.

J.P.

But we must remember, as Garner points out, that not all of History is past Politics or that Politics is present history. The history of art, science, industries, religion, language, military expeditions is of no use to the political scientist. Conversely, that part of political science which is philosophical and speculative in character is not based upon historical data. The truth is that "to fully comprehend Political science in its fundamental relations, we must study it historically, and to interpret History in its true significance we must study that politically." It must be remembered that History is not a mere delineation or chronology of facts and events. The study of History becomes fruitful only when political significance lying back of political events and movements is properly appreciated. The materials thus gathered from History are to be utilised to form the basis of the present. Thus both the subjects are complementary and contributory.

(iii) Relation to Economics—The Greeks regarded Political economy as the art of providing revenue for the state and even as late as the eighteenth century, Political economy was regarded as a branch of Political science by the Physiocratic school of writers in France. Although the science of wealth and welfare has now been emancipated from the fetters of the science of the state, yet the two touch at many points. The forms and functions of a government are considerably influenced by economic forces. Conversely, the economic activities of a society, its production, distribution and exchange, are largely conditioned upon the form of government and this explains the fundamental difference between the economic system prevailing in England and in China. Again there are certain subjects which are common to both, such as tariff, currency, taxation, etc. Social life and political life are in modern times so intermixed with, and interdependent upon, each other that the one cannot be completely divorced from the other. Modern states are confronted with numerous economic problems, the solution of which cannot be made except through the political action of the state. The ultimate problem of politics, viz., the reconciliation between liberty and authority, is, in reality, an economic problem. Bad politics hampers economic progress; bad economy corrupts politics.

(iv) Relation to Anthropology—Politics is a social science and as such, it has a close relation to Anthropology. Recent anthropological researches have brought into light certain important facts which have thrown new light on the origin as also on the different forms of organisations of early human society. *Jenks, Morgan and other writers have collected immense facts from Anthropology on the basis of which they have explained the origin of the state. The patriarchal and matriarchal theories about the origin of the state are examples illustrating the close relation between Political Science and Anthropology. Besides, heredity and environment influence to a great extent the behaviour of man. Unity of race is still regarded as a strong bond of nationality. Finally, national socialism in Germany under Hitler was based on the dogma of the superiority of the Aryan race to all other races. The fact that the modern system of law has been considerably influenced by ancient usages, customs and religious institutions is a proof positive of the close relation between these two sciences. Thus Anthropology can throw some light on the dark corners of political science.

(v) Relation to Ethics—Political Science is also closely related to Ethics.

Both the sciences are concerned with man. But while Ethics controls both the motives and external actions of men, Political science deals only with the external conduct of men in society. Again both are concerned with what ought to be. The 'ought' of Ethics comes from the conscience of men while that of Political science from the law-making authority. Besides, political ideas cannot be completely divorced from moral ideas. Laws should be enacted in such a way as to strengthen the moral ideas of the people. The actions of the state that violate the principles of morality are condemned. Gettel remarks that the existence of the state can be justified because it has an ethical standpoint, ethical end and a moral significance. The ancient philosophers duly emphasised the moral end of the state.

(vi) *Relation to Psychology*—Though a rational creature, man is not altogether free from the influences of instinct, emotion and passion. Psychology is a study of the behaviour of men as they are influenced by the above factors, while political science deals with political relationships of human beings and these relationships are considerably influenced by psychological factors. Modern writers like MacDougall, Le Bon and others have laid great prominence on psychological factors in determining the forms and organisation of the government of a country. The writers of this school seek to explain the political traditions and institutions of a country in terms of the psychology and genius of the people of that country. Thus the peculiar constitutional system of Great Britain is ascribed to the temperament and racial genius of the Anglo-Saxon race. Psychological approach to the study of political problems no doubt helps us in accurately estimating the political behaviour of men but it should be borne in mind that all political problems cannot be interpreted in terms of psychological analysis.

(vii) *Relation to Jurisprudence*—Jurisprudence may be rightly regarded as a sub-division of Political science inasmuch as laws which form the subject-matter of jurisprudence are created and sustained by the state. But there is a difference between the two. While Jurisprudence deals exclusively with law, Political science is concerned with the study of the state of which law is an instrument by which the state enforces its will upon the citizens. Law therefore reflects the character of the state concerned.

