Political Science as an Organised Discipline

It is often argued that political science as an academic discipline was first established in the United States and that it was only after the Second World War, when politics was made a separate field of study at European universities. A recent collection of articles on the state of political science in Western Europe (Klingemann, ed. 2007) supports this argument. The discipline seems to have found its place in Europe indeed only after the Second World War: France (1945), Norway (1947), the Netherlands (1948), Germany (1949), Belgium (1951), Denmark (1958), Italy (1966), Switzerland (1969), Iceland (1970), Austria (1971), Portugal (1975), Spain (the late 1980s), Greece (1989) and Cyprus (1996). Only in Sweden (1877), the UK (the late 19th century), Ireland (1908) and Finland (1921) one could find a few professors in political science before the War. Even in Britain, however, “it was not until after World War II that politics was studied more widely at British universities” (Goldsmith and Grant 2007: 382). Furthermore, political science in Central and Eastern Europe is a post-socialist discipline, beginning to develop only in the 1990s under the new democratic regimes (Klingemann, Kulesza, Legutke, eds. 2002). It is also revealing that all the national political science associations in Europe have been founded after the War (with the exception of the Finnish Political Science Association, which dates from 1935).

---

1 In the same way the development of political science in Europe had been suppressed by Nazism and Fascism between the Wars as well as authoritarian systems still afterwards (Spain, Portugal).
It was no wonder that Quincy Wright, the first President of the International Political Science Association, wrote in 1949:

“One difficulty of course is that social science is a very recent growth and few people really believe in its possibilities. I was impressed at the recent meeting to form an International Political Science Association in Paris with the lack of political science associations in the world and the lack of belief among many people that a political science was possible. Really as disciplines seeking to utilize so far as possible the objective methods which have developed in the natural sciences, social science comes near to being an American phenomenon of the last fifty years. Little as there has been to spend on social sciences in the United States there has been infinitely more than in any other country. One of the tasks of the international associations in the social sciences therefore is to try to spread what we know about social science in the United States to the rest of the world” (Wright 1949).

Because of the early development of political science as an academic discipline in the United States, it has sometimes been argued that political science is a distinctly American science (on this, see, e.g., Gunnell 2002). This image was strengthened after the Second World War. As the United States participated in political and economic affairs in Europe, it was no wonder that its influence was felt also in cultural life. American political science was part of that influence.

The development of political science as an independent discipline in American universities had taken a century. The teaching at the American colonial colleges was based on religion and ethics. The colleges had, in fact, been founded by different churches (with the exception of the University of Pennsylvania) (Barber 1988a: 5).² However, the classical political philosophers were well known, as college courses included works by Burlamaqui, Grotius, Locke, Montesquieu, Publius (The Federalist), Rousseau and Vattel. Besides, Aristotle’s Politics seems to have been the basis for moral and political philosophy (Haddow 1939: 82). In many cases politics was lectured to senior year students as part of the course in moral philosophy. Harvard, for instance, had a professorship in “Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity” (Haddow 1939: 57).

² In the colonial period there were nine colleges: Harvard (founded in 1636), William and Mary (1693), Yale (1701), Princeton (1746), Columbia (1754), Pennsylvania (1755), Brown (1765), Rutgers (1766) and Dartmouth (1769).
The American colleges started to change in the 1820s. One of the new ventures in higher education was the founding of the University of Virginia in 1819 on the initiative of Thomas Jefferson, based on secular curriculum (Barber 1988: 5). Another important new college was the South Carolina College (founded in 1805). At the time South Carolina was a prosperous, and one of the most liberal, states in the United States (Bordo and Phillips 1988: 43; 45). In these two institutions law and political economy began to develop within moral philosophy, both receiving academic recognition as disciplines. In both subjects politics was an essential part of the curriculum (e.g. governmental activity, public welfare). For the future development of political science it was significant that the South Carolina College hired Thomas Cooper (an English political radical during the French Revolution) first as a Professor of Chemistry in 1819 and then as the President of the College in 1821. Cooper was able to make political economy an independent subject of teaching in 1825 (lecturing the subject himself). Although Cooper was forced to resign in 1834 because of political controversies, political economy continued to be taught and in 1835 Francis Lieber was elected as a Professor of History and Political Economy (on the South Carolina College, see Bordo and Phillips 1988).

