



# **POLITICAL SCIENCE**

## An Introduction

FOURTEENTH EDITION

**Roskin • Cord • Medeiros • Jones**

## Designed for the way today's students **read, think, and learn**


REVEL is Pearson's newest way of delivering our respected content. Fully digital and highly engaging, REVEL offers an immersive learning experience designed for the way today's students read, think, and learn. Enlivening course content with media interactives and assessments, REVEL empowers educators to increase engagement with the course, and to better connect with students.

Over the course of several years, we have worked with more than 23,000 educators and students to develop REVEL. All of REVEL's key aspects—from features to content to performance dashboard reporting—were guided by interactions with our customers. We've tested each REVEL prototype with educators and students from across the country to make sure it accurately reflects their preferences and facilitates the achievement of their goals. The result is a new approach to digital learning that gives educators and students precisely what they need, and nothing more.

To request a demo of REVEL, or for more information, please contact your Pearson representative and or visit [www.pearsonhighered.com/REVEL](http://www.pearsonhighered.com/REVEL).

## Dynamic content

REVEL engages students in course material, while giving them the flexibility to learn their way.



**Integrated** within the author's narrative, **interactives** and **videos** empower students to engage with concepts and take an active role in learning. REVEL's media interactives have been designed using best practices in learning theory to keep students focused and to increase knowledge retention.

# Political Science

An Introduction

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Political Science

## An Introduction

**FOURTEENTH EDITION**

**Michael G. Roskin**

*Lycoming College*

**Robert L. Cord**

**James A. Medeiros**

**Walter S. Jones**

**PEARSON**

Boston Columbus Indianapolis New York San Francisco Amsterdam Cape Town  
Dubai London Madrid Milan Munich Paris Montréal Toronto Delhi  
Mexico City São Paulo Sydney Hong Kong Seoul Singapore Taipei Tokyo

**Editor-in-Chief:** Dickson Musselwhite  
**Publisher:** Charlyce Jones-Owen  
**Editorial Assistant:** Laura Hernandez  
**Field Marketing Manager:** Brittany Pogue-Mohammed  
**Program Manager:** Rob DeGeorge  
**Project Manager:** Carol O'Rourke  
**Senior Operations Supervisor:** Mary Fischer  
**Operations Specialist:** Mary Ann Gloriande

**Cover Art Director:** Maria Lange  
**Media Project Manager:** Tina Gagliostro  
**Text Permissions Project Manager:** Peggy Davis  
**Full-Service Project Management, Composition, and Design:** Integra  
**Printer/Binder:** RRD, Crawfordsville  
**Cover Printer:** Lehigh-Phoenix: Lehigh/Phoenix

**Photo Credits** p. 269: AP Photo/Pablo Martinez Monsivais; cover, p. 2, p. 28, p. 49, p. 68, p. 86, p. 109, p. 127, p. 148, p. 168, p. 187, p. 207, p. 228, p. 248, p. 291, p. 311, p. 331: Michael G. Roskin

---

**Copyright © 2017, 2014, 2012, 2010 by Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliates.** All Rights Reserved. This digital publication is protected by copyright, and permission should be obtained from the publisher prior to any prohibited reproduction, storage in a retrieval system, or transmission in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise except as authorized for use through the product subscription through which this digital application is accessed. For information regarding permissions, request forms and the appropriate contacts within the Pearson Education Global Rights & Permissions department, please visit [www.pearsoned.com/permissions/](http://www.pearsoned.com/permissions/).

#### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Political science: an introduction/Michael G. Roskin, Robert L. Cord,  
James A. Medeiros, Walter S. Jones.— Fourteenth edition.  
pages cm  
ISBN 978-0-13-440285-7—ISBN 0-13-440285-5  
1. Political science. I. Roskin, Michael G., 1939–  
JA71.P623 2017  
320—dc23

2015030801

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

#### **Student Edition**

ISBN-13: 978-0-134-40285-7  
ISBN-10: 0-134-40285-5

#### **Instructor's Review Copy:**

ISBN-13: 978-0-134-40989-1  
ISBN-10: 0-134-40498-X

#### **A La Carte Edition**

ISBN-13: 978-0-134-40479-0  
ISBN-10: 0-134-40479-3

**PEARSON**

# Brief Contents

<b>PART I</b> The Bases of Politics	1	<b>10</b> Parties	187
<b>1</b> Politics and Political Science	2	<b>11</b> Elections	207
<b>2</b> Political Ideologies	28		
<b>3</b> States	49	<b>PART IV</b> Political Institutions	227
<b>4</b> Constitutions and Rights	68	<b>12</b> Legislatures	228
<b>5</b> Regimes	86	<b>13</b> Executives and Bureaucracies	248
		<b>14</b> Judiciaries	269
<b>PART II</b> Political Attitudes	108	<b>PART V</b> What Political Systems Do	290
<b>6</b> Political Culture	109	<b>15</b> Political Economy	291
<b>7</b> Public Opinion	127	<b>16</b> Violence and Revolution	311
		<b>17</b> International Relations	331
<b>PART III</b> Political Interactions	147		
<b>8</b> Political Communication	148		
<b>9</b> Interest Groups	168		

*This page intentionally left blank*



# Contents

Preface	xi		
<b>PART I The Bases of Politics</b>			
<b>1 Politics and Political Science</b>			
What Is Politics?	1	Institutionalized Power	49
■ <b>CLASSIC WORKS: Concepts and Percepts</b>	2	■ <b>CLASSIC WORKS: Aristotle’s Six Types of Government</b>	50
What Is Political Science?	3	Effective, Weak, and Failed States	52
■ <b>CLASSIC THOUGHT: “Never Get Angry at a Fact”</b>	4	■ <b>THEORIES: Political Development in Three Stages</b>	53
■ <b>METHODS: Learning a Chapter</b>	8	Unitary or Federal Systems	54
Theory in Political Science	9	■ <b>METHODS: Sources</b>	55
■ <b>THEORIES: Models: Simplifying Reality</b>	10	■ <b>CASE STUDIES: The Shaky Lives of Confederations</b>	57
“Political Theory” versus Theory in Political Science	15	Electoral Systems	61
■ <b>CLASSIC WORKS: Not Just Europeans</b>	19	■ <b>CASE STUDIES: French and German Variations</b>	63
Review Questions 26 • Key Terms 26	22	States and the Economy	64
• Further Reference 27	23	Review Questions 66 • Key Terms 67	
		• Further Reference 67	
<b>2 Political Ideologies</b>	28	<b>4 Constitutions and Rights</b>	68
What Is Ideology?	29	Constitutions	70
■ <b>THEORIES: The Origins of Ideologies</b>	30	The Highest Law of the Land	71
Liberalism	31	■ <b>CASE STUDIES: The Dangers of Changing Constitutions</b>	72
Conservatism	33	■ <b>CASE STUDIES: Canada’s New Constitution</b>	74
Socialism	35	Can Constitutions Ensure Rights?	76
Nationalism	39	The Adaptability of the U.S.	77
■ <b>METHODS: Theses</b>	41	Constitution	78
Ideology in Our Day	42	■ <b>THEORIES: What Is a Right?</b>	79
■ <b>CASE STUDIES: Islamism: A New Ideology with Old Roots</b>	45	Freedom of Expression in the United States	83
■ <b>DEMOCRACY: Authoritarian Capitalism</b>	46	■ <b>METHODS: References</b>	84
Is Ideology Finished?	47	Review Questions 84 • Key Terms 84	
Review Questions 47 • Key Terms 48		• Further Reference 84	
• Further Reference 48			

