Author's copy

ca. 1953

UNITED STATES NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

[redacted] (An encyclopedia article)

United States National, State, and Local Government (sub-field of Political Science). The sub-field is usually referred to as "American Government."

Perhaps only the comparative government field of Political Science is independent of the subject-matter of American government. The fields of public administration, opinion and parties, international relations, and political philosophy are studied and taught in American government. Yet American government is regarded as a special field because it is the general subject of the introductory course in Political Science for the great majority of college students--by law, by rule, and by choice. In this role, it has acquired a life of its own; many professors are specialists in American Government: National, State, and Local, without necessarily being specialized in any other field. The situation resembles the position of "English Composition" in American curricula; a great many instructors teach English composition, many of them have no special role other than that of teaching freshmen composition, but yet it is part of most other subjects.

The latest extensive study of the prevalence of introductory courses in American government was made in 1951 by the American Political Science Association. Of 252 institutions that reported, 172 (70 per cent) offered American government as the beginning course. An additional 10 per cent appeared to offer a course largely in American government. Thirty-eight departments called their beginning course "principles of," or "introduction to" political science, these being combinations of philosophy, theory, principles, comparative government, and international affairs.

The objectives of courses in American government have been phrased by some of their sponsors. For instance, Francis O. Wilcox ("The Introductory Course in Government," American Political Science Review, XLI, 1947, p. 487) declares:

> The dominating objective should be to encourage an appreciation of the nature and value of popular government--what difference it makes whether we have it or not--what the alternatives are--what institutions would seem to be essential for its preservation. If instructors can make real progress towards this goal, we can forgive many sins.

Another Political Scientist, H. Malcolm Macdonald, states that the student should finish the course with "a general knowledge of the structure and functions of our government and some appreciation of current problems... The basic facts and structural organization of the government must be mastered by the student before he can hope either to participate fruitfully in a discussion of problems or adequately perform his functions as a citizen and voter." Carl B. Swisher says: "For almost all students, however, even if their goals be government employment, the practice of law, or graduate work in political science, I should state that the major objective as the promotion of understanding of political processes and ideas, and I should assume that understanding deep enough to be genuine would promote good citizenship." This writer's viewpoint, meanwhile, can be put as follows: Every college student must be indoctrinated with the values of the existing society, its institutions, its "goals," its "progress"; but every college student should also have a chance (which few will see and take) to learn objective political science in an atmosphere freed of political justifications and moral tensions; universities should be responsible for civic instruction just as churches are responsible for religious instruction. (The burden should not be placed upon political science

departments, but upon the university as a whole); thoroughly objective courses in American government should be offered in political science departments (although, under these new conditions, it is quite unlikely that the course would retain its shape or name for very long).

Of what does American government consist? Partly the scope of the field is defined by that famous, or infamous, document, the textbook on American government for college freshmen and sophomores. The text in this field corresponds to the texts in introductory economics, sociology, and psychology with respect to placement in the curriculum, but it takes an entirely different approach, being primarily a descriptive treatise on American institutions and law, rather than an attempt to state principles of human behavior.

At one time, most introductory courses in Political Science dealt with the principles of government, but in the 1920's, they were converted into a course on American government. At first the course was almost entirely juridical and structural. The text of Ogg and Ray, which came to dominate the field, gave little attention to the processes of politics and public opinion. Later, materials on parties and opinion grew in proportion as the legal and structural materials declined. Yet the texts have remained quite descriptive. Only lately have several of them begun to deal with the more complex factual theories of political and administrative behavior. The future, no doubt, will see an increase of such theoretical elements.