(viii) *Relation to Geography*—Political Science has also some relation with geography. The character and national life of peoples are susceptible to the influence of geographical conditions and physical environment of a state. The physical conditions of a state, such as, topography, climatic conditions, insularity, presence or absence of rivers or mountains, proximity to or distance from the sea,—all these act and react upon national life and activities. The difference in geographical factors largely explains the difference in the trend of political thought, economy and administrative systems of different countries. Various writers from Aristotle to Buckle have attempted to prove the relationship between geographical environment and political and economic organisations of the people. Rousseau went so far as to suggest that warm climates foster despotism, cold climates are conducive to barbarism while moderate climates are helpful to the growth of good governments. Buckle in his "History of Civilization" laid the greatest emphasis on the influence of geographical factors on the formation of the character and institutions of peoples by totally rejecting the dogma of

free will of man.

Although the extreme view of Buckle cannot be accepted, the fact remains that geographical factors play an important part in the organisation of political institutions. England's special economic and political system is largely due to her geographical environment which has cut her off from the European mainland.

* The importance of geography to a study of international politics cannot be denied. Napoleon once remarked that "the foreign policy of a country is determined by its geography". The influence of geographical factors to the study of political science and international relations has given rise to a new science of "Geopolitics". This new discipline first arose in Germany. Rudolf Kjellen a noted German geopolitician, first used the term "geopolitics". A group of German geopoliticians however, had so exaggerated the application geographical factors on German politics that it served to act as a cover for militancy expansionism. In spite of such misuse of geopolitics, it remains a fact that geopolitical analysis can throw much light upon some of the major internal and external problems and politics of a state.

(ix) *Relation to International Law*—Politics and International law seem to be allied sciences since both of them deal with state-life and the relations existing between different states. International law is concerned more with the rules that civilized states observe in their daily contact with one another. Pacifists and internationalists hope that with the gradual perfection of international law making its sanction obligatory on all states, the subject will be absorbed in Political science.

Value of the Study of Political Science. The study of Political science is useful in many respects. It has both a theoretical and a practical interest. A proper study of Political science enables us to acquire knowledge of a very useful subject. It broadens the mind and enlarges a man's intellectual outlook.

On the practical side, we learn from it fully the mechanism of the modern state, how laws are formulated and enforced so that common welfare can be promoted. The study of Political science makes us conscious of our rights and duties and the ways in which the rights are to be exercised and the duties discharged. The knowledge obtained from the study of Political science enables us to assess properly the value of political institutions and in the light of such assessments, political institutions and developments may be moulded for a better social life.

The utility of the study of Political science has assumed greater importance to the citizens of India in view of the recent change in the status of the Indian people. India is no longer in bondage, she is a sovereign socialist secular democratic republic today. It is therefore imperative on the part of her free citizens to make a close study of Political science so that they may be in a position to promote their national welfare.

Approaches to Political Science

All the social sciences try to establish their claim to be a science. Thus there has been a growing tendency to apply the techniques of natural science to the methodology of social sciences. So it is almost impossible to make a clear distinction between the natural and social sciences on the basis of their

Pacifism opposition to war to settle disputes

methods. Political Science is no exception to this general trend. However, a distinction between the natural and the social sciences will be fruitful if the focus of attention is shifted from methods to approaches. The natural sciences depend mainly on what is known as the empirical approach. While the social sciences including Political Science rely both on the empirical and the normative approaches. *

It is possible to categorise approaches to the study of Political Science in various ways but it is convenient to devote attention mainly to two—Traditional or Classical and Modern or Contemporary—based on the age of a particular approach.

Following Prof. Alan Ball it may be said that before 1900 traditional approach was dominant in Political Science. By the opening of the twentieth century Political Science began to be influenced by progress made in other social sciences—sociology, psychology etc.—under the impact of the natural sciences. There was a demand for the greater application of the scientific method in Political Science. According to Prof. Alan Ball, “The publication of Graham Walla’s ‘Human Nature in Politics’ and Arthur Bentley’s ‘The Process of Government’, both in 1908, symbolised a change in political studies.” But the real break through in the studies on Political Science came only with the advent of the Behaviouralists. This approach first appeared in the 1920s. Among those who have categorically contributed to the laying down of foundations of the behavioural Political Science in the real sense, the names of Prof. Charles Merriam stands out to be the most important. It was under his inspiring leadership the Department of Political Science of the University of Chicago became the most active centre of behavioural research and study and produced eminent political scientists like Harold Lasswell, V.O. Key, David Trueman, Herbert Simon, Gabriel Almond most of whom became famous as the pioneers of behavioural studies in Political Science. *

The behavioural approach to Political Science which arose as a protest movement against the traditional or conventional approach endeavoured for a change in both the content and the methodology of political science, in what and how of political science. The content of Political Science ceased to be confined to the study of state, government and their institutions. Instead it embraced any activity involving human beings associated together in relationships of power and authority. The subject-matter of political science became the political process and political systems. In the method of analysis the behaviouralists reject the value oriented approach to the study of political science and replace it by empirical approach.

