

ble and others just funny. There are many challenges to thought. It is impossible to read for more than a page without coming upon something that requires at least a moment's reflection, which is good for the reader and, the reviewer must grudgingly admit, a measure of success for the author. The author knows he has written an infuriating book. In fact he is proud of it. He knows that books should stir up readers—and besides, that is good for sales. "Some people will not like this book," he says in the first sentence of his preface. If people do not like the excitement of controversy, he continues, "they are free to stop reading whenever they like." Sturdy stuff and good show! But do not take his advice. Read the book. You may be moved to novel thoughts. If nothing else, you can see for yourself the real meanings of generation gap and paranoia.

Reviewed by THOMAS H. ETZOLD

Politics versus Science

The Unheavenly City Revisited, by Edward C. Banfield, *Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974. 358 pp. \$4.25.*

THIS REVISED VERSION of Professor Banfield's controversial treatise, *The Unheavenly City*, brings to the general reading public another opportunity to examine a most important work. The book deals only peripherally with politics as the word is commonly understood, which is to say, with government. Instead its concerns are directed more toward societal dimensions of political action: class, race, public and private character, poverty, and crime. While Banfield has retracted none of the theses put forth in the earlier volume, the new edition is worthy of consideration in its own right, even by those who have read the original.

The likelihood of having missed the point of the book appears high, given the controversy generated over its initial publication. What was ignored was a most serious argument about the large gap existing between urban politics and the talk and writing generated about urban politics. In that gap, Banfield argues, one finds a significant dimension of our urban crisis.

The Unheavenly City Revisited is a political critique of the way students of urban politics think about their subject. Why was the book written? Because of the belief of social scientists in their ability to solve urban problems with the method of intelligence or science. Banfield considers this a form of political idealism, which does more damage than good to urban residents because it implies depriving those most in need of political skills of the chance to learn them. He therefore argues that "the question arises . . . not of whether we are faced with an urban crisis, but rather, in what sense we are faced with one." To know this means to be able to recognize a problem.

"A problem" Banfield tells us, "exists only as we should want something different from what we do want or as by better management we could get a larger total of what we want." In other words, a problem exists where there is a gap between what is and what ought to be, or when people are told they shouldn't want what they do want—when what is, should not be. Beyond that, a problem exists when we believe things could get better with better management or administration of things. In sum, when what is, is bad management; what ought to be is scientific management. Implicit is the assumption that because we can get more, it is legitimate to want more. Competition about claims of knowledge of what is "good," which is to say, political conflict, should no longer be present. To the extent that such conflict does exist, the desire for better management may not be what people might want. Hence, partisans for better management must try to convince others they ought to desire what, in fact, they don't want.

The conviction that those with a scientific education are the most fit managers or teachers of managers is precisely what Banfield challenges in this book. In particular he questions the possibility of transferring the canons of scientific thought and practice to politics on the grounds that such rules would have no certain authority as rules which must be obeyed. Those pressing the claim for the direct use of scholarly findings tend to be relatively unskilled in what earlier students of politics called "the political art." Politics involves theoretical and practical skills; direct application of a method may continually be insufficient. In other words, the claim that science ought to be applied to politics turns out to be simply another political claim; it is only one among many. More significantly, however, when combined with impatience, empirical science turns rapidly into a kind of messianic idealism.

The Unheavenly City Revisited represents a sobering counter to this idealism. Banfield's method is to expose the wealth of measures available for studying each social and political phenomenon, arguing that the choice of which measure to use is a political, or should I say, value choice. For example, he reveals how census data and non-census statistical data provide two different profiles of the socioeconomic status of blacks as a group. What passes for a scientific realism is one of a variety of realisms. How then are scientific managers able to tell the difference between real cures to political problems and cosmetic ones? There is no scientific answer to this. One might demand, therefore, that the cures be demonstrably better than the disease, or at least not any worse. But how does one make those judgments? Shifting the criteria of what constitutes a cure at different times would hardly seem to be the way. In other words, the burden of proof rests with the scientists, and to date, they have yet to show how scientific management can solve political problems in less cosmetic ways than the politicians.

Banfield argues for less rather than more

policy on the grounds that the more social science introduced into politics the less likely are citizens able to discriminate and choose between alternatives. In raising this issue, he points to reconsideration of arguments, often silenced in contemporary life, questioning the degree to which we become more humane and just by application of scientific reason. "Our crisis" may be, therefore, that we are becoming insensitive to the nature of political phenomena as such. If we don't know what politics is we cannot recognize when a political solution has been effected. Nor is it possible to assess properly the limits of political action. What we wish for, the Heavenly City on Earth, we cannot achieve, so we despair. In illuminating this dilemma, *The Unheavenly City Revisited* teaches its readers the way in which a scientist can talk about politics from the view of political life. The book, in this sense, is a scientific defense of politics, but one that raises to the level of explicit discourse the silenced tension between science and society. Professor Banfield has written what constitutes the other half of a dialogue that may permit us all to more properly turn our attention towards the shadowy world of our unheavenly city.

Reviewed by MARTIN PLAX

Kant as a Proto-Hegelian

Kant, by Alexandre Kojève, *Paris: Editions Callimard, 1973. 220 pp. Frs. 34.*

IN THE COURSE of a recent interview, Raymond Aron, "the most intelligent Frenchman," was asked whom he regarded as the most intelligent man he ever met. (The French are addicted to this kind of Gallup-poll). His answer: Alexandre Kojève. Now if intelligence carries with it a forbiddingly complicated presentation of very difficult speculative problems, Kojève's