

Prospects of integration and development of political science in Poland

by Kazimierz OPALEK

Professeur de l'Université de Cracovie,
Président de Comité des Sciences Politiques de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences
Président de l'Association Polonaise des Sciences Politiques.



We often read about one or another social science — even in the sense of entire broad spheres and not just specialized divisions — being « a young science » i.e., a science which lays claim to equal rank with or approximating exact science. There is to be noted, on the other hand, the archaic beginnings of social thought in the different spheres as is indicated by the random reading of textbooks of history, philosophy, social doctrine, economics, politics, law or in the history of science. A social science may then be « young » or « old » depending on the point of view, and in particular on how rigorous are the criteria of scientology accepted.

If the criterion of the clear isolation and distinction of the field of problems is considered adequate, then such disciplines as psychology and sociology — stabilized in the second half of the 19 century — and even political economy, the actual beginning of which is associated with the conceptions of the Physiocrats and Adam Smith of the second half of the 18 century (1), may be considered young.

If we require further that science be equipped with a systematized stock of its own theses and procedures (methods and research techniques), approaches to them and their verification as well as elaborate theoretical frameworks, then the ages of such disciplines as history and study of law are shifted forward. For history, although distinguished long ago as a separate field, showed almost to the end of the 18 century the traits of uncritical chronicling, didactic moralizing combined with the lack of perception of the dynamics of historic processes and their peculiarities

(1) See in this connection the general exposition of J.D. BERNAL'S *Science in History*, London, 1957, ch. XII, Social Science in Historical Development (causes of backwardness as compared to the exact sciences, the process of individualization and attaining maturity).

in various conditions of time and space. The study of law too, constituting for many centuries a separate field of learning, remained for long a craft strictly connected with the practice of the processes of law-making and application of law (2).

All the above considered sciences would be regarded as having remained in the age of childhood if assessed from the viewpoint of the model of empirical science. Such a viewpoint is more widespread than would appear on the surface. Significant here is the terminology which attributes the name « science » only to exact disciplines or which limits the sphere of the history of science to only the history of the latter (3). We have in mind here, among other things, discussions in Poland in which extremist theses were often formulated regarding the unscientific and speculative nature, of the traditional social disciplines, as not fulfilling the requirements of this model. And about the social sciences one often speak mainly in a programmatic sense of constructing empirical disciplines in separation from the prevailing tradition and in the closest possible tie to the model of exact science (4).

It is difficult to enter into a broad discussion with the above view in the available space here. We can only limit ourselves to the statement that the specific nature of the subject of social research is lost here and the results obtained by the rigorous application of only the standardized methods and techniques of empirical science are impoverished. The adherents of that viewpoint do not pay proper attention to the perspectives opened up by the application of the Marxist method of investigating social phenomena — conducted on a macro-social scale with a historico-functional approach — and their results hitherto obtained. Concrete empirical research may and should be profitably included in this approach, but that does not mean that the opinion poll, the interview,

(2) As for historical science, see, for instance, A. MALEWSKI, J. TOPOLSKI, *Studia z metodologii historii (Studies in the Methodology of History)*, Warszawa, 1960 ; for jurisprudence - K. OPALEK, *Problemy metodologiczne nauki prawa (Methodological Problems of Legal Science)*, Warszawa, 1962, ch. I.

(3) S. OSSOWSKI, *O osobliwosciach nauk społecznych (On the Particular Features of Social Science)*, Warszawa, 1962, ch. V, *Wzory nauk przyrodniczych w empirycznej socjologii (Patterns of Natural Science in Empirical Sociology)*. On the widely discussed concept and scope of the history of Science see K. OPALEK, *Badania nad historia nauki. Ich charakter, zakres, organizacja (Research on the History of Science. Its Character, Scope, Organization)* in *Studia i Materiały z Dziejów Nauki Polskiej (Studies and Materials From the History of Polish Science)*, vol. I, Warszawa, 1953.

(4) See the discussion on the question of jurisprudence by A. PODGORECKI, *Socjologia prawa (The Sociology of Law)*, Warszawa, 1962, particularly p. 207 ; J. WROBLEWSKI, *O naukowosci prawoznawstwa (On the Scientific Nature of Jurisprudence)*, « *Panstwo i Prawo* », no 8-9, 1965 ; S. ZAWADZKI, *Kierunki i metody badan nad radami narodowymi (Directions and Method of Research on the Peoples' Councils)* in *Problemy Rad Narowych*, nr 1, 1964, and others.

the content analysis, etc. are in themselves able to resolve complex and subtle problems of social science.