Many intellectual historians see Francis Lieber as the first real American political scientist (e.g. Farr 1990), as he was invited in 1857 to become a Professor at Columbia with the same title he had in South Carolina. He asked, however, that his professorship would be renamed as that of History and Political Science (Haddow 1939: 122-123; 138-140). It is good to remember, however, that Lieber was assigned to teach modern history, political science, natural and international law with civil and common law and that his professorship was at the Department of Jurisprudence (which taught law, political economy and modern history). Because of the intra-mural politics Lieber was nearly fired in 1865, but some of his friends managed to save him. His title was changed, however, into a Professor of Constitutional History and Public Law and his position was moved into the Law School (Rozwadowski 1988: 185-188).

Lieber’s example is typical of the mid 19th century American study of politics. The old disciplines guarded their turf, which together with religious and political interests fighting with each other, led to constant internal struggles within colleges and
universities. The discipline began to be recognized as an independent field of study, but its relations with other subjects were not yet clear.

If the foundations for political science were laid in the period from the 1820s to the Civil War, the real development began after the War. As Moral Philosophy started to concentrate on individual ethics, Law to become a technical and analytic study of American law, and Political Economy to focus mainly on problems of production and distribution of goods, the study of politics had to reorient itself. As Hans Morgenthau has written:

“The first departments of political science in this country, then, did not grow organically from a general conception as to what was covered by the field of political science, nor did they respond to a strongly felt intellectual need. Rather they tried to satisfy practical demands, which other academic disciplines refused to meet. For instance, in that period the law schools would not deal with public law. It was felt that somebody ought to deal with it, and thus it was made part of political science…political science grew not by virtue of an intellectual principle germane to the field, but in response to pressures from the outside” (Morgenthau 1955: 436-437).

In the new situation the study of history and political science had close links with each other in some colleges, while political science and jurisprudence were still considered as two sides of the study of politics in some others. In this respect there are two influential universities, which are usually considered as founding institutions of political science, the Johns Hopkins and Columbia universities. Both represent also a new modern university, which was born in the United States between the 1870s and the early twentieth century.

Many factors caused the transformation of the American system of higher education during the late 19th century. The Morrill Act of 1862 was a starting point for the enlargement of the university system. The federal government acted for the first time in the field of education, giving aid to states which supported colleges with agricultural and mechanical instruction (Veysey 1965: 15). On the other hand, the economic growth after the Civil War created large business empires, whose owners channelled some of their money to philanthropy (Friedman and McGarvie, eds. 2003).

3 “The Columbia program, together with the graduate studies at Johns Hopkins, set an example for other universities interested in developing courses and degrees in political studies” (Ricci 1984: 60).
This helped the rise of research universities, as private money was used to establish such first rate new universities as Cornell (with a gift from Ezra Cornell’s Western Union stock), Johns Hopkins (a Baltimore business magnate), Stanford (railway magnate Leland Stanford) and the University of Chicago (funded by John D. Rockefeller, Sr.) (see, e.g., Ricci 1984: 33-34). The large fortunes of these “robber barons” were also placed under the control of foundations, which acted as intermediaries between business and universities.

The Johns Hopkins University was opened in 1876 as a private institution. One of its departments was a Department of “Moral and Historical Sciences”, consisting of Ethics, Political Economy, History, International and Public Law (Barber 1988c: 206). Soon the University wanted to develop a branch of sciences which came to be described as “Historical and Political Science”. In 1881 Herbert Baxter Adams was hired as “an associate” for a two-year term to be responsible for a general work of the department. Adams had a Ph.D. degree from Heidelberg, where he had studied history and to some extent also political economy (Barber 1988c: 209-210). By his initiative a series of scholarly publications was established in 1882 entitled “Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science”. The following year Adams was made an associate professor and given a responsibility to direct the work of the Department of Historical and Political Science. Within the Department students were expected to choose history, political science or political economy as their major field of specialization (Barber 1988c: 212-213).

