

## SUMMARIES

---

### **The Roots of the Finnish Political Science: Rafael Karsten as a Political Anthropologist**

by Ilmari Susiluoto

Political science as it is now known, as predominantly empirical, quantitative research based on the postulates of logical empirism was hardly known in Finland before the Second World War. The division of labour between different academic disciplines had not yet taken its present segmented form.

This situation has implications for the study of the history of science. Ideas of political importance may be found not only from the academic representatives of political science, staatslehre as it was called, but from historians, philosophers, and as is the case with Rafael Karsten, from anthropology.

Rafael Karsten became famous as a pioneering student of South-American indian cultures. As an anthropologist he was interested in studying cultures in their totality and consequently was in favour of scientific monographs where a given culture was rigorously studied as a whole: the areas focussed upon ranged from material production to religion, from habits and rituals to the way arrow-poisons were made. As an evolutionist he was interested in the birth, development of and subsequent decline of the culture and/or its prominent traits.

The aim of the article is to point out that there exists in the voluminous anthropological studies of Rafael Karsten a dimension of politics and consequently organizational forms of the culture were also thoroughly analyzed.

From the perspective of political science Karsten's most important book is without a doubt a monograph about Inca culture, originally published in Swedish in 1938, in Finnish in 1946, in English and German in 1949 and in French in 1952. The English name of Karsten's original *Inkariket och dess kultur i det forna Peru* characterizes this political message of the book. Karsten changed the Swedish original and named the English version *A Totalitarian State of the Past. The Civilization of the Inca Empire in Ancient Peru*.

In addition to the term totalitarian he also uses terms »socialist» and even »communist» to describe the social conditions of the Inca state. But it should be noted that Karsten did not attempt — because of his methodological premisses — to use these terms in any theoretical way. They were mere descriptions about a unique phenomenon that cannot be analyzed with traditional concepts of European political thought.

*A Totalitarian State of the Past* is a study that can be termed a political science classic. But to understand this we must »translate» its ideas from the

terms of descriptive evolutionary anthropology into terms of theoretically oriented analysis.

This can be done in the following way. The ideas of Karsten must be ordered in a somewhat different manner that appear in his work. Karsten's main interest was evolutionism and culture as a whole and in his descriptions one may have difficulty in reconciling the elements of evolution with those of structure. By changing the order of his ideas we may find that his notions are of importance for the present day discussion of primitive societies.

In the article this restructuring of Karsten's ideas is carried out in terms of the following categories: material production, social classes, and the state.

The results thus achieved are then compared with the Marxist discussion about the Asiatic mode of production on the one hand and Max Weber's ideas of religion and politics on the other.

The theoretical interpretation of Karsten's work proves that early Finnish social anthropology has gathered rich empirical material which may be used in the present day theoretical discussion in a fruitful way. It may be further said that anthropology as such has many implications for contemporary political science. »Primitive» societies in Asia, Latin-America and Africa are being politically integrated into modern states and political organizations. New forms of socialism which are created in the developing countries must not be analyzed on the basis of Western liberal democratic biases, and cannot be understood by traditional Marxist concepts. Data that anthropologists like Karsten have gathered seem to give us — if theoretically re-evaluated — a more solid basis for argumentation. That is why *A Totalitarian State of the Past* is valuable even today.

### **Some Theoretical and Methodological Problems in Research on Imperialism**

by Jyrki Käkönen

One of the most characteristic features in the field of studies on international politics has been — at least during the 1970s — the absence of major paradigms. Partly because of this, plenty of theories have been developed, either new ones or sophisticated versions of the old theories. Too often these theories have been similar to the old theories and they are meant to explain the same kind of events in the international system. And in addition there are also theories for one event only and this kind of situation is not logical.

The situation described above can be labeled as anarchistic in the field of science. There should be possibilities of studying international politics as a totality. But after the traditional and behavioral paradigms, no new paradigms have been developed. One possibility of trying to solve the problem is to develop the marxist theory of imperialism towards a paradigm. And a good reason to start from Lenin's theory of imperialism is that this theory reproduces the objective world as a totality.

