

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Southern Political Science Association

Contemporary French Political Thought. by Roy Pierce

Review by: Roger Shattuck

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Feb., 1968), pp. 243-245

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2128336>

Accessed: 04/02/2014 13:20

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>

of the PCF at home, the book is a report of the French Communist Party *in* the crisis of international communism. The book that Fejtó promised remains to be written.

MARK KESSELMAN

Columbia University

Contemporary French Political Thought. By ROY PIERCE. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966. Pp. x, 276. \$5.75.)

Before beginning this book, I looked up several items in the index: De Gaulle, Mendès-France, French Indochina, constitution, and political clubs (e.g., le Club Jean Moulin). As a humanist concerned with contemporary France, I hoped to learn more about these subjects from a book by a political scientist. Yet not one of them is discussed or mentioned in *Contemporary French Political Thought* (except for one insignificant reference to Mendès-France). What does Roy Pierce mean by "political thought"? He does not, obviously, mean the thinking of politicians, nor statistical samplings of citizens' views, nor analysis of institutions or constitutions. Mr. Pierce is fully aware of the course he has chosen. "Camus' thought almost totally disregards political, social, and economic structure." (p. 149) Such disclaimers appear frequently. Political thought here refers to the published writings of articulate non-participants. Marx and Rousseau are the names most readily invoked and define the tradition.

Mr. Pierce's book opens with a chapter surveying "French Political Thought on the Eve of the Thirties." Rejecting the notion of "the two Frances," he describes the heritage of French politics in terms of the liberalism of Alain, the traditionalism of Maurras, and Marxism. A second chapter gives a corporate biography of six political thinkers who are then treated in individual chapters. They all belong to "the post-1929 generation": Emmanuel Mounier, Simone Weil, Albert Camus, Jean-Paul Sartre, Bertrand de Jouvenel, and Raymond Aron. Mr. Pierce does a careful job of sifting and summarizing the work of each author. The dimensions of their published work and of Mr. Pierce's sympathies allow him to handle the sections on Mounier, Camus, and Aron very convincingly. I have never been much impressed by Simone Weil's books, political or religious, and Mr. Pierce barely pauses over the one aspect of her thought that

bears scrutiny—her attitude toward work and manual labor. The exposition of Sartre's political position is necessarily simplified. Mr. Pierce displays a kind of fascinated resistance to existentialism and to Sartre's superadded Marxism. As a result, this is the only chapter in which we are treated to a running criticism of the ideas presented. The heightened tone makes the other chapters seem a little wan in comparison. Bertrand de Jouvenel's reflections on "*Dux, Rex, and the Common Good*" hover between the pedestrian and the pretentious; Mr. Pierce does not give them much new sheen or substance.

Just to what extent can these figures be considered representative of contemporary thought? They are indeed the strongest, clearest voices today on political questions as they intersect philosophy and sociology. But how can one write such a book without a single mention of De Gaulle or the Planning Commission? After all, his publications are not to be sneezed at. Could one describe American political thought of the thirties without mentioning Roosevelt and the NRA? These six intelligences have not operated in a historical void. In Mr. Pierce's pages after chapter two, I miss above all a convincing sense of event. A strong case could be made that all this literary activity he discusses is not the center but the peripheral froth of politics. These men did not make policy but lived off policy made by others.

At least this is the accusation Mr. Pierce leaves himself vulnerable to. He never gives us any hint that political thinking can go on except among publishing intellectuals. The importance and individuality of these six figures would come through better if their texts were contrasted with two quite different but legitimate forms of published political thought: the action-thinking of politicians in speeches, interviews, and the like; and the official documents (laws, constitutions, planning proposals) that result from collaboration among individuals or factions.

I do not mean to sound testy. This is a very useful and valuable book, modest in its conclusions, and for the most part clearly written. It should make Mounier (unfortunately his importance in Vietnamese politics is never mentioned) and Aron accessible to the political scientist whose French is shaky—even though Mr. Pierce quotes frequently in the original French. At intervals a highly suggestive idea crops out from the smooth exposition, such as the relation or

politics and private life (pp. 65 ff.) and a new, essentially political definition of existential anguish (p. 166n). Mr. Pierce has read exhaustively and assimilated with discrimination. For him, an idea can still be exciting and powerful.

ROGER SHATTUCK

The University of Texas at Austin

The Eurocrats: Conflict and Crisis in the European Community.
By ALTIERO SPINELLI. Tr. C. GROVE HAINES. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966. Pp. viii, 215. \$5.95.)

The "functionalists" have won the first leg of the race to unite Europe: the limits of "functionalism" have been reached; new political decisions are now required to determine whether the unification effort will move forward and whether it will move in a federalist-democratic or a confederalist-Gaullist direction. That is the theme of this stimulating essay by Altiero Spinelli, veteran European federalist now on the staff of the Bologna Center of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. He finds the functionalist victory demonstrated by the vitality of the European Economic Community and especially of the Commission, its supranational executive. Most of the book is devoted to this "Europe of supranational offices" and to the "Eurocrats" who serve it. As the products of the functionalist victory, the Eurocrats are bureaucratic in philosophy and background and suspicious of centers of political power such as parliaments and political parties. These attitudes have substantially influenced the development of relations between the Commission and the other European power centers. The Commission has assiduously and successfully cultivated effective working relations with the *non-political* European power centers, such as the national bureaucracies and national and supranational interest groups, in such a way as to enhance the power of the Commission. Spinelli finds no similar effort to cultivate effective reciprocal relations with the *political* power centers such as the political parties, the European Parliament, the national governments and the European "movements." Barely adequate for the period of administrative implementation of the provisions of the Treaty of Rome, this strategy, if continued, will mean either stagnation of the Community or a confederalist-Gaullist victory by default. In the Commission's 1965