The texts generally are unclear as to whether they want to teach ethics or be objective. As a result their values usually sidle in silently. Examples of convictions common to a number of textbooks and other general works on American government would be the following: that the Presidency

should be strengthened in fiscal, personnel, regulatory, foreign policy, and legislative procedural areas; the parties are delinquent in putting real issues before the people; the Democratic Party contains more "progressive" elements than the Republican; the Supreme Court should not interfere with Congress or the States on economic matters, but should on civil liberties; public opinion and the majority should rule; the civil rights machinery of the federal government should be strengthened; everyone should participate actively in politics, and non-voting is a serious problem; public power has done wonders where it has been developed; Herblock the cartoonist has the right "pitch" on rightwing Congressmen like McCarthy and McCarren; though lip-service must be paid them, state and local government are relatively unimportant; becoming a civil servant is a noble aspiration--anybody can be a businessman; religion and politics should be as completely separated as possible; the city-manager form of government is superior to other forms; spending in politics should be greatly controlled and limited, or where this is impossible, full publicity should be given expenditures; the grant-in-aid programs offer little threat to states' rights; the beneficial aspects of the direct primary deserve more stress than the undesirable consequences; the existing level of government functions is accepted and, where necessary, must be defended; foreign policy is given a single meaning, inciting impatience and suspicion as to why the "national interest" is not pursued.

It may be said that some objectionable features obtain when a systematic defense of these beliefs of of another set of beliefs is not published. A student is likely to acquire a compartmentalized and confused mind. Some other suggestions to improve the content and teaching of the field bear repetition here. One is that writers in the field should exercise greater theoretical imagination. The same is true of the teaching of the

subject. One should recall how American writers of the early and late nineteenth century were busily proposing schemes of all sorts for the rectification of alleged abuses of the system--schemes ranging from anarchism to socialism and syndicalism, from universal suffrage to proportional representation, from the secret ballot to the direct primary. Today, scarcely anyone in the field is bearing forth plans and schemes of more than an "administrative" type; this seems to hold as true for "reactionaries" as for "radicals." The treatment of the field has become intensely current; it lacks broad historical or futuristic perspective; it has lost boldness and style; it is a mediocre training for the mind.

Another complaint is that the field is still too juridical. The courts are followed too closely as giving a true version of what occurs in politics and what is important to government. Also, many believe that the field lingers too readily on controversies that are "cheap"; that is, they are easy to come by, anyone can have an opinion on them, and they are current. Prominent among these are civil rights issues, taken without reference to the total context of social action; public power, taken as a direct black-and-white opposition to private power; and the "problem of the non-voter," where undiluted indignation may be vented upon the apathy of the public.

Research and writing in the field seems to favor certain topics. Electoral college reform is one. Reapportionment is another. The treaty power is a third. Congressional investigations and security measures constitute yet another. Negro rights, political participation, party responsibility, and executive reorganization are also favorites. States' rights have declined as a subject of interest but federalism still receives much attention.

State and local governments are inadequately studied. Most of the best scholars specialize in the national government, notwithstanding that

the possibilities of a political science are better in the state and local field, where many cases present themselves for analysis and comparison, and moreover that state and local government are in themselves important enough to warrant the interest of a fair proportion of the best minds.

Also, integration with the materials of economics and sociology lags, although the evidences of their integration in real politics and government abound, and other fields of political science are pressing towards a great^ integration.

Lastly, the important para-constitutional and quasi-public groups in the United States are not studied as essentials to knowing American government. Churches, unions, corporations, trade associations, foundations, universities, and other institutions are greatly influential in the political and governing processes; their structures, functions, networks of contacts, leadership, and increasing participation in government are largely ignored in the texts and, indeed, not yet well understood.

To sum up, the sub-field of American government is a kind of loose-knit holding company for materials of a half-dozen other sub-fields. It has developed out of practical, pedagogical needs and tends to be too concerned with descriptions of current events. Repeated efforts to reconstruct the field have been unsuccessful because they have been academic, while the field exists for mundane reasons. Consequently, the best hope for improving the field lies in the continuous feeding of newer, more valid, and systematic elements from other fields into the textbooks and classrooms.