<b>5</b>	<b>Regimes</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>■ CLASSIC WORKS: Almond's Three Publics</b>	<b>133</b>
	Representative Democracy	88	<b>■ DEMOCRACY: Opinion Curves</b>	<b>137</b>
	Democracy in Practice: Elitism or Pluralism?	94	Public-Opinion Polls	137
	Totalitarianism	97	<b>■ METHODS: Variables</b>	<b>141</b>
	<b>■ DEMOCRACY: Dahl's "Influence Terms"</b>	<b>97</b>	American Opinion	141
	<b>■ METHODS: Tight Writing</b>	<b>100</b>	Review Questions 145 • Key Terms 146	
	<b>■ DEMOCRACY: Why Democracies Fail</b>	<b>101</b>	• Further Reference 146	
	Authoritarianism	102	<b>PART III Political Interactions</b>	<b>147</b>
	<b>■ CASE STUDIES: Democracy in Iraq?</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>8 Political Communication</b>	<b>148</b>
	The Democratization of Authoritarian Regimes	104	The Mass Media and Politics	149
	Review Questions 106 • Key Terms 106		<b>■ CLASSIC WORKS: The Two-Step Flow of</b>	
	• Further Reference 107		<b>Mass Communications</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>PART II Political Attitudes</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>■ DEMOCRACY: The Tendency to Media</b>	<b>Oligopoly</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>6 Political Culture</b>	<b>109</b>	Social Media	154	
What Is Political Culture?	110	<b>■ CASE STUDIES: The Media and War</b>	<b>155</b>	
<b>■ CLASSIC WORKS: The Civic Culture</b>	<b>112</b>	The Giant: Television	156	
<b>■ DEMOCRACY: Civil Society</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>■ METHODS: Defining Variables</b>	<b>158</b>	
<b>■ METHODS: Quotations</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>■ THEORIES: The Framing of News</b>	<b>160</b>	
The Decay of Political Culture	115	Are We Poorly Served?	161	
<b>■ CASE STUDIES: America the Religious</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>■ CASE STUDIES: The Media</b>		
Elite and Mass Subcultures	117	<b>and Watergate</b>	<b>163</b>	
<b>■ THEORIES: Culture and Development</b>	<b>118</b>	The Adversaries: Media and		
Minority Subcultures	119	Government	164	
<b>■ CASE STUDIES: Quebec: "Maîtres Chez Nous"</b>	<b>120</b>	Review Questions 166 • Key Terms 166		
<b>■ DEMOCRACY: The Three Israels</b>	<b>122</b>	• Further Reference 166		
Political Socialization	122	<b>9 Interest Groups</b>	<b>168</b>	
<b>■ CLASSIC WORKS: The Authoritarian</b>		The Ubiquity of Interest Groups	169	
<b>Personality</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>■ THEORIES: Countervailing Power</b>	<b>171</b>	
<b>■ CASE STUDIES: China Builds Unity</b>	<b>124</b>	Interest Groups and Government	171	
Review Questions 125 • Key Terms 126		<b>■ CASE STUDIES: French Antipluralism</b>	<b>173</b>	
• Further Reference 126		Effective Interest Groups	174	
<b>7 Public Opinion</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>■ CASE STUDIES: How Powerful Are</b>		
What Public Opinion Is and Isn't	128	<b>U.S. Unions?</b>	<b>177</b>	
<b>■ DEMOCRACY: A Short History of Polling</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>■ METHODS: Tables</b>	<b>178</b>	
The Shape of Public Opinion	131	Interest Group Strategies	179	

■ CLASSIC WORKS: Olson's Theory of Interest Groups	182	<b>PART IV</b> Political Institutions	227
Interest Groups: An Evaluation	183	<b>12</b> Legislatures	228
Review Questions 185 • Key Terms 185		The Origins of Parliaments	229
• Further Reference 186		Presidential and Parliamentary Systems	230
<b>10</b> Parties	187	■ CLASSIC WORKS: Where Did the U.S. System Originate?	232
■ METHODS: Cross-Tabulations	188	Bicameral or Unicameral?	235
Functions of Parties	189	What Legislatures Do	236
■ DEMOCRACY: Parties That Ignore Voters	192	■ METHODS: Longitudinal Studies	237
Parties in Democracies	193	The Decline of Legislatures	240
■ THEORIES: What Is a "Relevant" Party?	195	■ DEMOCRACY: Pork-Barrel Politics	241
■ CLASSIC WORKS: Duverger's Three Types of Parties	196	Review Questions 246 • Key Terms 246	
Classifying Political Parties	197	• Further Reference 247	
■ CLASSIC WORKS: Kirchheimer's "Catchall" Party	199	<b>13</b> Executives and Bureaucracies	248
Party Systems	199	Presidents and Prime Ministers	249
■ DEMOCRACY: Multiparty Systems Are More Fun	200	■ DEMOCRACY: Israel's Directly Elected Prime Ministers	252
■ THEORIES: Sartori's Party Competition	203	■ DEMOCRACY: Putin's Authoritarianism	253
The Future of Parties	204	■ CLASSIC WORKS: Lasswell's Psychology of Power	254
Review Questions 205 • Key Terms 205		Executive Leadership	254
• Further Reference 205		■ DEMOCRACY: An Imperial Presidency?	255
<b>11</b> Elections	207	■ METHODS: Graphs	256
Why Do People Vote?	208	Cabinets	258
Who Votes?	209	■ CLASSIC WORKS: American Paranoia	260
■ THEORIES: Downs's Theory of Voting	209	Bureaucracies	260
■ METHODS: Tendency Statements	211	■ CLASSIC WORKS: Weber's Definition of Bureaucracies	261
Who Votes How?	212	The Trouble with Bureaucracy	265
■ CASE STUDIES: Is the U.S. Electoral System Defective?	217	■ THEORIES: Bureaucratic Politics	266
Electoral Realignment	219	Review Questions 267 • Key Terms 267	
■ DEMOCRACY: Partisan Polarization	220	• Further Reference 268	
What Wins Elections?	221	<b>14</b> Judiciaries	269
■ DEMOCRACY: Changing Positions	224	Types of Law	270
Review Questions 225 • Key Terms 225		■ CLASSIC WORKS: The Roots of Law	272
• Further Reference 226		The Courts, the Bench, and the Bar	273