Although Adams himself taught both history and political science he leaned more towards history than towards political science (at the time political economy was taught mainly by Richard T. Ely). Revealing is the aphorism of a British historian, Edward A. Freeman, “History is past politics and Politics present history”, which was inscribed on the wall of Adams’ seminar room and which each volume of the Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science had (Somit and Tanenhaus 1982: 25). Adams was also one of the prime actors in setting up the American Historical Association in 1884.

In many narratives of the American political science, the founding of the School of Political Science at Columbia in 1880, however, has been taken as a symbolic
beginning of the discipline (e.g. Crick 1959; Somit and Tanenhaus 1982). One of the reasons for this was that the Columbia School (more than the Johns Hopkins program) offered the first and the most ambitious graduate program in political science (Somit and Tanenhaus 1982: 21).

However, at the beginning even the Columbia School was only a collection of different social science subjects. It was not until the early 1890s that it had manage to evolve into the Faculty of Political Science with three internal administrative groupings, “Economics and Social Science”, “History and Political Philosophy,” and “Public Law and Comparative Jurisprudence”. The Department of Political Science developed later out of Public Law and Comparative Jurisprudence.

The Johns Hopkins and Columbia were not the only institutions, where political science developed. In many other colleges and universities similar schools of Political Science were founded, for instance, at Cornell (already a decade before the Columbia School), at the University of Michigan (1881) and at Yale (1886). These other institutions were not able, however, to compete with the Johns Hopkins and Columbia at that time, mainly because they did not pay attention to research and doctoral education (Lepawsky 1964: 42-43).

The final stage in the development towards an independent discipline of political science in the United States came in 1903, when the American Political Science Association was founded. With the founding of the Association the discipline began to gain its real identity and the launching of the American Political Science Review in 1906 became the final push in the disciplinary development, although political science was still often organizationally linked to other social sciences. This was only natural, as university departments were small and it made sense to combine disciplines into

---

4 Until the 1890s the School grew slowly because of the resistance of the few natural scientists at Columbia, who, according to Burgess, “with genuine scientific arrogance, they regarded us...with contempt (and) opposed us...as an expensive luxury”. There was much opposition also among old-guard College teachers and conservative trustees (Camic and Xie 1994: 781-782)

5 By 1914 there were 38 separate political science departments. Political science was also offered in 216 other departments with disciplines: history (80), history and economics (48), economics and sociology (45), economics (22) and history, economics and sociology (21) (Anderson 1939: 263; cf. also, Ricci 1984: 61-62).
one larger department. It can be argued, however, that at the beginning of the twentieth century, political science as an independent academic discipline was firmly established in the United States.

**The Emergence of Modern University and Academic Disciplines**

The development of political science in American universities was part of the structural transformation of American universities, which began in the 1870s. During the 19th century three higher education ideologies developed in Europe (of these, see, Wittrock 1985). In the mid 19th century England, the idea of a general (liberal) education gained ground as the “Newmanian” (John Henry Newman) principle on training good members for society. The British higher education ideology came to stress the general education of undergraduates with a certain detachment from the practical demands of society. Universities were to cultivate the mind, not to educate students for any specific profession.

When the “Newmanian” ideology focused on liberal education, the “Humboldtian” (Wilhelm von Humboldt) one in Germany emphasised teaching and learning together. From the founding of the new University of Berlin in 1809, the university was seen as the place of true learning. It was self-administered by chaired professors, there was freedom and unity of teaching and learning and research was to be free of immediate social concerns.

The third ideology was the French “Napoleonic” model, according to which teaching and research were separated from each other. After the French revolution the old universities had been abolished (and they were not really restored until the late 19th century as loosely coordinated faculties). Instead, after the revolution and during “the Napoleonic reforms”, a system of elite professional education institutions was created in France. Research, on the other hand, was carried out in a number of extra-university institutions.

