

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Southern Political Science Association

Political Man. by Robert E. Lane

Review by: Herbert Hirsch

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Aug., 1973), pp. 761-764

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2129161>

Accessed: 04/02/2014 13:32

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>

Both recognize the need to register, organize, and motivate voters to go to the polls as the primary reason for collecting money. Neither mentions the inadequacy of civic training in what passes for public education as an important factor. Emphasis upon vocational training instead of civic education helped to produce the disastrously low turnout in 1972. There is no mention of the compulsory vote as a possible solution. There are suggestions of subsidies but a rather slight treatment of the taxpayer check-off that Congress has now adopted and which is on the 1972 income tax return. The idea was suggested 20 years ago in the American Political Science Association's subcommittee's study, later published in the reviewer's book, *Money in Politics* (1959).

The Alexander volume completely supplants his mentor Alexander Heard's *Costs of Democracy*. Not only is there additional research but the style is so clear and simple that it could well serve as a model for expository writing in the discipline. Perhaps it will start a trend for the rediscovery of the English language in political science.

Though the legislation of 1972 summarized by both Alexander and Adamany is an improvement over previous efforts at public control, there are no final answers. Both writers are dependent upon what interviewers tell them and official reports subject to a considerable margin of error. There is still the need for a public investigation by a select committee similar to a Royal Commission in Great Britain. Evidence gathered by subpoena and subject to cross-examination by skilled lawyers is still to be preferred to "empirical" data given in personal interviews—even to perceptive social scientists.

JASPER B. SHANNON, *Western Kentucky University*

Political Man. By ROBERT E. LANE. (New York: The Free Press, 1972. Pp. vii, 328. \$10.95.)

Once upon a time, many years ago when the world and discipline were young and innocent (around 1953), a young knight set forth from the Kingdom of Yale to secure success and dispel ignorance.

Ah, success was to be achieved, but ignorance continued to triumph. For the path to "truth" was strewn with many obstacles, and the young knight Lane was confronted by four temptations.

As many knights before him, he confronted the temptations of: publication, time and relevance, pretension, and cliché. Unlike Gawain in his quest for the grail, the young knight Lane was to succumb to all four temptations.

At first he seemed to be winning his battles, but alas, in the year 1972 he was finally to yield. First to confront our hero was the temptation of publication. *Political Man* is not in any sense a book. It is a collection of the work of Robert Lane begun in 1953, the date on which the earliest selection, transformed into chapter 2, was first published, and presumably culminating in the publication of *Political Man*. Not integrated theoretically or conceptually, the present book is repetitious for the professional student of politics, and for the average nonprofessional student of little or no interest. All but five of the fifteen chapters have been published previously, and the five "new" selections illustrate how our young knight yielded to the second temptation—time.

The young knight is reluctant to give up his horse for the automobile. The material in the five previously "unpublished" selections relies on outdated source material, data gathered for the most part in 1957 and 1958. For example, in Part III, "Core Belief Systems," our hero ignores a great deal of recent material on the subject of beliefs and attitudes, and relies instead upon material published when, we suspect, the previously unpublished selections were originally written. Thus, Rokeach's work is cited, but the knight goes into battle with the *Open and Closed Mind*, published in 1960, and neglects to pick up Rokeach's recent important theoretical work, *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values*, 1970.

The ravages of time have also worked their will upon our knight. In Chapter 12, "The Politics of Consensus in an Age of Affluence," first published in the *American Political Science Review* in 1965, the young knight characterizes the "age of affluence" as ". . . a period when men's economic security and income have increased and when, for the first time in history, it appears likely that the business cycle can now be controlled" (p. 217). Reading this, one might believe that the last several years of rampant inflation, balance of payment and trade deficits, devaluation of the

dollar, Phases 1, 2 and 3, had not occurred. Moreover, after years of ethnic political activity “. . . perhaps one could judge that the rebellious spirit of the black power advocates and the slogan ‘black is beautiful’ provide long-delayed and much-needed cues for restoring self-esteem to this oppressed group” (p. 192). Indeed, “it is a portent of the times (or at least of the discipline of political science) when the deaf lead the blind.”

Alas, the young knight was not over his period of trial. For on the heels of his temptation by time would come his temptation by the obvious. The selections in this book come dangerously close to clichés. Lane asserts that important political questions can be answered. How? For the knight “the lesson is clear, indeed obvious—but often neglected: it is in a combination of circumstances and attitudes, environment and political personality, that the answers to the important political questions will be found” (p. 9). Indeed! The debate over nature vs. nurture has found its way into the daily papers as far from the Kingdom of Yale as Austin, Texas. But our hero is not content to issue instructions as to how to answer the great political questions of the times. No, he—brave knight he is—forays into uncharted territory and comments upon “The Study of Literature as Political Education.” Thus, “A third distinction, too obvious to mention except for the tendency to speak of the ‘aesthetic experience’ as a homogeneous concept, is the difference between reading Dickens and T. S. Eliot, Homer and Faulkner. *The nature of the work makes a difference*” (p. 144; Italics mine). Finally, why study literature? Well, the answer is again obvious. “I would say too, that the study of literature tends to give a person what I shall call *depth*” (Italics in original, p. 148).

If this were not sufficient, one final temptation bared its breasts—pretension. The preface to *Political Man* outdoes the title in pretense.

“I am the doubter and the doubt.” I am the observer and the observed. I am the actor and his critic. I murder to dissect, and I am the *corpus delicti* (“I am the slayer and the slain”). The proper study of mankind is man: I am the student and his studies. I am man.

And so the journey of our knight ends in the triumph of the four temptations. Success has been achieved, but ignorance reigns,

and the reader of this nonbook is left feeling much like Yeats felt after witnessing a performance of Shaw's *Arms and the Man*:

Presently I had a nightmare that I was haunted by a sewing-machine, that clicked and shone, but the incredible thing was that the machine smiled, smiled perpetually.

HERBERT HIRSCH, *University of Texas at Austin*

The Convention Problem: Issues in Reform of Presidential Nominating Procedures. By JUDITH PARRIS. (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1972. Pp. xi, 194. \$5.95 cloth, \$2.95 paper.)

With the publication of this book Judith Parris moves into the front ranks of those who study presidential electoral politics. Her previous effort, co-authored with Wallace Sayre, *Voting for President: The Electoral College and the American Political System*, is a concise review of the major debates over electoral college reform. In the present work, Ms. Parris strikes out on her own.

Judith Parris examines the great problems in presidential nominating conventions: apportionment of delegates; how people get to their parties' national conclaves; the management of conventions; platform drafting; and the role of those who report what goes on. She reviews existing literature and adds her own research. The methodology is mixed—mainly analytical and descriptive—so that the intelligent laymen as well as students profit from the final product.

Ms. Parris' singular contribution lies in her unashamed willingness to engage in value judgments. Despite my unqualified admiration for her willingness to tell it like she thinks it ought to be, it is precisely at this point that I have the most difficulty with what Ms. Parris has written. She is just plain wrong in so many of her judgments that it would take a fair-sized volume to refute her conclusions. Although we have never met, I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to debate with her before any of my American politics classes. It should be fun. Perhaps both of