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CASE STUDIES: Common Law versus Code Law</b></li> </ul>	274	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CASE STUDIES: Revolutionary Political Warfare in Vietnam</b></li> </ul>	320
Comparing Courts	276	Revolutions	321
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CLASSIC WORKS: <i>Marbury v. Madison</i></b></li> </ul>	279	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CASE STUDIES: The Iranian Revolutionary Cycle</b></li> </ul>	323
The Role of the Courts	280	After the Revolution	324
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>METHODS: Scattergrams</b></li> </ul>	281	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CASE STUDIES: Violent versus Velvet Revolutions</b></li> </ul>	326
The Supreme Court's Political Role	283	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Questions 329 • Key Terms 329</li> <li>• Further Reference 329</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Questions 288 • Key Terms 288</li> <li>• Further Reference 288</li> </ul>			
<b>PART V What Political Systems Do</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>17 International Relations</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>15 Political Economy</b>	<b>291</b>	What Is International Relations?	332
What Is Political Economy?	292	Power and National Interest	334
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CASE STUDIES: How High Are U.S. Taxes?</b></li> </ul>	294	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>METHODS: Avoid "They"</b></li> </ul>	334
Government and the Economy	294	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>THEORIES: Types of National Interest</b></li> </ul>	335
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>METHODS: Maps</b></li> </ul>	298	The Importance of Economics	336
What Is Poverty?	302	Why War?	338
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>DEMOCRACY: Poverty and Ideology</b></li> </ul>	303	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CLASSIC WORKS: Kennan's Dinosaur Analogy</b></li> </ul>	340
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CASE STUDIES: Welfare Spending versus Tax Expenditures</b></li> </ul>	305	Keeping Peace	341
The Costs of Welfare	306	Beyond Sovereignty?	343
How Big Should Government Be?	308	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>DEMOCRACY: The Democratic Peace</b></li> </ul>	345
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Questions 309 • Key Terms 310</li> <li>• Further Reference 310</li> </ul>		U.S. Foreign Policy: Involved or Isolated?	345
<b>16 Violence and Revolution</b>	<b>311</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>THEORIES: Klingberg's Alternation Theory</b></li> </ul>	346
System Breakdown	312	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>CLASSIC WORKS: Thucydides on War</b></li> </ul>	348
Types of Violence	314	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Questions 349 • Key Terms 349</li> <li>• Further Reference 349</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>METHODS: Thinkpieces</b></li> </ul>	315	Glossary	351
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>THEORIES: Rising Expectations</b></li> </ul>	318	Index	360
Terrorism	319		

# Preface

## Political Science and Democracy

Some people say political science is impractical. It may be interesting, they add, but it really cannot be used for anything. Not so. Political science began as practical advice to rulers and still serves that function. Plato, Aristotle, Confucius, Machiavelli, Kautilya, and Ibn Khaldun, among others, aimed to give sound advice based on one or another theory. John Locke and the Baron de Montesquieu deeply influenced the framers of the U.S. Constitution. Political science has always entwined theoretical abstractions with applied reasoning. You may not become a political scientist, but you should equip yourself with the knowledge to make calm, rational choices and protect yourself from political manipulation.

One of the great questions of our day, for example, is whether democracy can and should be exported. China, the Middle East, and many other areas could benefit from democratic governance, but is it practical to push democracy on them? One of the original aims of the 2003 Iraq War was to install a democratic regime which would then inspire others in the region. Iraq, totally unready for democracy, turned from a brutal dictatorship into brutal chaos.

Even the United States, after more than two centuries of trying to apply a democratic constitution, is far from perfect. Reforms are badly needed—but blocked at every turn—in taxation, voting fairness, election campaigning, powerful lobbies, economic policy, and the inefficiency and complexity of government programs. By examining such problems, students see that democracy is a constantly self-critical and self-correcting

process moved by open discussion and the admission of mistakes. It is always a work in progress.

Political science instructors may take some joy in the uptick of student interest in politics, although we cannot be sure how deep and durable this interest may be. Budgetary cliffhangers, spending cuts, and tax increases can provoke discussion. For some years, students were rather apolitical, a trend this book always tried to fight. We ask them, “Well, what kind of a country do you want? You’d better start developing your own rational perspectives now because soon you will have to make political choices.”

*Political Science: An Introduction* seeks to blend scholarship and citizenship. It does not presume that freshmen taking an intro course will become professional political scientists. Naturally, we hope to pique their curiosity so that some will major in political science. This is neither a U.S. government text nor a comparative politics text. Instead, it draws examples from the United States and from other lands to introduce the whole field of political science to new students. Fresh from high school, few students know much of other political systems, something we attempt to correct.

The fourteenth edition continues our eclectic approach that avoids selling any single theory, conceptual framework, or paradigm as the key to political science. Attempts to impose a grand design are both unwarranted by the nature of the discipline and not conducive to broadening students’ intellectual horizons. Instructors with a wide variety of viewpoints have no trouble using this text. Above all, the fourteenth edition still views politics as exciting and tries to communicate that feeling to young people new to the discipline.

## New To This Edition

Instructor input, the rapid march of events, and the shift to digitalization brought some changes to the fourteenth edition:

- The old Chapter 2, Theories, has been merged into Chapter 1 to bring the total number of chapters down to seventeen, to better fit a semester.
- Jonathan Williamson of Lycoming College contributes to Chapter 1 with discussions of political theory and how political science contrasts with history and journalism.
- A new box in Chapter 3 explains Francis Fukuyama’s three-step theory of the origins of political order.
- The 2015 *Charlie Hebdo* murders in Paris illustrate the problem of free speech as opposed to hate speech in Chapter 4.
- Recent Hong Kong protests now start Chapter 5, illustrating the struggle for democracy. Also new: Opportunism and corruption undermine Communist regimes.
- A new box in Chapter 6, “The Three Israels,” shows how successive waves of immigrants brought distinctive political cultures to Israel.
- Jonathan Williamson, a pollster himself, updates Chapter 7 on public opinion.
- The rise of the Tea Party and super-PACs raises questions about the relevance of U.S. parties in Chapter 10.
- Nonwhite voters are increasingly important, and realignments may evolve more slowly than previously thought, explains Chapter 11.
- Incomprehensible, overlong legislation is now highlighted in Chapter 12.
- Chapter 13 now includes Fukuyama’s thesis that uncorrupt, merit-based bureaucracies are the basis of good governance.
- Chapter 16 gives more emphasis to the mostly unhappy results of the Arab Spring and to ISIS and Islamic fundamentalism.

- Chapter 17 begins with the dangers of a new Cold War we face with Russia and China.

As ever, I am open to all instructor comments, including those on the number, coverage, and ordering of chapters. Would, for example, a textbook of fourteen chapters—one for each week of a typical semester—be a better organization?

