



## Southern Political Science Association

---

Congressmen in Committees. by Richard F. Fenno,

Review by: Lawrence C. Dodd

*The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (May, 1974), pp. 495-497

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of the [Southern Political Science Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2129483>

Accessed: 04/02/2014 13:35

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Southern Political Science Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ruling. The results tend to confirm earlier findings that formal compliance is commonplace, the police resentful (although not as much so as their official spokesmen and unofficial champions claim), police routine substantially unchanged, and the broad policy objectives of *Miranda* unfulfilled.

The author concludes that *Miranda*, though possessing significant educational and symbolic value, may have been, in terms of tangible effects upon interrogation practices, "an act of judicial futility." In the final chapter, summarizing the major themes of the study, Professor Stephens raises doubts about the efficacy of Supreme Court pronouncements in effecting reforms of police practices, particularly where the judicial remedy for violation of constitutional rights is the exclusionary rule. This latter suggestion might have been more fully explored. Application of the exclusionary rule to confessions obtained by physical force or unconscionable pressure may be perceived as a fitting remedy, exacting not too high a price even as some of the guilty escape conviction. But can the same be said for application of that rule to enforce *Miranda*? Is the remedy appropriate to redress the constitutional wrongs, both deliberate and inadvertent, which *Miranda* seeks to suppress? Or does it exact, for those wrongs, a price so high that the rights themselves may be discredited?

CLYDE E. JACOBS, *University of California, Davis*

*Congressmen in Committees.* By RICHARD F. FENNO, JR. (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1973. Pp. xvii, 302. \$4.95 paper.)

*Congressmen in Committees* represents the culmination of 15 years of research into the committee system of the House of Representatives by Richard Fenno and his associates. The thesis of the book is that the decisions made by House committees are a natural and predictable outgrowth of the goals and environmental constraints characterizing a committee's membership. Committee members' goals and committees' environmental constraints together determine the strategic premises (decision rules) followed by a committee; these premises in turn determine the nature of decisions made by the committees. Since congressmen enter different committees for different reasons, and since different committees face very different

external expectations, committees within the House differ in the nature of the decisions that they make.

Over-all, the book is an impressive documentation of the utility of Fenno's thesis in understanding six House committees: Appropriations, Education and Labor, Foreign Affairs, Interior, Post Office, and Ways and Means. As with *The Power of the Purse*, Fenno systematically compares these six House committees with their Senate counterparts, illustrating House-Senate differences, particularly the greater general permeability of the Senate committee system. Drawing on extensive interviews with members of the committees, committee staffs, executive officers, and House leaders, Fenno provides rich illustration of his major points. While no attempt is made to indicate the extent to which individual quotes reflect the over-all perception of a given committee, assertions as to committee characteristics such as partisanship or ideological predisposition are supported by tables indicating the relative behavior of each committee's members on replicable indices such as roll-call votes.

The primary problem with this book is that Fenno's analysis is much too extensive and intricate for the modest volume within which it is placed. His analysis could easily have sustained a more elaborate presentation. What the book really needs is (1) a more detailed presentation of the conceptual framework, justifying the approach and discussing in greater detail the departure from the conceptual schema used in *The Power of the Purse* (particularly the omission of integration as a key concept); (2) a more extensive conclusion that structures and simplifies the book's comparative arguments, providing a summary overview of committee-member goals, environmental constraints, and so forth; (3) a broader placement of these six committees (and their Senate counterparts) in the context of each house's committee system (it would be desirable, for example, to see the partisanship scores for all House committees so that we can have some indication of the representative nature of the six committees); (4) consideration of the applicability of the framework in other historical or systemic contexts. These suggestions would certainly have lengthened the book considerably, but when an author has as much to say as Richard Fenno, he should say it all. Perhaps some extended essays on these topics could fill the gaps left by the book.

As to the study, *Congressmen in Committees* is definitely a landmark work presenting generalizations relating across committees within one house, between houses, and over time. It presents a

provocative framework for comparative committee analysis, linking oft-trivialized phenomena like member goals to a web of decision-making that orders and simplifies our perceptions of congressional committees. The book is especially useful since it does provide analysis in depth of each committee, leaving the reader with a feeling of genuine understanding.

In academic parlance, Fenno has taken us one step short of a theory of committee decision-making. He has laid bare key motivations that drive committee members; he has identified critical environmental constraints that interact with congressional motivations to determine decision processes; he illustrates the interaction of these two factors in determining committee behavior. What is now needed is a rigorous statement of the logical relationship between these variables and independent tests of the predictions implicit in Fenno's analysis.

LAWRENCE C. DODD, *University of Texas, Austin*

*The European Administrative Elite.* By JOHN A. ARMSTRONG.  
(Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973. Pp. xii,  
406. \$20.00 cloth, \$9.75 paper.)

Elite theory in political science, despite an apparent recent resurgence, remains controversial as an approach to understanding politics. Regrettably, much of the criticism directed at elite studies is well founded. For example, many elite studies suffer from the tendency to use, in effect, a snapshot at a single point in time as the basis for analysis. Longitudinal analysis has been relatively rare; genuinely comparative research across diverse systems and political cultures is still exceptional.

In this book, Professor John Armstrong presents a major study in comparative administration which avoids many of the pitfalls of other elite analyses. The product is a work of impressive scholarship and a significant contribution to the literature of elite studies and administrative history.

Concerned with the evolution of the administrative elite role, Armstrong carefully examines role perceptions of high administrators themselves and other elites' perceptions of that role. The study deals longitudinally with long periods of the history of administra-