Strict and directionless empiricism arouses a deep feeling of inadequacy today. Theoretical reflection is regaining its proper place and the Marxist theory of social development plays a key role as a component deciding the scientific nature of social science (5).

The situation of the problems of politology has on the whole been similar to that of the subject matter of other social sciences. Politology and the latter were at one time linked in philosophy originally called « general », then in social or « moral » *scientia generalis*. It was closely fused with the technic or art of government. It was conceived in an ahistorical manner in the abstract principles (norms) of « good government » which, independent of time and place, may be invariably only one in contrast to « manifold anarchy ». It was finally attempted to turn politology into an empirical social science. With all that, the situation of the problems in question shaped-up differently in one very important respect. Politology even nowadays is a separate discipline only in a postulated, aspired sense. Furthermore, faith that that goal will ever be reached is not general. The other above mentioned social disciplines grew out of the level of *scientia generalis*, gained independence, established their spheres, worked out their own methods, systems of theses and theoretical foundations. Politology also left that level but not as a self-determined entity but as a number of components which entered the ranks of all their social sciences acquiring distinctness. It is thus enmeshed in the subjectmatter proper also to political economy, history, study of law, sociology and psychology — to mention only the more important disciplines. We therefore do not deal with a separate politology but rather with a political (or politological) « coefficient » of the mentioned sciences.

The question of course arises why it is so. The answer may be that politics is « everywhere and anywhere », that it is many-aspected. But that does not much. It would be more accurate to say that political phenomena are the concern for history when it deals with political events and political views; of political economy when the problems of state intervention in economic life or its direct economic and social activity is involved; or legal science when it examines the formal structure of the state power and its international relations; of sociology where, among

(5) On the importance of theoretical reflection see S. OSSOWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 208 ; F. STUJNICKI, *Przeptyw świadomości o normach prawa (The Flow of Awareness of Legal Norms)*, C. KRAKOW, 1965, p. 14. A new analysis of Marxist methodology is undertaken by L. NOWAK in *U podstaw marksistowskiej metodologii nauk (At the Foundation of the Marxist Methodology of Science)*, Warszawa, 1971.

others, the problems of political organization and movements, of decision-making and political behaviour are treated. The latter in addition constitute an area directly on the borderline of psychology and social psychology investigating motivational processes and attitudes which determine the behaviour in question. This incomplete list may be extended by the « political coefficients » of other disciplines ; the diversity of the problems under discussion dictates the application of varied methods in their research, methods appropriate to the sciences incorporating these problems. The investigation of political phenomena finds itself in an exceptional situation in this respect. There is a reason why politology appears in Poland and many other countries currently under the pretty ambiguous title « political sciences » and rather only programmatically (or in relation to the future) as a separate « science of politics » (6).

The name « political sciences » may point to the class conditioning and function of the above mentioned social disciplines hold in common. But in that sense it does not bring us any closer to the specific set of problems of politology. It may pertain to the branches of the above characterized disciplines which are more « politological », projecting their proper development and separation. It may finally link these disciplines, or actually their corresponding divisions, under one name accentuating their prevailing connections and need of integration, which is in great measure a matter of the future.

Hence while the separation of other social sciences consisted in their obtaining autonomy, the separation of the subjectmatter of politology consisted in the distribution of its parts among the former sciences. But the relation of that subjectmatter to each of the above mentioned disciplines has its distinct peculiarities.

In the case of history the question immediately arises of the time limits of the subject of its interest. A history of events, institutions and doctrines traditionally centres on past phenomena and is little « politological ». It acquires the « politological coefficient » only when it emphasizes recent history. Political economy in its classical liberal version is free, or almost free, of politologic elements. It incorporates them only in the protectionist or state interventionist versions and primarily when its tasks becomes the analysis and theoretical generalization of phenomena associated with the state's economic and social activity on the broadest scale. This pertains first of all to the socialist political economy and to a degree also to the economy

(6) H. GROSZYK, *Francuska koncepcja nauki politycznej (The French Conception of Political Science)*, Warszawa, 1968, ch. III.

of contemporary capitalism in the conditions of the state's « broad sphere of activity » (7).