It is necessary to distinguish between the traditional and the contemporary approaches. The distinction between them is between the speculative or normative and the empirical viewpoints. The term normative refers to value and preference whereas the term empirical implies fact and experience. An empirical statement can be verified and shown to be truth or false. But it is not possible to prove or disprove a normative assessment. Traditional Approach was mainly normative in the sense that the advocates of this school were concerned not only with how and why political events happen but also with what ought to happen. The viewpoint of most of the contemporary writers is purely empirical in the sense that their approach to political science is confined only to the analysis of how

and why things happen. They are least interested in what ought to happen.

The sole concern of the traditional school of writers was an analysis of the state and its various institutions but most of the contemporary writers go beyond that. They analyse the actual working and behaviour of political institutions with special reference to the behaviour of men who run these institutions and take note of the political activities of individual persons.

1. Traditional Approach—According to the normative or trans-empirical theorists, the study of political science can never be value-free and hence cannot be purely scientific. They argue that in actual political life facts and values are intermingled in such a way that it is impossible to separate them. The normative theorists believe that the study of political science has a purpose behind it. In the words of Leslie Lipson "The essence of Politics is choice and this implies a deliberate preference for one set of values for another.....politics is a search for ends as well as means. If Political Science pretends to be value-neutral, it will run the risk of degenerating into an apologia of the existing order."

* The traditional approaches lay emphasis on historical, philosophical and legal elements and these are mainly descriptive, institutional and deductive.

(a) Philosophical Approach—This is perhaps the oldest approach to the study of political science. This approach is mainly imaginary and idealistic. In most cases conclusions were reached with little observation of political facts. Plato in his 'The Republic' searched for a philosopher-king because according to him justice can be established in a state if it is ruled by a philosopher king. Thus he says, "Until kings are philosophers and philosophers kings cities will never cease from ills." This observation is not supported by any fact. But it is not correct to say that all the political philosophers were concerned with apriori deductions. Aristotle, for example, wrote his 'Politics' on the basis of his study of the existing Greek city-states. Machiavelli also wrote his 'The Prince' on the basis of his personal experience as an administrator.

(b) Historical Approach—The Historical Approach is the study of origin and development of political institutions by analysing past events through available evidence. On the basis of such knowledge it seeks to draw conclusions as to some aspects of the present day political activity. This approach has been followed by the scholars in different ages. Modern scholars like Sir Ivor Jennings, Robert Mckenzie, J. P. Mackintosh and Samuel Beer have relied on this approach.

(c) Study of constitutional law—The study of constitutional law provided "the third cornerstone of traditional political studies". This approach is based mainly on the formal aspects of government and politics. It concentrates solely on the study of legal institutions of the state, such as, the executive, the legislature, the judiciary, the bureaucracy, the local self governments, and from these studies valuable insights as to their organisation and functioning can be found, proposals for reform suggested and general conclusions drawn. Walter Bagehot's 'The English Constitution', and Edward Corwin's 'The President—Office and Powers' are a few outstanding works based on the institutional approach.

(d) Comparative Studies—Comparative approach is also a very old one. Aristotle, the father of political science, made a comparative study of more than 150 constitutions of the Greek city states. Bodin and Montesquieu have

also favoured this approach. The comparative approach does not necessarily imply that comparison must be cross-national to be rewarding. Even the apparent uniformity of political institutions of one's own country also provides a fertile field for comparative analysis. According to Prof. Alan Ball this approach provided "the link between the traditional approaches to political science and the more recent developments in the discipline."

1960's
2. Contemporary Approaches—The contemporary approaches concentrate mainly on the analysis of the behaviour of individuals and of small groups as the basic unit of study rather than, like the traditionalist, institutions, structures and ideologies. The protagonists of the contemporary approaches aim to improve our knowledge of political science by trying to examine the empirical aspect of political life by means of accepted assumptions of modern empirical science.

The advocates of the empirical approaches in political science have come forward with a number of theories, approaches and models.

