1970

Political Science and Public Policy, by A. Ranney

Everett F. Cataldo
Cleveland State University, e.cataldo@csuohio.edu

Original Citation
Cataldo, Everett F. 1970. "Political Science and Public Policy, by A. Ranney*Journal of Politics* 32:183-185.

missiveness of politicians and bureaucrats in their relations with *zaikai*. There is a conflict of styles, at times even antipathy, between these social-political elements, and each has a relatively autonomous base. Further, one misses a consideration of the opposition, whether it be the organized left wing or the lesser sectors of commerce and industry, which maintain complicated relations of dependency and resistance with big business. The bargaining process by which policy decisions are made is more intricate than Yanaga leads one to suppose.

As an illuminating survey of a critical area of Japanese politics, this book amply merits space on the shelves of generalists as well as specialists on Japanese affairs. It is a contribution of permanent value, which should in the future be supplemented by special studies but is not likely to be superseded.

A. M. HALPERN
Center for Naval Analyses (Arlington, Va.)

Political Science and Public Policy. Edited by AUSTIN RANNEY. (Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1968. Pp. xiii, 387. $5.95.)

This volume is a collection of papers given at two conferences sponsored by the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes. The purpose of the conferences was to explore the role of political scientists in studying, evaluating, and making recommendations with respect to the content of public policies.

As Austin Ranney shows in his introductory essay, the extent to which political scientists have the competence, and even an obligation, to speak out on public policies raises a number of sensitive questions which revolve around the scholar's professional obligations as distinct from his personal convictions. When do we speak as professionals? When do we speak only as concerned citizens? Should the political scientists' stance toward the policy-maker be that of advisor or critic? Should the political scientist be content to measure the effects of policies, or should he try to take a hand

in their formulation? There are no universally accepted answers to these questions.

Ranney suggests that "the political scientist, like any expert, may legitimately speak as a professional on matters of public policy only when what he says rests on and accords with his discipline's special body of knowledge." This may be intended as reassuring, but it is hardly convincing. What is that "special body of knowledge" that enables us to speak as professionals? Those who feel that, as professional scholars, we are obligated to subject policy-makers and the entire policy-making process, if need be, to a radical critique will point to one body of knowledge for support of their position; those who feel, as Ranney apparently does, that this is not the professional province of the political scientist will draw support from other sources. There is no getting around this yet. As reading even this rather one-sided collection shows, we are still an eclectic and immature discipline. One who wants to decide for the discipline, therefore, what is sanctioned professional activity and what is not, proceeds arbitrarily, as Ranney has done, to make a distinction between professional and personal activity, and to consign activity of which he disapproves to the non-professional category.

Three of the contributions are outstanding. The paper by James Davis and Kenneth Dolbeare on Selective Service is an excellent example of "impact" research. Selective Service policy is taken as an independent variable; its effects and consequences are skillfully traced and analyzed, and the paper concludes with considerations of alternatives to the present policies. Robert Salisbury has contributed an absolutely first-rate theoretical piece which attempts to reconcile the use of aggregate "system-resource" variables with the use of particularlistic "process" variables in explaining policy outcomes. Finally, there is a brilliant essay by Lucien Pye which suggests that the way political scientists view science has stood in the way of our ability to analyze political dynamics, and has led to a loss of the boldness and imagination which are, after all, the hallmarks of science. One should also make mention of a reprinted, good essay on budgeting by Aaron Wildavsky.

Collections seldom have a message. To the extent that this one has, it would appear to be that political scientists should place

more emphasis on policy as an independent variable, studying its effects on the political system rather than the other way around. The mode of investigation, i.e. the "scientific method," need not change; indeed, the suggestion seems to be that by focusing on policy as an independent variable, we can retain our scientific commitment while becoming, forgive the use of an over-used term, more relevant. All well and good. There are those, however, who would suggest that this is not the only means for achieving professional relevance. There are other ways, and they may not compromise science either. They may be based on a "special body of knowledge," however, that does not accord with the one upon which this volume is entirely based.

EVERETT F. CATALDO

Cleveland State University

Computers and the Policy-Making Community: Applications to International Relations. Edited by DAVIS B. BOBROW and JUDAH L. SCHWARTZ. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968. Pp. x, 374. $12.50.)

This collection presents fourteen papers which were given at an institute on "Computers and the Policy-Making Community" held at Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in April, 1966. It also includes an introductory chapter by the editors and an evaluation of the institute as an educational endeavor by Jeffrey S. Milstein and Bobrow. There are two appendices. The first is a summary of a panel discussion on the social utility of computers; the second is a glossary of computer terms. The work is intended for a non-technical audience; it seeks to dispel confusions about computers and to place the reader in such a position that he may be constructively critical of computer applications to political analysis.

Five of the papers deal with the nature and capabilities of computers. S. Fernbach's "Introduction to Computers" is an excellent historical and descriptive treatment. "The Monte-Carlo Method" by Harry Sahlin is surprisingly clear and informative for an account which relies so little on probability theory; however, readers with no background at all in this branch of mathematics