The problems associated with politology were in the sphere of study of law approached by the nature of things in a very onesided manner — from the viewpoint of the law in books, especially in the period of the dominance of so-called formal-dogmatic methods. Only of recent years has there been greater emphasis on the functioning of institutions in practice as confronted with their legal regulations. Previously there had been no departure from the orthodox presentation of the legally regulated forms of political activity, limited to « the juristic theory of State ». The conservative etatist point of view as understood in the study of law of the period of absolutism persisted to a great degree also under the 19 century conditions of the shaping of bourgeois liberal democracy. This met with a strong reaction from the arising new science, sociology, which counterposed society to the state. Focussed on the investigation of society, sociology underlines the significance of informal phenomena and processes (8). Thus the problems of the social manifestation of political activity and individual political behaviour, ignored thusfar, are now being treated, not without the participation of psychology. The share of the latter discipline in the investigation of political phenomena has however been very small so far (9).

The above review indicates not only a division of labour on many varied politological problems in the above mentioned branches of social science but also the existence of gaps in research or inadequacies in the manner of approach. The gaps in recent history only lately developed are not yet filled in. Nor is research much advanced in the field of economic and social policy and much less deepened theoretically. The juristic theory of State, although much improved, is not adequate. Political sociology has thusfar not overcome its aversion to research on formalized institutions. There is a clear gap in one of the key spheres, namely, research on international relations which cannot be substituted by international law and which cannot be comprised by sociology alone. We are confronted here with a set of problems which is complex and multi-aspected in itself — related to recent history, political economy, study of law, sociology and is also connected with geography and other disciplines. A separate science of international relations is emerging, but is not yet sufficiently

(7) In relation to this last problem see S. ZAWADZKI, *Panstwo dobrobytu. Doktryna i praktyka (The Welfare State. Doctrine and Practice)*, Warszawa, 1964.

(8) S.M. LIPSET, *Political Sociology in Sociology Today, Problems and Prospects*, 2nd edit., New York, 1960, p. 82.

(9) R.E. LANE, *Political Science and Psychology in Psychology: a Study of a Science*, Study II, vol. 6, New York, 1963, p. 583.

advanced (10). Finally, « political psychology » is still rather a project than a fact.

Hence the conclusion that in assessing the benefits of a manysided examination of differentiated political phenomena by the several social science we must also perceive the minuses of the existing state of affairs. Firstly, politology is subordinated to the points of view and trends of interest of the sciences in question, is often treated marginally, not as idiopathic but as constituting only an element of other. « main » considerations ; secondly, there exist « no-man's lands » not covered in the prevailing division of labour; thirdly, research works of several social sciences associable with politology are not only not linked together, coordinated, (which besides the gap does not exclude the possibility of repeating work on closely related themes), but as conducted with the application of various research methods and techniques are faced with the danger of obtaining non-comparable results. This provides little chance of the fuller development of politology regarded as an integral whole and in particular of working out the theory of political phenomena and processes, such theory being of exceptional importance in this field (11).

Great importance is attached everywhere in the world (under both social systems, although for contrary principles and aims) to problems of politology as not reducible to the marginal threads of the existing social disciplines but with its specific subjectmatter and in that connection having the right of independent being among these disciplines. This is a cognitively fascinating subject which requires a deeper approach than the simple day to day relation of political events, publicistic reflection or speculation. This of course does not mean to underestimate the great social role of political journalism and publicistic work. It is simply a matter of another line of inquiry into political phenomena, the line of theoretical study of the basic driving forces, mechanisms and rules governing political processes. This cognition is clearly and directly subordinated to practival tasks not only in the field of education and broadly conceived ideological influence, but also in the sphere of creating scientific foundations for improving political institutions and perfecting the processes of political decision-making. It should be noted that while politology is

(10) It is a matter of theoretical advance. A representative review of the problems in this field is to be found in the collective work *Współczesne stosunki międzynarodowe (Contemporary International Relations)*, Warszawa, 1968.

(11) The importance of a theory of political phenomena and processes was stressed at the Conference on the Methodology of Political Science, Warsaw, november 1971. See the report of K. OPALEK, *Charakterystyka nauk politycznych. Ich stan i perspektywy ich rozwoju w Polsce (Characteristics of the Political Sciences. Their State and Prospects of Development in Poland)* and the discussion on this report in *Studia Nauk Politycznych*, no II, 1972.

doing much in the first sphere also in Poland (12), it does not meet needs and expectations in the second. This is also the case there where it has been practiced for a long time (like the USA, or France) (13).