## REVEL™

### Educational Technology Designed for the Way Today’s Students **Read, Think, and Learn**

When students are engaged deeply, they learn more effectively and perform better in their courses. This simple fact inspired the creation of REVEL: an immersive learning experience designed for the way today’s students read, think, and learn. Built in collaboration with educators and students nationwide, REVEL is the newest, fully digital way to deliver respected Pearson content.

REVEL enlivens course content with media interactives and assessments—integrated directly within the authors’ narrative—that provide opportunities for students to read about and practice course material in tandem. This immersive educational technology boosts student engagement, which leads to better understanding of concepts and improved performance throughout the course.

Learn more about REVEL

[www.pearsonhighered.com/REVEL](http://www.pearsonhighered.com/REVEL)

## Features

The fourteenth edition merges old Chapters 1 and 2 (Theories) to give us seventeen chapters. The consolidation of twenty-one chapters into eighteen, more rationally arranged, received very positive instructor feedback in the eleventh and twelfth editions. We retain the introduction of methodologies early in an undergraduate’s

career. This does not mean high-level numbers crunching—which I neither engage in nor advocate—but a reality-testing frame of mind that looks for empirical verifiability. Where you can, of course, use valid numbers. As an instructor, I often found myself explaining methodologies in the classroom in connection with student papers, so I decided to insert some basic methodologies in boxes. Each of these boxes make one methodological point per chapter, covering thesis statements, references, quotations, tables, cross-tabulations, graphs, scattergrams, and other standard points, all at the introductory level. Instructors suggested that topics as important as “Key Concepts” should be integrated into the narrative, and I have done so. Boxes on Democracy, Theories, Classic Works, and Case Studies still highlight important political science ideas, provide real-world examples, and break up pages, making the text reader friendly.

The text boldfaces important terms and defines them in running marginal glossaries throughout the chapters. As an instructor, I learned not to presume students understood the key terms of political science. The definitions are in the context under discussion; change that context, and you may need another definition. There is a difference, for example, between the governing elites discussed in Chapter 5 (a tiny fraction of 1 percent of a population) and public opinion elites discussed in Chapter 7 (probably several percent). Italicized terms signal students to look them up in the glossary at the book’s end.

## Supplements

Pearson is pleased to offer several resources to qualified adopters of *Political Science* and their students that will make teaching and learning from this book even more effective and enjoyable. Several of the supplements for this book are available at the Instructor Resource Center (IRC),

an online hub that allows instructors to quickly download book-specific supplements. Please visit the IRC welcome page at [www.pearsonhighered.com/irc](http://www.pearsonhighered.com/irc) to register for access.

**INSTRUCTOR’S MANUAL/TEST BANK** This resource includes learning objectives, lecture outlines, multiple-choice questions, true/false questions, and essay questions for each chapter. Available exclusively on the Instructor Resource Center, [www.pearsonhighered.com/irc](http://www.pearsonhighered.com/irc).

**PEARSON MYTEST** This powerful assessment generation program includes all of the items in the instructor’s manual/test bank. Questions and tests can be easily created, customized, saved online, and then printed, allowing flexibility to manage assessments anytime and anywhere. To learn more, please visit [www.mypearsonstest.com](http://www.mypearsonstest.com) or contact your Pearson representative.

**POWERPOINT PRESENTATION** Organized around a lecture outline, these multimedia presentations also include photos, figures, and tables from each chapter. Available exclusively on the IRC.

**ATLAS OF WORLD ISSUES (0-205-78020-2)** From population and political systems to energy use and women’s rights, the *Atlas of World Issues* features full-color thematic maps that examine the forces shaping the world. Featuring maps from the latest edition of *The Penguin State of the World Atlas*, this excerpt includes critical-thinking exercises to promote a deeper understanding of how geography affects many global issues. To learn more, please contact your Pearson representative.

**GOODE’S WORLD ATLAS (0-321-65200-2)** First published by Rand McNally in 1923, *Goode’s World Atlas* has set the standard for college reference atlases. It features hundreds of physical, political, and thematic maps as well as graphs, tables, and a pronouncing index. Available at a discount when packaged with *Political Science: An Introduction*.

## Acknowledgments

My special thanks to Jonathan Williamson of Lycoming College, who made many updates to this edition. Several people reviewed this and earlier editions, and I carefully considered their comments. For this edition, I wish to thank Maorong Jiang, Creighton University; Kimberly Turner, College of DuPage; Robert Porter, Ventura County Community College; John Sutherlin, University of Louisiana at Monroe; Ngozi Kamalu, Fayetteville State University; and Aaron Cooley,

Johnston Community College. My thanks to Martha Beyerlein for her careful work throughout the production process.

Are further changes needed in the book, or have I got it about right? Instructors' input on this matter—or indeed on anything else related to the text or supplementary materials—is highly valued. Instructors may contact me directly at [maxxumizer@gmail.com](mailto:maxxumizer@gmail.com).

*Michael G. Roskin*



## Part I

# The Bases of Politics

**Ch. 1 Politics and Political Science** We study politics like a scientist studies bacteria, never getting angry at a fact but trying to understand how and why something happens. Political science focuses on power—how A gets B to do what A wants. We do not confuse our partisan preferences with the scholarly study of politics. Theories provide the framework for understanding the politics we study. Alternatives to the objective, theory-driven approach of political science include the emphasis on the unique taken by historians and journalists and the normative questions of political theorists.

**Ch. 2 Political Ideologies** Ideologies are plans to improve society. The classic liberalism of Adam Smith and classic conservatism of Edmund Burke and the modern versions of the same are still with us. Marx led to both social democracy and, through Lenin, to communism. Nationalism is the strongest ideology, sometimes turning into fascism. New ideologies include neoconservatism, libertarianism, feminism, environmentalism, and, currently a problem, Islamism. We study ideologies; we don't believe them.

**Ch. 3 States** Not all states are effective; many are weak, and some are failed. Aristotle's division of governments into legitimate and corrupt is still useful. Basic institutional choices can make or break a state. The territorial organization of states—unitary versus federal—and electoral systems—single-member versus proportional representation—are such basic choices. State intervention in the economy, or lack of it, may facilitate prosperity or stagnation.

**Ch. 4 Constitutions and Rights** These institutionalized documents formalize the basic structure of the state, limit government's powers, and define civil rights. Judicial review, the great U.S. contribution to governance, has over the years curbed sedition laws and expanded freedom of speech and freedom of press.

**Ch. 5 Regimes** Democracy is complex and must include accountability, competition, and alternation in power. In even the best democracies, elites have great influence but do not always trump pluralistic inputs. Totalitarianism is a disease of the twentieth century and has largely faded, but plenty of authoritarian states still exist. Democracy is not automatic but can fail in unprepared countries like Russia and Iraq.

# Chapter 1

# Politics and Political Science



---

## Learning Objectives

---

- 1.1** Evaluate the several explanations of political power.
- 1.2** Justify the claim that political science may be considered a science.
- 1.3** Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of several theoretical approaches to political science.
- 1.4** Contrast normative theories of politics to political science.

