

## SUMMARY

### Comparative Political Research by Jan-Magnus Jansson

The author defines political science as the realistic and systematic study of politics. While the word 'realistic' marks off the subject matter of political science — the actual political life — from that of jurisprudence — the legal norms that regulate the life of a society — the labeling of political science as a systematic science delimits it from history. Both historians and political scientists largely deal with the same stuff: but while the historical approach is a chronological and individualizing one, the approach of political science is systematic and generalizing. Political science does not arrange its material according to a chronological principle: instead, it classifies political phenomena with respect to their similarity or dissimilarity. While political scientists often have to treat individual cases, they always strive to relate them to general laws of political behaviour. The avowed purpose of classical political philosophy, which was the building of an all-embracing theory of politics, has not been abandoned by modern political scientists. The difference is, however, that present political science makes less bold assumptions than its classical forerunners, and that strict empirical proofs are required before a proposition can be regarded as an accepted part of a scientific theory of politics.

It is within this context that *comparative* political research has its place. 'Comparative politics' is often regarded as a separate branch of political science, along with the study of political ideas, political parties, etc. In fact, it is not a 'branch' of political science: it is rather a *stage* in the research process which bridges the gap between the individual observations and the establishment of general laws. The necessity of a careful comparison between political phenomena stemming from different political systems or from different historical periods is a consequence of the 'culture-bound' character of all social phenomena. Each single phenomenon must be regarded as part of a wider political system to which it belongs and its function within that system must be determined before a comparison can take place. Thus, the function of political parties varies considerably with the general character of the political system. The establishment of a 'law' on the basis of some few observations made in societies having a determined type of political system — for instance, Western democracy — evidently suffers from a lack of an adequate inductive foundation. They may have to be corrected when a sufficient number of observations has been collected from other types of political systems and subjected to a thoroughgoing comparative investigation.

Comparative political research can take many different forms, of which three seem to have a particular importance. The most usual form of comparison takes place between different political systems; this type may be called 'intersystematic' comparison. Generally, intersystematic comparison concentrates on the national level, *i.e.*, its object is to compare different states among themselves; but it is also conceivable that its purpose is the comparison of, say, international organizations. A second type of comparison deals with different stages in the development of the same political phenomenon, for instance the changes which have taken place in the position of the American president during subsequent presidencies. Lastly, we can compare two classes of political phenomena which differ either structurally or functionally but which have enough in common to offer themselves to a fruitful comparison. An example would be the respective roles and functions of parties and pressure groups in a society.

Finally, the author gives a sketch of how comparative research dealing with national political systems has developed during this century. He starts from the works of James Bryce and Max Weber and points out how the tradition inaugurated by Bryce's *Modern Democracies* has influenced the general framework of comparative politics at least up to the Second World War. In the last years, however, the horizons of this type of research have widened considerably, partly as a consequence of the co-existence of two power blocs with different régimes but above all because of the intensified interest in non-European political systems, shown by the appearance of works like *The Politics of the Developing Areas*, by Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman, or *The Political Systems of Empires*, by S. N. Eisenstadt. In the future, many cherished concepts and ideas of the present political science may have to be abandoned as being based exclusively on observations made in the countries belonging to the Western world. Instead, we shall, for the first time, have an opportunity to build up a world-embracing political science, which is founded on a comparative view of the political experiences of the whole mankind.

#### African Socialism by Svante Kuhlberg

If socialism, in the shape it appears during this decade, is considered from an ideological point of view, it may be stated to be characterized by two tendencies. One is a reflection of a kind of breakdown of the once so monolithic, Soviet-directed »Socialist world system«, which has differentiated into a number of special 'sorts' of socialism. The other is characterized by the coming into existence of a system of in the doctrinal respect rather heterogeneous system of socialist states in three, politically »new«, continents. From the standpoint of ideological analysis, the 'black' continent is the most interesting. In that continent complete confusion of concepts prevails. At the present time no political term may be more widespread in the »Third World« than »socialism«. In short, all political groups and parties begin and end their programmes with this term. If one asks for a clear definition as to what is »African« and what is »classically socialist« in the notion of »African Socialism«, the answer usually reads that African socialism rests on the traditional African communalism, and that Marxism has been applied to it in so far as it fits in with African circumstances. Precisely which Marxist dogmas have been embraced and which ones have been rejected in this doctrine remains rather obscure. It appears less important to make Africa Marxist than to »Africanize« Marxism. Nor does the traditional communalism, which people in Africa are so ready to refer to, rest on any socialist basis in the true sense of the word.

To form a more concrete idea of the African brand of socialism, one must compare it with European socialism, its genesis and its doctrinal content.

Both European and African socialism came into existence as a protest and indignation movement directed against oppressive capitalism, which in Africa manifested itself in the form of colonialism and imperialism. Historically, however, European socialism is associated with modern industrial society, whereas the African states continue to be underdeveloped agrarian countries. It may be stated, further, that African socialism did not come into being as a result of any class struggle. Like European socialism, African socialism advocates economic planning.

Fundamentally, the African socialists are only seeking an efficient formula for the technique of development; they are less interested in ideology. Moreover, the strong religious tradition of Africa amounts to a serious obstacle to its transition to 'true' socialism.

#### **On Regional Differences in Voting Behaviour within the Suburban Zone of Helsinki** by Harri Holkeri

The internal differentiation typical of big cities is also discernible in Helsinki. The statistics on elections also show that regions differing from one another with respect to political behaviour are distinguishable within the city area. In this article regional differences in voting behaviour in the suburban areas which belong administratively to the Municipality of Helsinki are discussed, chiefly in the light of the parliamentary elections of the 1950s, and observations of these differences and their correspondence with certain social variables are subjected to study.

Two behaviour patterns are discernible: a predominantly bourgeois and a predominantly left-wing orientation of the population of the region. It is also discovered that the supporters of the right-wing party and the Communists are distributed less evenly between various regions than are those of the other parties. In the bourgeois regions the Communist party is extremely weak. In the left-wing regions, in turn, the vote of the right-wing party is small. It is obvious that the coming into existence and persistence of various political behaviour regions depend upon differences in the economic and social circumstances discernible between the regions. A bourgeois behaviour pattern is predominant in the regions characterized by a relatively large proportion of the highest social strata among the population, whereas a left-wing pattern is frequently encountered in regions where the lowest social strata are strongly represented.

The behaviour patterns possess a permanent character in the regions where the social characteristics of the population have remained unchanged to the highest degree.

---