The above considered difficulties make themselves felt in the diagnosis of the significance and distinctness of the subject in question. Hence the endless discussion on the subjectmatter, scope and method of politology, its monistic incorporation into one science of politics or its pluralistic life within a number of political sciences — its integrative strategy and tactics, etc. (14). As often happens in such cases, two polar tendencies confront each other here between which there is a continuum of intermediate positions. There is on the one hand the tendency to « decree » a new science insofar as its scope and internal division is concerned and, on the other hand, the tendency to « register » the status quo, which may gradually evolve by centering greater interest on the politologic aspects of the existing social sciences. « Decreeing », particularly in the fields considered, is never successful in the face of hard facts which cannot be changed at the stroke of a pen (15). On the other hand, passivity before facts also leads to nothing. The matter requires a different approach.

As things stand at present there is a lack of a clearly defined centre of attraction or bases for carrying out integrative activity externally. This is particularly painful for politology which in each case aims to integrate various threads of problems and research efforts. The situation is different with each really separate existing discipline. Sociology, for instance, exerts an integrative pull on psychology, cultural anthropology, etc. The study of law too makes approaches, though not too successfully, to sociology, logic and semantics. It is the same with history, political economy, etc. But politology does not exist as a separate science in a sense analogous to those others. We are aware of the negative consequences of using that term in the present paper, since a name always suggests the separate existence of the subject designated by it. In this case because of inadequate means of expression the term « politology » is used to define only a certain loosely conceived field of interest.

(12) See the reports of J. STEPERSKI, A. LOPATKA, R. BIERZANEK, J. SKRZYPEK at the conference of November 1971. *Zycie Szkoły Wyzszej*, n° 5, 1971.

(13) J. MEYNAUD, *Methodological Uncertainties in Political Science*, Inquiry, II, 2, 1959.

14. H. GROSZCZYK, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

(15) In relation to « decreeing » the development of science see E. GELLNER, *The Alchemist of Sociology*, Inquiry, II, 2, 1959, p. 132.

For politology so understood there is the clear need to create one centre or point of concentration and unification of efforts directed in these paths as well as to strengthen them. As long as a science of politics is at best a matter of the future, it seems necessary to base ourselves on some existing discipline, the most « political » of all considered above. Tradition favours the study of law, especially some of its divisions (theory of State, constitutional law, administrative law as well as international law). As a leading science it should certainly be open to other problems and approaches subject to integration with it, but its partners show a lack of confidence in the study of law in this respect because of many proofs of its one-sided viewpoint. Nor should it be forgotten that politology has to no small degree been proclaimed a science which in its investigation of the facts of political life constitutes a reaction to a look at politics (as limited to the State) through the prism of legal regulations (16). More predisposed to investigate political life, and not only legal regulations, than the study of law is modern and dynamic sociology which already has its division of political sociology. But here too there is a certain one-sidedness in the choice of problems. Besides, there has appeared a cult (thusfar weakly counteracted) of empirical factography and difficulties in association with the approaches of historians, economists and jurists. The question of sociology as a leading science in relation to politology although it has its strong sides, remains controversial and, what is most important, there is no sign that such an orientation is becoming the dominant one.

Nor is any of the remaining social sciences being taken into serious consideration in this respect. History, and all the more so recent history, is too factographic for that. It moreover often lacks adequate perspectives for broader conclusions regarding phenomena and processes in statu nascendi. Nor are institutional aspects, so important for politology, developed broadly and deeply by applying the approaches proper to history. The history of doctrines, as everyone agrees, represents too limited a thread in order to pull the whole of politology after it. Political economy (including economic and social policy) continues on a side track-as is further explained below. Political psychology is in general undeveloped and its benefits are rather observable in close connection with sociological research (17). The question of a guiding centre for politology thus remains open.

(16) H. GROSZCZYK, *op. cit.*, ch. V.

(17) Involved here is the broader problem of the close link between psychological and sociological research on social phenomena. See on this question, for instance, A. MALEWSKI, *O zastosowaniach teorii zachowania (On the Applicability of Behavioural Theory)*, Warszawa, 1964, particularly part I.

Behind everything that is involved here stand concrete people : researchers and lecturers. The study of law, sociology, history, political economy, psychology are not some kind of abstractions which may be manipulated in some manner in order to obtain the best solutions. These terms should be subordinated to the activity of given people and their results. It is not surprising then in light of the above that politologists in such strict sense, as the representatives of the above social disciplines, do not exist. Those come closest to the ideal politologist whose considerations stand on fairly general level, who are not hampered too much by scientific rigours and whose reflections are on the borderline of speculation and higher level publicistics. But the most frequent are specialists in other disciplines with a politologic inclination. The degree of the inclination varies. The minimum is represented by the fulfillment of a didactic services on the level of elementary lectures to the generality of students in higher educational establishments.