The new American higher education system developed out of these three European models. As Björn Wittrock has written:
“...the rise of modern university-based research is not just the simple, sequential unfolding of one single tradition, notably the Humboldtian. Rather the rise to real prominence of the modern research university occurred in a setting characterized by the confluence of traditions of liberal education, professional education and research and research training, namely in the United States, where these different traditions did not exclude each other but were rather superimposed upon each other...Thus during a process extending over several decades in the late 19th and early 20th century, American higher education institutions came to include a group of strongly research-oriented universities, which, however, retained parts of an earlier Anglo-Saxon tradition of liberal undergraduate education as well as of a commitment to professional education” (Wittrock 1985: 16; 25).

A new American university relied on the idea of liberal education at the undergraduate level (the “Newmanian” model). At the same time it incorporated professional schools (the “Napoleonic” model”) into the university structure (law, business). A big step forward was, however, an introduction of the “Humboldtian” idea of the linkage between research and teaching, which came to dominate the postgraduate work and led to the rise of big American research universities6.

An important new innovation in the American higher education was a system of departments, which contrasted with the German single-chair system, and gave better possibilities for the recognition of new disciplines (Wittrock 1985: 25). The formation of the departmental structure of the American university was created between 1890 and 1910, and at that time it was internationally unique. As Andrew Abbott has noted, this “departmental structure appeared only in American universities, although since mid-century it has gradually spread to Europe and elsewhere. Indeed, academic disciplines in the American sense – groups of professors with exchangeable credentials collected in strong associations – did not really appear outside the United States until well into the postwar period” (Abbott 2001: 122-123).

Departments stood between the individual professor and the university. The year 1869 has been seen as a turning-point in American higher education in this respect. Charles

---

6 The German model has been seen as an important model for the restructuring of the American university system in the late 19th century as a first hand experience of the German university was brought home by hundreds of American students going to study at German universities after the Civil War (Haddow 1939: 172). Although this argument has its merits, it has to be specified as above (see also, Ash 2006: 46).
W. Eliot became then President of Harvard and introduced a new system of elective studies, which fostered a university with precise study fields. And when the Johns Hopkins was founded (1876) as a university concentrating on post-graduate research, this made departments even more desirable (Veysey 1965: 320-322; Crick 1959: 21), as general education was not the idea of doctoral studies, but concentration on specific research problems. The real change came then with the opening of the University of Chicago in 1892. Its first President, William Rainey Harper initiated a new disciplinary system, which led to the formation of the departmental structure of the American university. The influence of the system grew, as the University soon became a center for research, raiding other universities to attract the biggest academic names and the most promising young scholars (Sealander 2003: 232-233).

Departments were also products of ambitious young scholars, as they wanted to create new disciplines out of the old sub-specialties of established disciplines. However, the stronger departments grew, the better able they were to keep the sub-specialties attached to them. A saturation point was achieved soon and the birth of new departments slowed down considerably after the 1890s (Veysey 1865: 322).

The development of political science as an academic discipline has followed the logic of the rise of academic disciplines. Tony Becher argues that what constitutes an academic discipline “will depend on the extent to which leading academic institutions recognize the hiving off in terms of their organizational structures” and “also on the degree to which a free-standing international community has emerged, with its own professional associations and specialist journals”. But although disciplines are identified by the existence of academic departments, “it does not follow that every department represents a discipline”. It is also a question of the legitimacy of departments in academia and “international currency is an important criterion, as is a general though not sharply-defined set of notions of academic credibility, intellectual substance, and appropriateness of subject matter” (Becher 1989: 19).

In this sense new social science departments developed into the point, where they were seen as legitimate departments of their own. To strengthen their position they

---

As to political science, Harper’s Chicago began with separate departments of political economy, political science, history, sociology and philosophy (Barber 1988b: 245).
also began to establish publishing outlets as instruments for the dissemination of their research results. *The Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science* was founded in 1883, and in 1886 Columbia began to publish the *Political Science Quarterly*. In 1890 the University of Pennsylvania came up with the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Ricci 1984: 63).