When the Cold War ended, several thinkers held that democracy had won and would encompass the world. Soviet communism had collapsed and Chinese communism had reformed into state-managed capitalism. There were scarcely any other models for governance than Western-style capitalist democracy, argued some neo-conservatives. Even the Middle East, home to some of the worst dictators, would give way to democracy, argued Bush administration neo-cons as the United States invaded Iraq in 2003. The 2011 Arab Spring seemed to show the longing for democracy, aided by the new hand-held social media.

But we were too optimistic. Not everyone craved democracy; many, in fact, either feared it or wanted to use it for misrule. Russian democracy collapsed back into an autocracy that is now hostile to the United States. China's Communist chiefs oversaw dramatic economic growth but proclaimed that they would keep ruling. They jailed dissenters and also turned hostile to the United States. In the Middle East, elections produced undemocratic regimes (exception: Tunisia) and dangerous chaos. What had gone wrong? And what can political science tell us about why democracy did not spread as planned? Were these countries simply not ready for democracy, which seems to require a large, educated middle class and a tolerant, pluralist culture? Long-run, over several decades of economic and educational growth, is a march toward democracy likely to resume?

Questions like these make political science relevant and exciting. As its two-word name implies, political science is both a topic of study and a method for studying its topic. If we are studying politics, we need to start by thinking about what politics is. If we are studying it with science, we need to consider what makes the scientific method distinct from other ways to study politics.

## What Is Politics?

### 1.1 Evaluate the several explanations of political power.

When you think of politics, you probably think of government and elections. Both are clearly political, but politics can happen in many more places. Politics happens in the workplace, in families, and even in the classroom. Consider the kid in class who asks too many questions and keeps the class late. What happens? Either the professor cuts the kid off, or his classmates express their disapproval to shape his behavior to achieve their goals. Either way, the kid's behavior is shaped by the politics of the classroom.

Politics is the ongoing competition between people, usually in groups, to shape policy in their favor. To do so, they may seek to guide policy indirectly by shaping the beliefs and values of members of their society. Notice this definition can encompass the politics of government, but it can also encompass the political dynamics in other contexts. While this text will largely focus on politics of governments, it is important to understand that politics is more fundamental than governments but occurs wherever human competitions play out.

## Political Power

As Renaissance Florentine philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527) emphasized, ultimately politics is about power, specifically the power to shape others' behavior. Power in politics is getting people to do something they wouldn't otherwise do—and sometimes having them think it was their idea.

### political power

Ability of one person to get another to do something.

Some people dislike the concept of **political power**. It smacks of coercion, inequality, and occasionally brutality. Some speakers denounce “power politics,” suggesting governance without power, a happy band of brothers and sisters regulating themselves through love and sharing. Communities formed on such a basis do not last; or, if they do last, it is only by transforming themselves into conventional structures of leaders and followers, buttressed by obedience patterns that look suspiciously like power. Political power seems to be built into the human condition. But why do some people hold political power over others? There is no definitive explanation of political power. Biological, psychological, cultural, rational, and irrational explanations have been put forward.

**BIOLOGICAL** Aristotle said it first and perhaps best: “Man is by nature a political animal.” (Aristotle’s words were *zoon politikon*, which can be translated as either “political animal” or “social animal.” The Greeks lived in city-states in which the polis was the same as society.) Aristotle meant that humans live naturally in herds, like elephants or bison. Biologically, they need each other for sustenance and survival. It is also natural that they array themselves into ranks of leaders and followers, like all herd animals. Taking a cue from Aristotle, modern biological explanations, some of them looking at primate behavior, say that forming a political system and obeying its leaders are innate, passed on with one’s genes. Some thinkers argue that human politics shows the same “dominance hierarchies” that other mammals set up. Politicians tend to be “alpha males”—or think they are.

The advantage of the biological approach is its simplicity, but it raises a number of questions. If we grant that humans are naturally political, how do

## Classic Works

### Concepts and Percepts

The great Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant wrote in the late eighteenth century, “Percepts without concepts are empty, and concepts without percepts are blind.” This notion helped establish modern philosophy and social science. A percept is what you perceive through your sensory organs: facts, images, numbers, examples, and so on. A concept is an idea in

your head: meanings, theories, hypotheses, beliefs, and so on. You can collect many percepts, but without a concept to structure them you have nothing; your percepts are empty of meaning. On the other hand, your concepts are “blind” if they cannot look at reality, which requires percepts. In other words, you need both theory and data.

we explain the instances when political groups fall apart and people disobey authority? Perhaps we should modify the theory: Humans are imperfectly political (or social) animals. Most of the time, people form groups and obey authority but sometimes, under certain circumstances, they do not. This begs the question of which circumstances promote or undermine the formation of political groups.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL** Psychological explanations of politics and obedience are closely allied with biological theories. Both posit needs derived from centuries of evolution in the formation of political groups. Psychologists have refined their views with empirical research. In the famous Milgram study, unwitting subjects were instructed by a professor to administer progressively larger electric shocks to a victim. The “victim,” strapped in a chair, was actually an actor who only pretended to suffer. Most of the subjects were willing to administer potentially lethal doses of electricity simply because the “professor”—an authority figure in a white lab smock—told them to. Most of the subjects disliked hurting the victim but rationalized that they were just following orders and that any harm done to the victim was really the professor’s responsibility. They surrendered their actions to an authority figure.

Psychological studies also show that most people are naturally conformist. Most members of a group see things the group’s way. Psychologist Irving Janis found many foreign policy mistakes were made in a climate of “groupthink,” in which a leadership team tells itself that all is well and that the present policy is working. Groups ignore doubters who tell them, for instance, that the Japanese will attack Pearl Harbor in 1941 or that the 1961 Bay of Pigs landing of Cuban exiles will fail. Obedience to authority and groupthink suggest that humans have deep-seated needs—possibly innate—to fit into groups and their norms. Perhaps this is what makes human society possible, but it also makes possible horrors such as the Nazi Holocaust and more recent massacres.

**CULTURAL** How much of human behavior is learned as opposed to biologically inherited? This is the very old “nurture versus nature” debate. For much of the twentieth century, the cultural theorists—those who believe behavior is learned—dominated. Anthropologists concluded that all differences in behavior were cultural. Cooperative and peaceful societies raise their children that way, they argued. Political communities are formed and held together on the basis of cultural values transmitted by parents, schools, churches, and the mass media. Political science developed an interesting subfield, *political culture*, whose researchers found that a country’s political culture was formed by many long-term factors: religion, child rearing, land tenure, and economic development.