(a) **Psychological Approach**—The British Writer Graham Wallas in his 'Human Nature in Politics' (1908) and other writings tried "to interpret political phenomena in terms of psychological forces rather than in terms of form and structure." In the words of Alan Ball ".....Wallas had carried the important message that to understand the political process one must examine how people actually behave in political situations, not merely speculate on how they should or would behave."

(b) **Group Approach**—Arthur Bentley in his "The Process of Government" (1908) emphasised the supreme importance of the study of groups for political understanding and investigation. The group approach has been applied mainly to examine legislative activities because the legislature is the place where various interest groups have tried to exert much of their influence. Although this approach was criticised for ignoring almost completely the formal political institutions, but it paves the way to the study of the roles of pressure groups, political parties, elections and public opinion in the political process.

(c) **Power Approach**—The power approach was applied by the behaviourists from the very late 1930s. The exponents of this approach are Charles Merriam and Harold Lasswell. According to this approach the motivating issue behind political investigation is "who holds power and how is it used?" In the words of Lasswell, political science is "the study of shaping and sharing of power" or "the study of the influential and the influenced."

(d) **Systems Analysis**—David Easton in his "The Political System" (1953) first presented the systems approach in political science. According to Easton the political system is "that system of interactions in any society through which binding or authoritative allocations are made." He was mainly concerned with portraying the relationships between a system and the environment in which it was situated. He paid attention to the boundary between politics and other aspects of social life and postulated the existence of a close connection between the system and the environment. Easton divided the basic components of his model into inputs and outputs. Inputs consist of 'demands' and 'supports' from various environments, and they are converted into output or authoritative decisions. Authoritative decisions may be roughly regarded as policy making.

Feedback processes put output back into the system as input, and in this way completing a complex—cyclical operation.

The systems approach is, in the words of Alan Ball, "One of the more ambitious attempts to construct a theoretical framework from within political science".

(e) *Structural Functional analysis*—As its name reveals, G.A. Almond's structural functional analysis aims at examining what political structure under what conditions fulfil what functions in a particular political system. Intended, recognised or purposeful functions are called manifest functions whereas those functions which are not intended are designated latent ones. The court is a structure within the political system and its manifest function is to explicate the law. A latent consequence of judicial decisions may be to educate the people about the nature of law.

(f) *Communication theory*—This theory is the result of the application of cybernetics to the study of political science. Cybernetics means a study of communication mechanisms in electronic calculating machines and the human brain. Karl Deutsch, the chief exponent of this theory, explained his view-point in his book "The Nerves of Government, Models of Political Communication and Control" (1966). "This book" says Deutsch "suggests that it might be profitable to look upon government somewhat less as a problem of power and somewhat more as a problem of steering, and it tries to show that steering is decisively a matter of communication." The point of this theory is that any organisation, including political organisation, is limited by communications, and thus, it is this process that should be deeply analysed.

(g) *Games Theory*—Thomas Schelling and H. W. Riker applied the games theory to political science. It is a formal analysis of rational decision-making in situations where the actor is to choose from a given set of alternatives. The actor must try to make the best choice from the alternatives in order to maximise his goal.

(h) *New Political Economy*—This approach attempts to apply economic models to Political Science. In order to distinguish this approach from political economy of the classical liberal economists of the nineteenth century it has been given the title 'new political economy'. The names of Anthony Downs, J. M. Buchanan and G. Tullock are well connected with this approach. This approach views political process as a process of exchange. Politics is compared to market place. The vote, for example, is regarded as a commodity which is exchanged for gaining some benefit. According to the supporters of this approach politics deals with the allocation of resources and maximization of social welfare and thus the choice within the political process are connected with government finance, budgets, various taxes and the repercussion of these choices on political structure.

Conclusion—A close study of the view point of the advocates of the new approaches reveals that they want to give proper emphasis and recognition to the human factor in politics which the traditionalists completely ignored. The Behaviouralists seek to formulate theories and models on the basis of their analysis of the influence of the human factor on political actions and reactions.