The departmentalization of the university coincided also with the formation of national disciplinary associations (Abbott 2001: 126). The American Social Science Association had been founded already in 1865, as the idea of social science began to develop. The Association had been formed “to find solutions to various social problems, especially those resulting from rapid urbanization” and “embraced most of our present-day social science disciplines, and it began to produce a number of specialist offspring which reflected the increasing division of labor among the educated cadre” (Coats 1988: 353). This development gave birth to the American Historical Association (1884), the American Economic Association (1885), the American Anthropological Association (1902) and finally the American Political Science Association (1903).

**European Study of Politics and ‘Schools of Political Science’**

As was pointed out at the beginning of this paper, it has often been argued political science as an academic discipline was made a separate field of study at European universities only after the Second World War. Although this is true, the history of the discipline in Europe is, however, more complex than that. Politics has been taught at European universities from the very beginning. Germany is a good example. Suzanne Schüttemeyer refers to the teaching of politics already in the 14th century in Vienna and Prague as well as at the universities of Leipzig and Erfurt in the 15th century.8

---

8 As was the case with the Columbia Faculty of Political Science itself, its journal *Political Science Quarterly* was a general social science journal devoted to “the Historical, Statistical and Comparative Study of Politics, Economics and Public Law”.

9 The same is the case with many other countries, Swedish political scientists often refer to the fact that the Johan Skytte professorship of *discourse and politics* was established at the University of Uppsala in 1622, (although the scholars holding the chair did not concentrate on the study of politics until the 1840s) (Ruin 1982, 299). In the same vein, *Professor of Politices* was founded at Leiden University in 1613.
And during the 17th and 18th centuries the special “Politikwissenschaft”, which dealt with questions of how to secure the general well-being of a political community, spread in German universities (Schüttemeyer 2007, 163-164).

Furthermore, with institutional changes in universities at the beginning of the 19th century (Humboldt), *Staatswissenschaften* started to bloom in Germany, mostly as a combination of politics with either law or history. Hans-Dieter Klingemann, for instance, has argued that “the emergence of political science as an academic discipline in Germany can be traced back to the beginning of the nineteenth century”, as “the first chairs were established as part of the *Staatswissenschaftliche Fakultäten* of the universities of München (1814), Tübingen (1817), and Würzburg (1822) (Klingemann 1996, 87). After 1848/49 revolutions the discipline “disappeared”10, however, although it was again partly carried on in law faculties under the name of *Allgemeine Staatslehre* in the late 19th century, when the political had become a matter of some concern within the faculties of law after the rise of modern politics (Kastendieck 1987, 28).

However, as these chairs were not supported by academic structures, publishing outlets and scientific associations, there was no political science in the meaning of a scientific discipline. On the other hand, it is important to notice that in the 19th century, the contents of the American and European study of politics were in fact quite similar to each other. The main difference between them was mainly due to different organisational settings. The study of politics concentrated on problems of constitutional law and history, but in the United States it was carried out in social science departments, while especially on the Continental Europe it was part of law faculties. As Peter Wagner has written:

“First, the non-existence of political science at European academic institutions in the early 1900s was not due to the fact that nobody had tried to establish it. In contrast, the historical constellation of restructurizations of the nation-states lent itself to such an interest, and movements for a political science emerged, which however, failed. Their failure can be explained to a considerable extent by the facts, second, that a drive towards ‘scientification’ in late-nineteenth-century universities bypassed political education.”

---

10 In the 19th century the juridical-legalistic point of view began to predominate the theory of the state also in the Netherlands. But then, “between roughly 1840 and World War II Dutch universities practically neglected the existence of political science proper” (Reinalda 2007, 275).
science, that no scientific language could be phrased, but that instead public law became the codified language in which to talk about the state; and third, that the existing demand for political-administrative professionals in the new states could to some extent be satisfied with exactly this formal legal training and, for the rest, was matched in professional schools whose orientations conflicted with those required for scientific discourses” (Wagner 2001: 26).

