

*The Study of Politics: The Present State of American Political Science.*

By Charles S. Hyneman. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959. Pp. xi, 232. References, index. \$4.50.)

Professor Charles S. Hyneman, of Indiana University, proposes in this volume to diagnose the present state of American political science and to illumine some of the major issues facing members of the profession. He divides his essay into three parts. He first outlines the problems that most trouble political scientists, e.g.: Do they spend too much time in public affairs and too little at scholarship? Do they try to cover far more ground in their studies than can effectively be embraced by one discipline? Is their work adequately related to the efforts of other disciplines that study social relationships? Second, Hyneman describes the scholarly undertakings of political scientists. These entail description of legal governments, examination of political ideas, development of a scientific literature, and presentation of normative doctrine and proposals for social action. Finally he identifies the major issues of intellectual conflict among American political scientists, e.g.: Are workers in the field scientific enough in method and purpose? What is the proper place of values in political science? Does study of the "classics" serve any useful purpose for contemporary students?

It is of course not possible for so brief a survey of so many and such fundamental problems to do more than indicate the fields of battle and the probable lines of attack and defense. In attaining this goal Professor Hyneman's lucid if at times repetitive book succeeds admirably. It is intended for graduate students, but it is an outline of problems confronting American political science today which can be used profitably by teachers as well.

Particularly helpful is Professor Hyneman's suggesting in which areas of study American political science has been strong and in which it has been weak. Political scientists, for instance, have done a good job in analyzing voting in public elections, but contributions to an understanding of ideas essential to democracy are meager, indeed. An evaluation of the significance of Christianity for politics, to give one example, has been left almost entirely to the theologians, men like Barth, Maritain, and Niebuhr.

Although American political scientists have devoted a substantial share of their energies to the national government of the United States, Hyneman cites shortcomings in this field as well as in studies of state and local government. As a political science teacher just completing his first year as a member of Congress, the reviewer notes with particular interest the author's contention that "very little" of what men and women in the American national government do and how they do it "has as yet been described."

Apparently, few political scientists have made much effort to make their way through the jungle that is the House of Representatives of the United States. The task of analyzing the crosscurrents of party, personality, section, economic interest, pressure groups, and constituency, which together play upon the constellation of committees which constitutes the House, is a formidable one which the reviewer now ap-

precipitates more readily than he did while teaching American government. That the task is of great importance and that few persons are working very hard at it seems also to be true. It is however encouraging to see that political scientists are beginning to tiptoe toward the political reality of Congress, to mention only one branch of the federal government, through various participant-observation projects.

One major explanation of such gaps in our knowledge may simply be lack of imagination on the part of political scientists. Last year, for example, the House battled long weeks through what veteran congressmen described as the most savage legislative struggle in Congress in over ten years, the issue of labor-management reform. It required no great political sophistication to know in January of 1959 that this issue would be coming to a head during the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress. Some group of political scientists might well have conducted a series of confidential interviews with party leaders in the House and Senate, members of the House Education and Labor Committee, lobbyists of concerned organizations, and knowledgeable newspapermen—the difficulties in making such arrangements notwithstanding.

It is true that waiting for the smoke of battle to clear away may bring greater objectivity to an investigation. It is also true that battlefield accounts may provide evidence not easily recoverable at a later date or, to point to another hazard, evidence not so readily subject to what the *Congressional Record* knows as "extension and revision of remarks."

Perhaps Professor Hyneman's thoughtful book will stimulate the coming crop of American political scientists to a more imaginative and fruitful use of their talents.

*Member of Congress*  
*Third District, Indiana*

John Brademas

*The President's Cabinet: An Analysis in the Period From Wilson to Eisenhower.* By Richard F. Fenno, Jr. *Harvard Political Studies.* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959. Pp. xii, 327. Notes, index. \$5.50.)

Disregarding the usual historical or legalistic method of writing about the president's cabinet, Professor Fenno declares that the cabinet is a distinct, discreet and describable political institution" (p. 3). Many, although by no means all, of the precedents that Washington initiated in dealing with his cabinet have remained to the present. Naturally new cabinet offices have kept pace with our increasingly complex technological society as well as with our evolving social conscience. Nearly all of the added cabinet departments began as insignificant administrative agencies.

Although the president is supreme in relation to the cabinet, the author contends, and logically so, that this group is always being "transformed by other influences in the American political system" (p. 50). For example, in making cabinet appointments the chief executive recog-