

SUMMARIES

The Study of Politics as Science and as Politics — Science and Politics as Studies of Politics

By Kari Palonen

»All human activities are politics, one way or another» (Galtung), even science. But also the contrary relation holds: all politics contains some kind of analysis of the society where the political action itself is performed. One of the main theses of this paper is that *politics and science are no separate fields of activity but competitors — both as science and as politics.*

The academic »political science» ought to have a position between science and politics, critical towards both. Its »objective interest» is to make all science conscious of its political aspect and all politics conscious of its study aspect.

For such a criticism theoretically and historically relevant dichotomies in the concepts of »politics» and of »study» are needed. A *positive* view limits the study to the analysis of the realized (past or present) reality, while a *critical* view also studies the possibilities (past, present and future) and criticizes the realized reality in their light. A *technical* conception of politics sees this as an activity to better one's own position in the power structure, but in a *structural* conception the essence of politics is the change or maintenance of the power structure itself. By combining these dichotomies we get the following simple typology.

POLITICS	STUDY	
	positive	critical
technical	CONSERVATIVE	REFORMISTIC (true or opportunistic)
structural	ACTIVISTIC (revolutionary or counter-revolutionary)	RADICAL

A corresponding typology can also be made of the research politics process itself on the basis of the strength and direction (positive-negative) of the dependence between social units. These typologies can then — abstracting in an admittedly questionable way from the historical peculiarities of the situation — be combined as follows:

- | | |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| conservative | — division or labour |
| reformistic | — autonomy |
| activistic | — domination |
| radical | — criticism (including resistance) |

These theoretical perspectives are applied to the analysis of the contemporary Finnish science policy. The main result is that the dominance of conservative views and division of labour structures (both within academic institutions and between them) seems to be maintained by a clever »divide et impera» policy. The establishment has managed to direct the reformist-autonomy program and the activist-domination program against each other and not against their common enemy, the establishment itself. For an overthrow of established theories and structures, both in science and in other kinds of politics, a radical-criticistic program is needed, but it has some historical and theoretical difficulties before itself.

The academic political science in Finland has hardly criticized politics because of its uncritical analyses of society but still less it has criticized the uncritical, undemocratic and specialized academic science in general. At the end of the paper some concrete proposals are put forward in order to make the academic political science a radical and critical force in the university and in the society at large.

The Realisation of the Principles of the New International Economic Order

by Esko Antola

The Declaration of the principles of the New International Economic Order (GA, 3201, S-VI and GA, 3202, S-VI) as well as the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (GA, 3281, XXIX) are important landmarks in a long process aiming at the restructuring of the international economic system. They must be regarded not as UN resolutions as such but they reflect in an important way the changes in the balance of forces internationally. Most of the principles adopted in the resolutions defined above have been repeated in several international instances during the last few years. It is the overall development in the international arena which gives the realism to the execution of the principles. The role and the impact of the principles of the New International Economic Order in international relations is in principle close to those of the Final Act of the European Security Conference.

The declarations of the NIEO also reflect the basic concept of development in the UN. In short, the concept of development in the above documents may be characterized by distribution, growth and cooperation. The three elements are the cornerstones of the NIEO as a development model. In the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States the rights and duties may be grouped into five main categories which also are the categories of the realisation of the principles. The categories are:

- 1) *General means of development policy*, including the complete abolishment of colonialism, racism and all the effects linked to them as well as the realisation of the principle of global responsibility, the strengthening of peaceful relations between the states as well as the strengthening of the equal sovereignty of all states.

- 2) *The means of the restructuring of the world trade* including the abolishment of trade barriers, commodity agreements, the stabilisation of the export-

earings of developing countries and the adoption of the principle of non-discrimination in the North-South trade.

3) *The means of the coordination of the international investments.* The category includes such elements as the development of a comprehensive legal system of the control of international investments, both nationally and internationally, the control of the operations of the transnational corporations and the strengthening of the position of producer alliances.

4) *The menas of international cooperation* stress first of all the positive elements of regional and subregional cooperation which may be extended to cover larger geographical areas as well. Also the role of development cooperation is included.

5) *The means of mobilisation, science and technology* are based on the assumption that the duty to mobilize all the available resources is given to every single country. In order to fulfill this duty scientific and technological aspects have a special relevance.

Politics and Law: Some Comments on Problems, Approaches and Essentials in Judicial Political Science

by D a g A n c k a r

The aim of the article is to give a review and some comments on contemporary judicial research from a political science point of view. A short outline of the development of judicial research is followed by a discussion of different approaches to the study of judicial behavior, and the widely accepted view concerning attitudinal causation is called in question. Two types of shortcomings in the literature on judicial decision-making are pointed out: (1) the tendency to construct the independent variables from the dependent ones, meaning that one uses behavioral data (voting opinions) to construct categories which are to explain behavior; and (2) the operationalization of the dependent variable in terms of voting data, meaning that one generalizes from nonunanimous decisions to unanimous decisions. As the vast majority of judicial decisions are unanimously agreed upon by judges, this method is highly questionable and biased in favour of attitudinal causation.

As an alternative mode of explanation, the concept of judicial role is brought into the discussion. The author draws quite heavily on arguments which have been put forward by Theodore Becker, and he concurs in the notion that interviews and surveys of role definers form a way towards creating independent measures of the judicial role as an independent or intervening variable when explaining behavior. However, the validity of such data is open for much criticism, and a research design implying independent measures of general political attitudes, judicial role positions, and judicial behavior is suggested.

Such a design could at least to a certain degree come to terms with the validity problem, as it would be possible to study the constraining link between attitudes and role behavior.

When turning to the question of how to determine the relevance of the judicial sector for political science, the author operates within an eastonian framework. In one sense all judicial decisions are by definition political: they allocate authoritatively values for a society. However, there are significant differences regarding the possibilities of courts to alter the effects of politics. Political scientists in Scandinavia have in fact paid very little attention to problems belonging to the judicial area. Apparently, this should be taken as an expression of the belief that studies of the judiciary have very little relevance for political science. Such a belief seems well-founded as far as the nordic countries are concerned, as the possibilities for the judiciary to alter or undermine policy outputs of other political institutions presumably are very limited. Of course, this does not hold true for every political system. An examination of items registered under some leading judicial key words in the International Political Science Abstracts 1970—73 shows that countries like USA, West-Germany, and India have been in the focus of judicial research, and this is apparently due to the fact that the judicial structure of these countries is characterized by judicial review, meaning the power of courts to determine the constitutionality and, hence, enforceability of laws and actions based upon these laws.

The author concludes his article with a brief section on the judicial process, where five subprocesses are extracted and discussed from a systems analytical point of view. Special attention is given to the societal impact of judicial decisions, and the difficulties involved in studies of this impact are illustrated by a short review of Robert Dahl's famous article on The Supreme Court's role in american policy-making and of the debate following Dahl's article. One main argument is that Dahl's winners-and-losers approach overlooks important ways in which the court can contribute to policy-making.