While in the Unite States:

“Another negative factor was that Law Faculties (in the U.S., E.B.) were ceasing to be the sustaining ground for traditional political theory…. were increasingly becoming technical professional schools, and they paid less and less attention to that ‘Jurisprudence’ which,…can embrace so much of politics. Political science in part arose as a separate discipline to fill this gap in learning left by the decay of Jurisprudence in American Law Schools. By way of contrast, the viability of Jurisprudence in German universities largely explains why ‘political science’ there has not found a separate identity, either conceptually or departmentally, until our own generation, and then largely under American influence” (Crick 1959: 13).

There is also another aspect of the development of political science, which the study of the history of the discipline has curiously neglected: the role of different European ‘Schools of Political Science’ in the formation of a discipline. These institutions are usually mentioned only in passing in the histories of political science (although there are a few commemorative writings describing the development of these institutions).

However, at the turn of the 20th century institutions of political science(s) were founded in many European countries, among them the Ecole Libre des Science Politiques in Paris (1871), the Facoltà di scienze politiche in Florence (1874), the London School of Economics and Political Science (1895), Deutsche Hochschule für Politik in Berlin (1920) and a Higher School of Political Sciences in Athens (1927). Their role has been downplayed because they have been seen only as institutions which were aimed to educate civil servants, diplomats and journalists with curricula comprising law, history, philosophy, economics and politics and in that sense were not proper political science institutions.

However, the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques was a model for the Columbia School of Political Science (this is well documented, however, in the histories of political science, e.g. Crick 1959; Somit and Tanenhaus 1982). A plan for the School was very much based on the curriculum of the Ecole Libre. In a letter to W.F.
Willcox, Burgess himself (1916) wrote that, “My first idea in regard to a School of Polit. Science in the U.S. came to consciousness during the horrors of our Civil War, and I resolved then to dedicate myself, should I outlive that struggle; to the work of promoting a better political education in our country…I. The institutions, which, as models, influenced me were the Imperial University of Strassburg, which had a separate Faculty for the Political Sciences, and the Ecole libre des Sciences politiques at Paris”. To get support for his plan, Burgess emphasized, in the spirit of the Ecole Libre, the need to train civil servants. The training of civil servants was a “bounden duty” and an opportunity for the Columbia University (Rozwadowski 1988: 191).

In this sense the Ecole Libre was one of the key factors in setting up political science programs in the United States. In fact, there was not much difference in American and European study of politics before the 1920s, as political science (as political sciences) prospered in different European schools of political science, the Ecole Libre being a model also for European institutions.11

Another influential school of political science was the London School of Economics and Political Science, which was founded in 1895. The 19th century British study of politics was marked by a strong anti-scientific culture. The defeat of Benthamism (and an attempt to develop “a science of legislation”) by the Whig protagonists praising the excellence of the British Constitution had left the field to philosophers, historians and jurists as well as to politicians and journalists and until the 1960s “skepticism about the possibility of political science was deeply rooted in the British intellectual tradition, represented notably by the University of Oxford…. The belief that a liberal élite education could best be acquired through an acquaintance with the political philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, coupled with a knowledge of the history of the political systems of Athens and Rome, survived the Second World War, when mainstream political science was having difficulties in institutionalizing itself” (Hayward 2003: 18-19).

In this situation Sidney Webb’s plan to create the London School as a replica of the Ecole Libre to train an elite for the country represented “a meritocratic-technocratic

11 One of the earliest of these was the Facoltà di scienze politiche in Florence (1874).
break with the gentleman-amateur Oxford tradition (Hayward 2003: 12). Webb firmly believed that the objective search for knowledge would lead to Fabian socialist conclusions about the future of society (MacKenzie 1979: 216). The School had a professorship in political science, the first professor being Graham Wallas, whose 1908 book “The Human Nature in Politics” was widely praised among American political scientists as an approach to scientific study of politics.