Cultural theorists see trouble when the political system gets out of touch with the cultural system, as when the shah of Iran attempted to modernize an Islamic society that did not like Western values and lifestyles. The Iranians threw the shah out in 1979 and celebrated the return of a medieval-style religious leader, who voiced the values favored by traditional Iranians. Cultural theories can also be applied to U.S. politics. Republicans try to win elections by

**culture**

Human behavior that is learned as opposed to inherited.

articulating the values of religion, family, and self-reliance, which are deeply ingrained into American culture. Many thinkers believe economic and political development depend heavily on **culture**.

The cultural approach to political life holds some optimism. If all human behavior is learned, bad behavior can be unlearned and society improved. Educating young people to be tolerant, cooperative, and just will gradually change a society's culture for the better, according to this view. Changing culture, however, is slow and difficult, as the American occupiers of Iraq and Afghanistan discovered.

Culture contributes a lot to political behavior, but the theory has some difficulties. First, where does culture come from? History? Economics? Religion? Second, if all behavior is cultural, various political systems should be as different from each other as their cultures. But, especially in the realm of politics, we see similar political attitudes and patterns in lands with very different cultures. Politicians everywhere tend to become corrupt, regardless of culture.

**rational**

Based on the ability to reason.

**RATIONAL** Another school of thought approaches politics as a **rational** thing; that is, people know what they want most of the time, and they have good reasons for doing what they do. Classic political theorists, such as Hobbes and Locke, held that humans form "civil society" because their powers of reason tell them that it is much better than anarchy. To safeguard life and property, people form governments. If those governments become abusive, the people have the right to dissolve them and start anew. This Lockean notion greatly influenced the U.S. Founding Fathers.

The biological, psychological, and cultural schools downplay human reason, claiming that people are either born or conditioned to certain behavior and that individuals seldom think rationally. But what about cases in which people break away from group conformity and argue independently? How can we explain a change of mind? "I was for Jones until he came out with his terrible economic policy, so now I'm voting for Smith." People make rational judgments like that all the time. A political system based on the presumption of human reason stands a better chance of governing justly and humanely. If leaders believe that people obey out of biological inheritance or cultural conditioning, they will think they can get away with all manner of deception and misrule. If, on the other hand, rulers fear that people are rational, they will respect the public's ability to discern wrongdoing. Accordingly, even if people are not completely rational, it is probably for the best if rulers think they are.

**irrational**

Based on the power to use fear and myth to cloud reason.

**IRRATIONAL** Late in the nineteenth century, a group of thinkers expounded the view that people are basically **irrational**, especially when it comes to politics. They are emotional, dominated by myths and stereotypes, and politics is really the manipulation of symbols. A crowd is like a wild beast that can be whipped up by charismatic leaders to do their bidding. What people regard as rational is really myth; just keep feeding the people myths to control them. The first practitioner of this school was Mussolini, founder of fascism in Italy, followed by

Hitler in Germany. A soft-spoken Muslim fundamentalist, Osama bin Laden, got an irrational hold on thousands of fanatical followers by feeding them the myth that America was the enemy of Islam.

There may be a good deal of truth to the irrational view of human political behavior, but it has catastrophic consequences. Leaders who use irrationalist techniques start believing their own propaganda and lead their nations to war, economic ruin, or tyranny. Some detect irrationalism even in the most advanced societies, where much of politics consists of screaming crowds and leaders striking heroic poses.

## Power as a Composite

There are elements of truth in all these explanations of political power. At different times in different situations, any one of them can explain power. Tom Paine's pamphlet *Common Sense* rationally explained why America should separate from Britain. The drafters of both the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were imbued with the rationalism of their age. Following the philosophers then popular, they framed their arguments as if human political activity were as logical as Newtonian physics. Historian Henry Steele Commager referred to the Constitution as "the crown jewel of the Enlightenment," the culmination of an age of reason.

But how truly rational were they? By the late eighteenth century, the thirteen American colonies had grown culturally separate from Britain. People thought of themselves as Americans rather than as English colonists. They increasingly read American newspapers and communicated among themselves rather than with Britain. Perhaps the separation was more cultural than rational.

Nor can we forget the psychological and irrational factors. Samuel Adams was a gifted firebrand, Thomas Jefferson a powerful writer, and George Washington a charismatic general. The American break with Britain and the founding of a new order were complex mixtures of all these factors. Such complex mixtures of factors go into any political system you can mention. To be sure, at times one factor seems more important than others, but we cannot exactly determine the weight to give any one factor. And notice how the various factors blend into one another. The biological factors lead to the psychological, which in turn lead to the cultural, the rational, and the irrational, forming a seamless web.

One common mistake about political power is viewing it as a finite, measurable quantity. Power is a connection among people, the ability of one person to get others to do his or her bidding. Political power does not come in jars or megawatts. Revolutionaries in some lands speak of "seizing power," as if power was kept in the national treasury and they could sneak in and grab it at night. The Afghan Taliban "seized power" in 1995–1996, but they were a minority of the Afghan population. Many Afghans hated and fought them. Revolutionaries think they automatically gain **legitimacy** and authority when they "seize power"—they do not. Power is earned, not seized.

### legitimacy

Mass feeling that the government's rule is rightful and should be obeyed.

Is power identical to politics? Some power-mad people (including more than a few politicians) see the two as the same, but this is an oversimplification. We might see politics as a combination of goals or policies plus the power necessary to achieve them. Power, in this view, is a prime *ingredient* of politics. It would be difficult to imagine a political system without political power. Even a religious figure who ruled on the basis of love would be exercising power over followers. It might be “nice power,” but it would still be power. Power, then, is a sort of *enabling device* to carry out or implement policies and decisions. You can have praiseworthy goals, but unless you have the power to implement them, they remain wishful thoughts.

Others see the essence of politics as a *struggle for power*, a sort of gigantic game in which power is the goal. What, for example, are elections all about? The getting of power. There is a danger here, however: If power becomes the goal of politics, devoid of other purposes, it becomes cynical, brutal, and self-destructive. The Hitler regime destroyed itself in the worship of power. Obsessed with retaining presidential power, President Nixon ruined his own administration. As nineteenth-century British historian and philosopher Lord Acton put it, “Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely.”

## What Is Political Science?

### 1.2 Justify the claim that political science may be considered a science.

The study of politics can take many forms. Political science is a method of how to study politics. Political science ain’t politics. It is not necessarily training to become a practicing politician. Political science is training in the calm, objective analysis of politics, which may or may not aid working politicians. Side by side, the two professions compare like this:

#### Politicians

- love power
- seek popularity
- think practically
- hold firm views
- offer single causes
- see short-term payoff
- plan for next election
- respond to groups
- seek name recognition

#### Political Scientists

- are skeptical of power
- seek accuracy
- think abstractly
- reach tentative conclusions
- offer many causes
- see long-term consequences
- plan for next publication
- seek the good of the whole
- seek professional prestige

Many find politics distasteful, and perhaps they are right. Politics may be inherently immoral or, at any rate, amoral. Misuse of power, influence peddling, and outright corruption is prominent in politics. But you need not like the thing



## Classic Thought

### “Never Get Angry at a Fact”

This basic point of all serious study sounds commonsensical but is often ignored, even in college courses. It traces back to the extremely complex thought of the German philosopher Hegel (1770–1831), who argued that things happen not by caprice or accident but for good and sufficient reasons: “Whatever is real is rational.” This means that nothing is completely accidental and that if we apply reason, we will understand why something happens. We study politics in a “naturalistic” mode, not getting angry at what we see but trying to understand how it came to be.