The next degree is the selection by representatives of the given branches of social science of some line of research with clear politological aspects. In this case there is a high degree of involvement. For it consists of independent work which often goes far beyond the classical problems of one's own discipline in the direction of integrating its stock of knowledge with the theses and methods of other, tangential fields of science, in the direction of deepening the links between different threads. It must be stressed with acknowledgment that the predominant part of Polish attainments in the field of politology was accomplished in this manner.

On the whole, however, involvement in politology or the direct formation of research politologists is still confronted with great difficulties. First of all, resistance is to be met here against full transition to these new fields, constituting a kind of leap in the dark. There is a widespread view that it is better to hold on to a long established discipline than to take the risk of participating in undertakings with unknown destinies. The former already enjoy a certain prestige — while the prestige of new field has first to be built — and often without the best past experience with like intentions. Secondly, even those whose research work and deepened teaching activity attest a shift to the camp of politology, whether they want to or not stamp the essence of their work not with the « spirit of the politologist », but with that of the jurist, historian, sociologist or economist. In the activity undertaken individually — and such as a rule is the nature of these people's work — it is difficult to avoid one-sidedness and the lack of a broader perspective, which can only come from coordinated activity on the basis of a general plan. Thirdly, the very question of becoming a specialist in the field of politology does not appear to be simple, at least as matters stand today. As stated above,

it is here a question not so much of a determined discipline as of a field of interest with fairly open borderlines.

The specialized politologic studies of a higher level, such as the recently introduced in Poland postgraduate studies, are undoubtedly an important step toward linking the students to a greater extent with this field of interest than it was the case with the older generation of, shall we say, « amateur » scientists in this field. But this is only a certain level in the emergence of the new discipline. For it must be borne in mind that this personnel obtained their master's degrees in other fields of science and already represent highly crystalized silhouettes of jurists, economists, historians, etc. This has its good side (bringing various points of view into politology), but also weak sides in the form of gravitation toward themes which bear the clear stamp of the mentioned disciplines and are perforce recognized as belonging to politology. Another important consideration is that the young personnel is trained by scholars of the older generation among whom the weight of their own specialty is felt most strongly. Furthermore, the curriculum embraces no few subjects not specific to politology. For since politology as such has thusfar not managed to adequately establish its independence, there is a slight chance of its internal division into appropriate component disciplines from which a clearly delineated research programme may be created. As it seems, then, a politology in the full sense of the term could in this way be created only by means of successive approximations. Hence the definite need to apply other means.

All the above considerations clearly suggest that if political science (in the singular) is the desired goal, which however does not promise rapid realization, then the basic question with political sciences (in the plural) today is integrative procedures. There is a difference in the character of integration in the established above mentioned sciences and in that of the political sciences. In the former it is a matter of enriching the scientific content on the basis of the attainments of related disciplines. Integration here is therefore a means to an end which is, to put it briefly, extension of the subjectmatter of the given discipline beyond the traditional, and in consequence modernization of its approaches. Whereas integration in politology is of a basic character : its chief premise is the creation of an independent discipline from varied politologic threads. Integration means here the process of constructing a discipline of various component parts united organically, not mechanically.

When the base for integration is not in this case a clearly defined discipline, then this base must consist in the activities of groups of representatives of various disciplines. In that kind of integration procedures of an organizational and institutional nature are much more important

than in any other case, for they create a working platform for the cooperation of scientists in various field united for the realization of certain aims. Among such aims are : universal academic teaching of a lower level, specialized teaching (i.e. by delivering monographic lectures) and joint scientific research. The first is clearly inadequate for integration, but has a certain preliminary importance in creating a certain atmosphere and initiating contact between representatives of different disciplines. The second is a very important step, for it impells on the one hand lecturers to independent effort in behalf of politology while broadening their perspectives and, on the other hand, leads to the formation of a new corps more politologized than their predecessors and teachers. There is at the same time a kind of natural transition from teaching activity to scientific work.

It is well that great emphasis was laid in shaping the programme of development of politology in the spheres of teaching and scientific research since 1964 in Poland on organizational and institutional matters. However, many countries are ahead of Poland in this sector. Politology has been treated for too long only as a didactic service. More basic institutions, from the viewpoint of the development of that discipline, arose on a large scale considerably later and the question of scientific research in the field occupies the centre of interest only since 1971 (18). We are thus at the beginning of true integration; there is rather a programme than reached achievement.