Although these schools continued their own traditions after the Second World War and did not directly adopt the model of American political science, they laid the foundations for an independent study of politics also in Europe (e.g. Blondiaux and Déloye: 2007: 138). The Ecole Libre was restructured in 1945 and divided into two parts: the Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques became the financial guardian of the new institution (with research), while the Institut d'Etudes Politiques (IEP), Paris became its teaching component. At the same time a number of other IEPs was founded. As the French higher education system has been marked by the duality of the system consisting universities and “Grande Ecoles”, political science has developed above all in the IEPs, while in the universities it has been mainly part of the law faculties (Blondiaux and Déloye: 2007: 137).

In Germany the influence of the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik has been very much the same. The founding of the Hochschule in 1920 in Berlin followed the Ecole Libre tradition to teach civil servants, diplomats, journalists and laymen in economics, history, law and politics. Although the School was a mixture of liberal and conservative national goals (suppressed finally by the Nazi takeover) (see, Eisfeld 1996 on the history of the School), its refoundation after the War helped to create a political science profession in Germany. The reopening of the Hochschule in 1949 provided a new start for the establishment of the independent study of politics in Germany. The School was also integrated into the Freie Universität in Berlin in 1959.

12 “Sidney had long considered that Britain needed an institution devoted to the social sciences. On his American tour he had been impressed by the work of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; he had envied the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques in Paris; and his work on the Technical Education Board had made him see the need and the possibility of doing something similar in London” (MacKenzie 1979: 214).

13 Today there are eight other IEPs: Aix-en-Provence, Bordeaux, Grenoble, Lille, Lyon, Rennes, Strasbourg and Toulouse.
It is revealing that at that time there were ten chairs in political science in *Freie Universität*, out of the total 24 chairs in the whole country. (Schüttemeyer 2007: 165).

In that way the *Hochschule* helped to counter a strong opposition against political science as a discipline in Germany after the War. For a number of reasons universities were not really reformed after the War and the heritage of Nazism was not dealt with, which in itself restricted opportunities for significant changes in universities (Kastendiek 1987, 31). It was left mainly to social democratic scholars and politicians, returning émigré scholars and the American occupation forces to promote political science as a discipline, one argument being a need to educate Germans for democracy.

The *Ecole Libre* and the *Hochschule* are not the only examples of laying the foundations for the independent study of politics in Europe. It can be argued that also the LSE had a similar influence in Britain, although its political science had actually dropped its meritocratic-technocratic goals under Harold Laski, who had followed Wallas as a professor of political science. The example of the early LSE was imitated, however, in some of the new universities founded in the 1960s.

Besides, one can find similar cases also in other European countries. Two examples are Finland and Greece. The Civic College was founded in Helsinki in 1925 after the model of the LSE (Rasila 1973). Although at the time there was one chair in political science at the University of Helsinki, the College was the main institution for teaching social sciences until the 1950s in Finland (the teaching of political science was in the program from the beginning). The School’s example brought also pressure to found the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Helsinki in 1944. In 1960 the School moved to Tampere and developed into a multi-disciplinary University of Tampere (1966). The University is still one of the strongest social science centers in Finland.

Another example is The *Higher School of Political Sciences* in Athens, which was founded in 1927. Developing out of liberal reform attempts in the early 20th century

---

14 The College changed its name in 1930 to the School of Social Sciences.
and getting the support of Alexander Pantos, who had studied at the Ecole Libre in Paris, the School followed the ideology and structure of the French institution. The School also adopted Pantos’ name (Contogeorgis 2007: 197-199) and today Panteion University is the leading political science institution in Greece.

As these examples illustrate, the schools of political science have played an important role in giving birth to political science as an independent academic discipline in Europe. As the European schools also influenced the development of the American political science, a reinterpretation of the history of political science is in order.