For example, we hear of a politician who took money from a favor-seeker. As political scientists, we push our anger to the side and ask questions like: Do

most politicians in that country take money? Is it an old tradition, and does the culture of this country accept it? Do the people even expect politicians to take money? How big are campaign expenses? Can the politician possibly run for office without taking money? In short, we see if extralegal exchanges of cash are part of the political system. If they are, it makes no sense to get angry at an individual politician. If we dislike it, we may then consider how the system might be reformed to discourage the taking of money on the side. And reforms may not work. Japan reformed its electoral laws in an attempt to stamp out its traditional “money politics,” but little changed. Like bacteria, some things in politics have lives of their own.

you study. Biologists may study a disease-causing bacterium under a microscope. They do not “like” the bacterium but are interested in how it grows, how it does its damage, and how it may be eradicated. Neither do they get angry at the bacterium and smash the glass. Biologists first understand the forces of nature and then work with them to improve humankind’s existence. Political scientists try to do the same with politics. The two professions of politician and political scientist bear approximately the same relation to each other as do bacteria and bacteriologists.

## The Master Science

Aristotle, the founder of the **discipline**, called politics “the master science.” He meant that almost everything happens in a political context, that the decisions of the *polis* (the Greek city-state and root of our words *polite*, *police*, and *politics*) governed most other things. Politics, in the words of Yale’s Harold Lasswell (1902–1978), is the study of “who gets what.” But, some object, the economic system determines who gets what in countries with free markets. True, but should we have a totally free-market system with no government involved? A decision to bail out shaky banks sparks angry controversy over this point. Few love the bankers, but economists say it had to be done to save the economy from collapse. Politics is intimately connected to economics.

Suppose something utterly natural strikes, like a hurricane. It is the political system that decides whether and where to build dikes or deliver federal funds to rebuild in flood-prone seacoast areas. The disaster is natural, but its impact on society is controlled in large part by politics. How about science, our

### **discipline**

A field of study, often represented by an academic department or major.

# Methods

## Learning a Chapter

Read each chapter *before* class. And do not simply read the chapter; learn it by writing down the following:

- A.** Find what strikes you as the *three main points*. Do not outline; construct three complete sentences, each with a subject and predicate. They may be long and complex sentences, but they must be complete declarative sentences. You may find two, four, or six main points, but by the time you split, combine, and discard what may or may not be the main points, you will know the chapter. Look for abstract generalizations; the specifics come under the point C below, examples or case studies. Do not simply copy three sentences from the chapter. Synthesize several sentences, always asking what three sentences distilled from this chapter will most help me on the exam? These might be three main points from Chapter 1:
1. Study politics as a scientist studies nature, trying to understand reality without getting angry at it.
  2. Political science combines many disciplines but focuses on power: who holds it and how they use it.
  3. Politics can be studied objectively, provided claims are supported by empirical evidence and structured by theory.
- B.** List a *dozen vocabulary words*, and be able to define them. These are words new to you or words used in a specialized way. This text makes it easier with the boldfaced terms defined in the margins; for terms not in boldface, read with a dictionary handy.
- C.** Note specific *examples* or *case studies* that illustrate the main points or vocabulary words. Most will contain proper nouns (i.e., capitalized words). Examples are not main points or definitions; rather, they are empirical evidence that support a main point. The examples need not be complete sentences. These might be examples from Chapter 1:
- Aristotle's "master science"
  - AIDS versus breast cancer research
  - West Germany's success story
  - Communist regimes in Eastern Europe
  - Afghanistan's chaos
  - Shah's regime in Iran erodes

bacteriologists squinting through microscopes? That is not political. But who funds the scientists' education and their research institutes? It could be private charity (the donors of which get tax breaks), but the government plays a major role. When the U.S. government decided that AIDS research deserved top priority, funding for other programs was cut. Bacteria and viruses may be natural, but studying them is often quite political. In this case, it pitted gays against women concerned with breast cancer. Who gets what: funding to find a cure for AIDS or for breast cancer? The choice is political.

## Can Politics Be Studied as a Science?

Students new to science often assume it implies a certain subject for study. But science is a way to study nearly any subject. It is the method, not the subject. The original meaning of science, from the French, is simply "knowledge." Later, the natural sciences, which rely on measurement and calculation, took over the term. Now most people think of science as precise and factual,

supported by experiments and data. Some political scientists have attempted to become like natural scientists; they **quantify** data and manipulate them statistically to validate **hypotheses**. The quantifiers make some good contributions, but usually they focus on small questions of detail rather than on large questions of meaning. This is because they generally have to stick to areas that can be quantified: public opinion, election returns, and congressional voting.

But large areas of politics are not quantifiable. How and why do leaders make their decisions? Many decisions are made in secrecy, even in democracies. We do not know exactly how decisions are made in the White House in Washington, the Elysée in Paris, or the Zhongnanhai in Beijing. When members of Congress vote on an issue, can we be certain why they voted that way? Was it constituents' desires, the good of the nation, or the campaign contributions of interest groups? What did the Supreme Court have in mind when it ruled that laying off schoolteachers based on race is unconstitutional but hiring them based on race is not? Try quantifying that. Much of politics—especially dealing with how and why decisions are made—is just too complex and too secret to be quantified. Bismarck, who unified Germany in the nineteenth century, famously compared laws and sausages: It's better not to see how they are made.

Does that mean that politics can never be like a natural science? Political science is an **empirical** discipline that accumulates both quantified and qualitative data. With such data we can find persistent patterns, much like in biology. Gradually, we begin to generalize. When the generalizations become firmer, we call them theories. In a few cases, the theories become so firm that we may call them laws. In this way, the study of politics accumulates knowledge, the original meaning of science.

## The Struggle to See Clearly

Political science also resembles a natural science when its researchers, if they are professional, study things as they are and not as they wish them to be. This is more difficult in the study of politics than in the study of stars and cells. Most political scientists have viewpoints on current issues, and it is easy to let these views contaminate their analyses of politics. Indeed, precisely because a given question interests us enough to study it indicates that we bring a certain passion with us. Can you imagine setting to work on a topic you cared nothing about? If you are interested enough to study a question, you probably start by being inclined to one side. Too much of this, however, renders the study biased; it becomes a partisan outcry rather than a scholarly search for the truth. How can you guard against this? The traditional hallmarks of **scholarship** give some guidance. A scholarly work should be *reasoned*, *balanced*, supported with *evidence*, and a bit *theoretical*.