Three aspects may be distinguished in integration : 1° the unification of research in a given field by creating higher theoretical foundations for them (general ones and those pertaining to branch problems as for instance, internal political organization and international relations, political organizations of socialist and capitalist societies, etc.) as well as by rendering precise the conceptual apparatus and appropriate research techniques and methods ; 2° coordination of politologic research conducted explicite under the heading of politology or *de facto* related to it ; 3° conducting inter-disciplinary research linking various trends and approaches (19).

Theoretical investigation, although always important for integration, are of exceptional significance for the selfdetermination of the field of politology by means of the closest possible establishment of its subject and scope. This is to be done by identifying the specific features of

(18) See note 11 above.

(19) Regarding these aspects of general integration see K. OPALEK, *Problemy « wewnętrznego » i « zewnętrznego » integracji nauk prawnych (« Internal » and « External » Problems of Integration of the Legal Sciences)*, « *Krakowskie Studia Prawnicze* », I, 1-2, 1968, pp. 7-11.

political phenomena and processes as well as of the rules governing them which constitute a particular instance of the general rules of social development. Historical materialism creates a suitable foundation for successfully accomplishing this task. This does not mean that success will come automatically, without the effort of many-sided research and detailed analysis. The unification of research methods and techniques is a further important goal in conditions where varied unadjusted approaches are involved. It would furthermore be desirable for politology to work out specific methods determined by its subject. As for the conceptual apparatus, there has been clear chaos in the field — misunderstandings caused by the clash of varied terminologies : legal, sociological, economic, etc. (20).

The coordination of research is also a burning question. Scholars engaged marginally or in an amateurish way on subjects related to politology should be drawn into joint and organized efforts. The results of their work are not trifling, they actually represented politology in Poland at a time when it did not exist in an official, institutional form. There are scientific institutions partly or even wholly devoted to fields akin to politology, but which do not correlate their activity. Of the new political science centres, some are of a more teaching profile and others lean more toward scientific research.

Of special importance to the process of integration of the political sciences is the programming and conduct of team research in which scientists of various specialties would participate. Its significance has been pointed out for some time and it has been realized as a necessity in some fields — empirical sociological works for instance. But it on the whole still meets with much resistance in the humanities and social sciences where tendencies to individualistic research come to the fore — at times, it must be admitted, with justification. For not all problems lend themselves to team research. Thus, for example, theoretical reflection in the field of political science will also be advanced by individual work. But beyond this sphere, team work is — without exaggeration — a question of the life of political science. Such research will contribute most to moulding and maturing politology personnel who in concrete practice harmonize their points of view and approaches. The historian, jurist, sociologist, economist — each makes his important contribution here to the cooperative shaping of a new quality of synthesized approach to politology. Moreover, team research is most suitable for the multiaspected character of politological problems which at each step involve the inter-

(20) This is noted, among others, by J. MEYNAUD, *op. cit.*, and in *Introduction à la science politique*, Paris, 1959.

weaving of historical, legal, economic, etc. threads (whether it is a matter of internal or international affairs) with their central phenomena and processes of execution of power which constitute the specific subjectmatter of politology.

A basic elaboration of a theory of political phenomena and processes cannot be expected overnight, but will rather be the result of long-lasting effort. Realistically approached, it may be said that wise plans from above do not settle everything at once. But they may in given cases push matter considerably forward and hasten the process of maturing of political science. It is furthermore known that far — reaching mechanical plans — patterned after the exact sciences, particularly technical ones — applied in the humanities and social sciences do not always stand the test and in some cases exceed possibilities and needs. It may be so elsewhere, but such energetic and conscious action does not seem to be indispensable in political science because of all its above indicated particular features. For involved here is the specific question of creating a discipline the need of which is generally acknowledged. It is a discipline which represents living content, arouses many-sided interests and requires intervention assuring its rapid development.

In a period when science and technology have become a powerful instrument of social change, the shaping of social and political relations must also acquire its scientific outposts so that social and political activity may be equal to the over more complex and difficult tasks of the epoch. Much more is expected in this situation from political science than only teaching in politics, the registration of events and not too deep judgements on the « current situation ». It should indicate concrete ways of improving political institutions, deepen the processes of political decisionmaking, elucidate the mechanisms and manners of political influence, serve to scientifically deepen the socialist political ideology. Political science ought to devote itself on a broad scale to the subject of *homo politicus* under the conditions of the socialist system. The subjectmatter should be conceived in the categories of state-citizen relations and from the point of view of developing the public activity and expanding the citizens' political participation.