The Development of Political Science as a Discipline: An Interpretation

The model of the American political science which one came to know in Europe after the second World War, was not that of the first phase of American political science (1880-1920), but that of the second phase (1900-1940) (of the phases, see Berndtson 1987). A new political science that emerged in the second phase was critical of the old concepts of state and sovereignty, moved towards psychology, experimented with statistics and tried to imitate the natural sciences. It also introduced group dynamics and pluralism into the discipline’s vocabulary and talked about power and a need for a new theory of democracy (see, e.g. Gunnell 2007).¹⁵

This kind of political science was new to Europeans and for many, especially for reform-minded political scientists, it offered a chance out of the old legalistic political culture. At the same time the older legacy of common political science in Europe and the United States began to be criticised. The first phase of the American political science had focused, above all, on problems of administration, legislation and constitutional and public law. As Westel Woodbury Willoughby, the first Secretary of the American Political Science Association wrote in his 1904 Report of the Secretary, “In order to cover effectively the whole field of Political Science, the Association will distribute its work among sections, devoted respectively to such topics as International Law and Diplomacy, Comparative Legislation, Historical and

¹⁵ The second phase then led to the third one (1940-1965) which was marked by behavioralism and the pluralist theory of democracy.
Comparative Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, Administration, Politics, and Political Theory” (Willoughby 1904: 27).

In the same manner, Frank J. Goodnow, the first President of the American Political Science Association, stated in his first Presidential address that until the formation of the Association there had existed no other association which had assembled “on a common ground those persons whose main interests were connected with the scientific study of the organization and functions of the state (Goodnow 1904. 36) and “one of the most important objects of the association is just this study of the public law…For it is only by a study of law, sometimes a most detailed study, that we can arrive at an accurate idea of the form and methods of a governmental system. Indeed, it is very doubtful whether one can be a political scientist in any sense without a knowledge of the law governing the systems subject to study” (Goodnow 1904: 42).

Although it has sometimes been argued that political science developed out of history, this interpretation does not see the importance of the study of public law for the rise of political science as a discipline. The role of public law is also well illustrated in the first article of the Political Science Quarterly by Munroe Smith. Smith begins his introductory article for the journal stating first that, “Political science signifies, literally, the science of the state” (Smith 1886: 2). He then writes that ”In endeavouring to distinguish political science from the so-called political sciences, I have no thought of denying the close connection which subsists between political science, as here defined, and the sciences of economics and law. On the contrary it is a chief object of this article to demonstrate the interdependence of these sciences” (Smith 1886: 3).

According to Smith, political science, law and economics were substantial sciences, while statistics, comparative legislation and history were auxiliary sciences, modes of accumulating facts for comparison, and “history, for example, is not a social science in the same sense as economics, for it does not deal with a definite group of social relations. It is a mode of investigating all sorts of social relations” (Smith 1886: 5).

The legal emphasis of the early political science was only natural. Burgess and many of his associates had been trained in law and a substantial proportion of the political
science students at Columbia had completed the two-year program at Columbia’s School of Law (Somit and Tanenhaus 1982: 18-19). If one looks at the history of the APSA, it is also worthwhile to remember that Goodnow had graduated from Columbia and the Association’s second President Albert Shaw, although a Johns Hopkins graduate, had been a student of political economy under Richard T. Ely at the Johns Hopkins. Some of the historically oriented political scientists had an important role in the APSA (e.g. the eight President Albert Bushnell Hart), but before the “intellectual revolution” of the 1920s, the scholars with a legal training clearly played a more important role in guiding a new discipline.

As the first phase of American political science was also “overwhelmingly practical” (Morgenthau 1955: 433) and was oriented to citizenship training, preparing students for professions (such as the law) and educating future civil servants (Ricci 1994: 68), the similarities with the European study of politics of the time are obvious.

It was only in the 1920s when new research interests replaced these “primary” functions of the American study of politics, when the paths of American and European political sciences temporarily diverged from each other. If that was a good or bad for the study and teaching of politics, is hard to say. A new science of politics has its merits, but it also has its problems. Two of the most obvious ones are the minor role of law in the present study of politics and the separation of the discipline from the other social sciences. Although both problems are discussed now and then and different remedies are offered, no real solutions have been in sight. Maybe it is time for political scientists to take a new look at the origin of their discipline.
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