**REASONED** You must spell out your reasoning, and it should make sense. If your perspective is colored by an underlying assumption, you should say so. You might say, "For the purpose of this study, we assume that bureaucrats are rational," or "This is a study of the psychology of voters in a small town." Your

### quantify

To measure with numbers.

### hypothesis

An initial theory a researcher starts with, to be proved by evidence.

### empirical

Based on observable evidence.

### scholarship

Intellectual arguments supported by reason and evidence.

basic assumptions influence what you study and how you study it, but you can minimize bias by honestly stating your assumptions. German sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920), who contributed vastly to all the social sciences, held that any findings that support the researcher’s political views must be discarded as biased. Few attempt to be that pure, but Weber’s point is well taken: Beware of structuring the study so that it comes out to support a given view.

**BALANCED** You can also minimize bias by acknowledging other ways of looking at your topic. You should mention the various approaches to your topic and what other researchers have found. Instructors are impressed that you know the literature in a given area. They are even more impressed when you can then criticize the previous studies and explain why you think they are incomplete or faulty: “The Jones study of voters found them largely apathetic, but this was an off-year election in which turnout is always lower.” By comparing and criticizing several approaches and studies, you present a much more objective and convincing case. Do not commit yourself to a particular viewpoint or theory, but admit that your view is one among several.

**SUPPORTED WITH EVIDENCE** All scholarly studies require evidence, ranging from the quantified evidence of the natural sciences to the qualitative evidence of the humanities. Political science utilizes both. Ideally, any statement open to interpretation or controversy should be supported with evidence. Common knowledge does not have to be supported; you need not cite the U.S. Constitution to “prove” that presidents serve four-year terms.

But if you say presidents have gained power over the decades, you need evidence. At a minimum, you would cite a scholar who has amassed evidence to demonstrate this point. That is called a “secondary source,” evidence that has passed through the mind of someone else. Most student papers use only secondary sources, but instructors are impressed when you use a “primary source,” the original gathering of data, as in your own tabulation of what counties in your state showed the strongest Obama vote. Anyone reading a study must be able to review its evidence and judge if it is valid. You cannot keep your evidence or sources secret.

**THEORETICAL** Serious scholarship is always connected, at least a little, to a theoretical point. It need not be a sweeping new theory (that’s for geniuses), but it should advance the discipline’s knowledge a bit. At a minimum, it should confirm or refute an existing theory. Just describing something is not a theory, which is why Google or Wikipedia are seldom enough. You must relate the description to some factor or factors, supported, of course, with empirical evidence. The general pattern of this is: “Most of the time there is C there is also D, and here’s probably why.” Theory building also helps lift your study above polemics, an argument for or against something. Denouncing the Islamic State, which we all may do with gusto, is not scholarship. Determining why people join IS (studied by several scholars) would have important theoretical and practical impacts.

## What Good Is Political Science?

Some students come to political science supposing it is just opinions; they write exams or papers that ignore all or some of the preceding points. Yes, we all have political views, but if we let them dominate our study we get invalid results, junk political science. Professional political scientists push their personal views well to one side while engaged in study and research. First-rate thinkers are able to come up with results that actually refute their previously held opinion. When that happens, we have real intellectual growth, an exciting experience that should be your aim.

Something else comes with such an experience: You start to conclude that you should not have been so partisan in the first place. You may back away from the strong views you held earlier. Accordingly, political science is not necessarily training to become a practicing politician. Political science is training in objective and often complex analysis, whereas the practice of politics requires fixed, popular, and simplified opinions.

Political science can contribute to good government, often by warning those in office that all is not well, “speaking Truth to Power,” as the Quakers say. Sometimes this advice is useful to working politicians. Public-opinion polls, for example, showed an erosion of trust in government in the United States starting in the mid-1960s. The causes were Vietnam, Watergate, and inflation. Candidates for political office, knowing public opinion, could tailor their campaigns and policies to try to counteract this decline. Ronald Reagan, with his sunny disposition and upbeat views, utilized the discontent to win two presidential terms.

Some political scientists warned for years of the weak basis of the shah’s regime in Iran. Unfortunately, such warnings were unheeded. Washington’s policy was to support the shah, and only two months before the end of his rule did the U.S. embassy in Tehran start reporting how unstable Iran had become. State Department officials had let politics contaminate their political analyses; they could not see clearly. Journalists were not much better; few covered Iran until violence broke out. Years in advance, American political scientists specializing in Iran saw trouble coming. More recently, political scientists warned that Iraq was unready for democracy and that a U.S. invasion would unleash chaos, but Washington deciders paid no attention. Political science can be useful.

## The Subfields of Political Science

Most political science departments divide the discipline into several subfields. The bigger the department, the more subfields it likely has. We will get at least a brief introduction to all of them in this text.

*U.S. Politics* focuses on institutions and processes, mostly at the federal level but some at state and local levels. It includes parties, elections, public opinion, and executive and legislative behavior.

*Comparative Politics* examines politics within other nations, trying to establish generalizations about institutions and political culture and theories of

democracy, stability, and policy. It may be focused on various regions, as in “Latin American politics” or “East Asian politics.”

*International Relations* studies politics among nations, including conflict, diplomacy, international law and organizations, and international political economy. The study of U.S. foreign policy has one foot in U.S. politics and one in international relations.

*Political Theory*, both classic and modern, attempts to define the good polity, often focused on major thinkers.

*Public Administration* studies how bureaucracies work and how they can be improved.

*Constitutional Law* studies the applications and evolution of the Constitution within the legal system.

*Public Policy* studies the interface of politics and economics with an eye to developing effective programs.

## Comparing Political Science to History and Journalism

Understanding how others study politics shows what makes political science distinct. History and journalism have different goals from political science, but they share common features. History studies the past, and not all history focuses on politics. Journalism covers the present, and only some news stories are on politics. What they share, however is a focus on unique events. When a historian studies the French Revolution, she wants to tell the story of the people, the places, and the events to better understand what happened and put forward a thesis about why it happened. She is not interested in comparing the French to the American Revolution, as those are distinct, unique events that deserve separate study.

Similarly, a journalist reporting on a war will describe the events as they unfold. He interviews people affected by the conflict and chronicles a battle to explain why it was a turning point.

Political science approaches these tasks differently. Instead of focusing on one revolution, a political scientist might compare several revolutions to discover what links them together. What factors cause revolutions? Why do they sometimes succeed and sometimes fail? What are the consequences of revolution?

Similarly, a political scientist would not necessarily be interested in writing about today’s battle or interviewing a war refugee. Instead, political scientists might be interested in what causes wars generally or why some small conflicts result in major wars and others do not. Under what circumstances do civil conflicts lead to genocide? What forms of aid are most successful when faced with large numbers of refugees?

Where historians or journalists often seek to explain the unique circumstances of a particular event, political scientists seek to **generalize**. What are

### generalize

Explaining the causes of consequences of a whole class of events.