The behaviouralists apply the scientific method as adopted by the chemist or the physicist in their study of political events and institutions and on the basis of this scientific method of study of political events and institutions the behaviouralists build up their political theories and models. But it should be remembered that the scope of the application of the scientific method is very limited in political science. In some cases as in voting, a study of the voting behaviour of human beings may help the political scientist to formulate a more or less correct assessment but in case of abstract concepts like liberty or justice a study of human behaviour will yield practically no fruit. Thus towards the end of sixties, a powerful attack was made on the behavioural stand by a group of political scientists known as the post-behaviouralists. This so called 'Post-Behavioural Revolution' was an expression of deep dissatisfaction with political research and teaching that was trying to convert the study of political science into a more rigorously scientific discipline based on the methodology of natural sciences. The two major demands of post-behaviouralism are—relevance and action. This reminds us of the famous Aristotelian dictum 'the end of politics is not knowledge but action'. Alan Ball sums up the view point of this school in this way: "The post-behavioural approach accepts the need to make political science relevant to real political problems;.....and emphasises that political scientists should perhaps seek some of their inspiration in traditional political philosophy."

However, it must be said to the credit of the behaviouralists that they have done a great service by pointing out the limitations of the traditionalists and giving due importance to the human factor in politics. They have supplemented but not supplanted the view point of the traditionalists.

Differences between the Traditional Approaches and the New Approaches to the study of Political Science.

The Traditional Approaches to the study of Political Science differ from the New Approaches in nature, objectives, methods and conceptual frames of reference.

First, the Traditional Approaches are distinguished from the New Approaches in nature. Traditional Approaches are mainly normative, descriptive and institutional. But the New Approaches insist on the application of scientific methods and on the making of accurate statements about political phenomena. For applying scientific methods to political analysis the proponents of the New Approaches collect necessary resource material from physical sciences like physics and chemistry and other social sciences like, sociology and psychology. Thus the emphasis is always actual observation and preference is for data collected through one's senses rather than through institutional perceptions and deductive reasoning.

Secondly, the New Approaches differ from the Traditional Approaches in their objectives also. The real aim of the new political analysis is not the realisation of the good life but to analyse and describe political phenomena realistically. But the primary goal of traditional political analysis is the speculation about the ideal state or the ideal political phenomena. The question of values arises here. A great deal of controversy between the traditionalists and the supporters of new approaches lies over the question of value neutrality. According to the

traditionalists political science could not refuse to show concern with questions of right and wrong and thus a researcher cannot keep his value preferences away from his study. The Behaviouralists, on the other hand, insist on what they call the "pure science" approach and thus their analysis can always be kept value free.

Thirdly, if the goals of new political analysis is different from that of the traditional approaches, there exists a wide difference in their methods also. The proponents of the New Approaches particularly the Behaviouralists attach a great deal of importance to the gathering and interpreting data which can be used as evidence to accept or reject a hypothesis. A hypothesis implies a statement that indicates a suspected relationship among two or more factors. The accuracy of conclusions drawn depends not only on the proper kind of data gathering but also on the correct methods applied in analysing it.

Lastly, another peculiar feature related to the new approaches to the study of political science is the conceptual frame of reference which is totally unknown to the traditional approaches. An important problem before the investigator of Behavioural political enquiry is that of integrating the findings from his enquiry into an overall pattern. A conceptual frame of reference offers an investigator with an abstract scheme within which he can apply his findings and integrate them into a meaningful analysis of political phenomena. Systems analysis, structural functional analysis, communications theory, group approach — are examples of such conceptual frames of reference, each of which has its own technique to analyse political phenomena.

The New Approaches to the study of Political Science should not be regarded solely as a protest movement against the Traditional Approaches. As a protest movement the New Approaches introduced new goals and new methods of inquiry. But this does not in any way imply total rejection of the traditional mode of analysis. The New Approaches specially the Behaviouralism have tried to enrich speculative thought and macro-analysis of the traditionalists through their micro-empirical studies. Thus the New Approaches may be regarded as a means of enriching and extending the basic concerns of the Traditional Approaches.

✓ SUMMARY

Definition, Scope and Method.

The science of the state is variously known as Politics, Political Philosophy and Political Science. Political science is concerned with the state. It includes a three-fold study of the state: the state as it has been, an analytical study of what it is, and a philosophical discussion of what the state ought to be. It deals with the statics and dynamics of state.

Theoretical Politics is concerned with the laws of political development while Practical Politics deals with actual political institutions. Political Philosophy is abstract in character, while Political science is concrete in nature.

Political Laws are hypothetical in nature. They are not so exact as the laws of other natural sciences.

There are various methods of the study of Political science, viz., historical method, comparative method, philosophical method, experimental method, etc. Of these, the historical and philosophical methods are regarded as more sound and correct.

Is there a Science of Politics ?