But it is not at all any easy task to develop Lenin's theory of imperialism towards a paradigm. From the point of historical materialism, the main problem is the relation between theory and object. It is certain that Lenin's theory

of imperialism cannot as such reflect correctly the present international system. This does not mean that Lenin's theory is wrong. But it means that if the object and the essence of the object have changed, the theory must change, too. From this point of view it is also important to find out what is general and what is specific in Lenin's theory of imperialism.

To develop the theory correctly requires that the method used by Lenin is known. Lenin has not left any method as such but he has left his *Note Book on Imperialism* and his study *Imperialism the Last Stage of Capitalism*. On the basis of the two works and on that of the general dialectic method, it is possible to reproduce the method Lenin used in his analysis of imperialism.

In all marxist analysis the most important thing is the basic category. In Lenin's analysis of imperialism the monopoly held this position. It was a result of the historic development of capitalism and it was also a materialistic category. That is why it was for Lenin a natural category from which to start the analysis of imperialism as a new phase of capitalism. From this category he could go further towards explaining other categories of imperialism, like export of capital, the political and economic divisions of the world and other phenomena of imperialism.

In the present analysis of imperialism, one of the main problems is that of the base category of imperialism. It seems natural that transnational corporation has this position but modern imperialism does not develop any longer only on the basis of its internal laws; there is also the socialist world system and it is an external force in the development of imperialism. So it is possible that there must be two base categories and not only one. And this is not the only problem that must be solved before it is possible to develop a paradigm of imperialism. But the task is not impossible.

Briefly the different tasks are:

1. We must analyse the method used by Lenin in his study of imperialism.
2. We must analyse the theoretical and methodological aspects of other theories of imperialism.
3. We must study the historical development of the phenomenon of imperialism and the logical development of the theory of imperialism.
4. We must study modern imperialism as a totality and also its specific aspects, statemonopolistic capitalism and neocolonialism.
5. We must study the role of the socialist states in the international system.
6. We must study different forms of the anti-imperialist struggle and the effects of this struggle both on the phenomenon of imperialism and the development of the theory of imperialism.

### **The ambiguous reality. Some notes on voter rationality**

by Dag Anckar

The aim of the article is to discuss some aspects of voter rationality, a problem which remains unsolved despite the fact that large amounts of research have been done on electoral behavior as well as rationality in politics.

The two research areas have not been integrated in a fruitful manner, partly due to the fact that voter research mostly has been conducted at a very concrete and empirical level. As a consequence, there have been considerable difficulties in bringing the many findings in line with the abstract and formal theories of rational behavior.

After a brief discussion concerning the concept of rationality and possible criteria of a rational voter, the author turns to an examination of empirical results. He finds two incompatible patterns of interpretation. An unifying conception in the earlier voting studies, e.g. *The People's Choice, Voting, The Voter Decides* and *The American Voter*, was that the average voter is irrational, a conclusion based on an image of the voter as a politically uninterested, uninformed, passive and ignorant individual, whose electoral choices best could be explained through the concept of party identification. However, later re-examinations of these results, conducted by V. O. Key, Harry Daudt, and others, have demonstrated that the original conception indeed can be called in question. Findings which are thought to support the earlier doctrine can be re-interpreted in the opposite direction — for instance, following group norms in voting can be seen as a way to reduce information costs and voting in a traditional manner can be seen as a consistent following of a rational choice, which has proven valid. In a different phrasing: it need not be the case that one holds certain attitudes because they are maintained by one's party, it is equally possible that one votes for a party because it maintains certain views that correspond to one's own views. — By and large, the rationality problem in voting remains unclear and calls for further and deeper empirical research.

The author concludes his article with a short methodological paragraph, where he gives a presentation of Martin Fishbein's so-called ab-model (stating that a person's attitude toward an object is a function of his beliefs about the object and his evaluations of the content of those beliefs), quotes a calculation table given by H. T. Reynolds, and comments on some empirical studies which have been performed with this research design. The question how to construct a valid attitude index when studying voting in a multiparty system is briefly touched upon, as well as the question if there are different degrees of voter rationality in different kinds of elections.