Some writers go to the length of denying to Political science the name of science. They argue that as political phenomena are lacking in order and continuity and marked by uncertainty and variableness, the scientific method of investigation is inapplicable to it. Hence, it should not be treated as a science. But the subject is now universally recognised as a science in view of the fact that the huge mass of materials at its disposal is capable of being treated by ordinary scientific methods. But it cannot claim the same degree of perfection which other sciences have attained. It is an imperfect science.

For a clear understanding of the scope of Political science, it is necessary to study its relation to the allied sciences.

(i) *Political science and Sociology*—Sociology is a study of human society as a whole in all its aspects, while Political science is concerned with only one form of society, viz., the state.

(ii) *Political science and History*—Political history forms the ground-work of Political science inasmuch as the former deals with the growth, development and decay of political institutions. Similarly Political science is concerned with History, but only with that part of History which can explain political institutions.

(iii) *Political science and Economics*—Political life and economic life are mutually interdependent in modern times. The production and distribution of wealth in a country are largely influenced by the policy pursued by a state while economic conditions profoundly influence the organisation of the state.

(iv) *Political science and Anthropology*—Politics and Anthropology are closely related. Recent anthropological researches have discovered certain facts which are helpful in explaining the origin of the state. Modern law which grew out of ancient usages and customs of early societies also proves the close relation between the two.

(v) *Political science and Ethics*—The relation between the two was more marked in ancient society. The standard of state activity is suggested by the ethical standard. Both of them preach the same ideal that man should lead a lean and honourable life. But while Ethics regulates the whole course of a man's life, Political science only his external conduct. It deals mainly with man as a citizen.

(vi) *Political science and Psychology*—Politics has a relation with Psychology inasmuch as political activities of men are very often influenced by psychological motives. Though psychological approach is helpful to the study of political problems, all political problems cannot however be explained in terms of psychological analysis.

(vii) *Political science and Jurisprudence*—Jurisprudence, deals exclusively with laws made by the state while political science deals with the state in all its aspects.

(viii) *Political Science and Geography*—Political Science and Geography are related in some way. The geographical factors like situation, climatic conditions, fertility, etc., influence to some extent the character of the people and their economic and political institutions. This is amply illustrated by Great Britain which has developed peculiar economic and political institutions because of her isolation from the European continent.

(ix) *Political science and International Law*—International law deals with the relation existing between civilized states and as such it may be regarded as a subdivision of Political science.

Value of the study of Political science—The study of political science has a theoretical as well as a practical interest.

- (a) It helps us to acquire knowledge about an important subject.
- (b) It helps us to know how governments are formed and how they function.
- (c) It is a source of knowledge about civic rights and duties.
- (d) As India is free today, the citizens of India should acquire this knowledge in order to promote national welfare.

✓ QUESTIONS

1. (a) "Politics is not an experimental science." (G. C. Lewis)
 (b) "Politics (so far as it is a science) is an experimental science." (James Bryce)
 (c) "Politics is an observational and not an experimental science." (Lowell)
 Discuss the statements. (C. U. Hons., 1952)
2. Discuss the methodology of Political Science pointing out how it becomes a combination of the two approaches of philosophy and history. (C. U. Hons., 1963)
3. Examine the claim of Political Science to be categorized as a science. [C. U. (Hons.), 1967]
4. Attempt a formulation of what you would regard as the correct methodology in Political Science. [C. U. (Hons.), 1968]
5. Define Political Science and point out the relation of Political Science to History and Sociology. (C. U. 1969)
6. Can Political Science be strictly regarded as science in the strict sense of the term? State your reasons fully. (C. U. 1970, 1972)
7. Define 'Political Science' and point out the relation between (a) Political Science and Sociology and (b) Political Science and Economics. (C. U. 1976)
8. What do you understand by the behavioural approach to the study of Political Science? Point out its major characteristics and limitations. (N. B. U. 1980)
9. Critically discuss the main tenets of behavioural approach to the study of political science. (C. U. 1984)
10. Explain the traditional approaches to the study of political science. (C. U. 1985, 1988)
11. Explain the different methods of study in Political Science. (C. U. 1987)
12. Discuss the nature and scope of Political Science. (C. U. 1989, 1992)
13. Discuss the features of traditional approaches to the study of Political Science. Mention briefly their points of distinction with the modern approaches. (C. U. 1990)
14. Indicate the differences between traditional and contemporary approaches to the study of Political Science. (C. U. 1994)
15. What are the major approaches to the study of Political Science? (C. U. Law 1987, 1993)