PARTY ca 1953

(An encyclopedia article)

Party. The Latin "pars", with its plural "partes", meant "part", then a number of persons of similar sentiment, especially political. However, "party" appears to have come from the French "partie" in the late Middle Ages, which in turn was from "partir," and the Latin verb "partire", meaning to part. Factions, cliques, gangs, cabals, private armies, lobbies, pressure groups, special interests, clubs and caucuses are terms which, like "party", denote voluntary associations to influence government. Party and faction were synonymous in Rome. In early United States the terms were used interchangeably. Today they are rarely used to mean the same thing. Party has come to have a special and important connotation in the last century and a half. It refers to that paramount private association that is privileged to compete for control of a government. Government by legislature occasioned the emergence of modern parties. The word began to be used during the English Restoration period in something like its present sense; by 1714, Pope could write "a curse on the word Party, which I have been forced to use so often in this period." ("Letter to Jervas.") "On the whole, the development of parties seems bound up with that of democracy, that is to say with the extension of popular suffrage and parliamentary prerogatives." (M. Duverger, Political Parties, 1951.) A strong monarchy, predicated on traditional principles, sees no ultimate purpose to parties. A rationalistic ethos justifies a competitive struggle of parties for control of the government. Edmund Burke was less the champion of traditionalism than the instrument of the dawning rationalistic, competitive theory of government when he produced his famous definition: "party is a body of men United, for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest, upon some particular principle in which they

all agreed." Burke's definition cannot be used in objective political discourse. Like so many other early definitions of key terms in politics, it begs the major questions it has to attack: whether parties are indeed devoted to principle, are united in order to promote anything, or have any relation to a national interest, whatever that may be. (Goldsmith wrote of Burke "who, born for the universe, narrowed his mind, And to party gave up what was meant for mankind" [1774].) However, there can be little question of the rhetorical utility of such a definition. The same thing might be said of the "definition" of the communist party contained in the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. of 1936 (article 126): "the most active and politically-conscious citizens in the ranks of the working class and other sections of the working people unite in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which Party is the vanguard of the working people in their struggle to strengthen and develop thesocialist system and is the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and state."

Burke himself could be most realistic, of course: "Party divisions, whether on the whole operating for good or evil, are things inseparable from free government." (Observations on..."The Present State of the Nation," 1769.) Or, as Thomas Jefferson put it, "in every free and deliberating society, there must...be opposite parties, and violent dissensions and discords; and one of these, for the most part, must prevail over the other for a longer or shorter time." (To J. Taylor, 1798.) Yet Jefferson, like most writers, continued to assert the supposed function of seeking the national interest, in contradiction to reality and in lieu of other obviously important functions.

Beginning with the studies of M. Ostrogorski (Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties, 1902) a realistic and analytic approach to party study is manifest, and party definitions show the result. Max Weber wrote (Theory of Social and Economic Organization, 1947, orig. German ed. 1925) that "the term 'party' will be employed to designate an associative type

of social relationship, membership in which rests on formally free recruitment. The end to which its activity is devoted is to secure power within a corporate group for its leaders in order to attain ideal or material advantages for its active members. These advantages may consist in the realization of certain objective policies or the attainment of personal advantages or both....By definition a party can exist only within a corporate group, in order to influence its policy or gain control of it." By the time Weber wrote, other European and American scholars were employing similar, though not so exhaustive, concepts. Thus A. L. Lowell (1896) and C.E. Merriam (1927) should be mentioned, but Woodrow Wilson (The State, 1898) scarcely mentions the party or party process. In 1915, Robert Michel's Political Parties appeared, and became a classic of the study of parties; here he ventured no formal definition, but did so later in his First Lectures in Political Sociology (1927, trans.1949), following Weber's definition closely. In Political Parties he asserted that "the study and analysis of political parties constitutes a new branch of science. It occupies an intermediate field between the social, the philosophico-psychological, and the historical disciplines, and may be termed a branch of applied sociology."

Both American and European definitions coalesced on the fact of the power drive of parties. Thus Merriam and Gosnell: "The party may be looked upon as a type of social group, primarily concerned with social control as exercised through the government....The party system may be regarded as an institution, supplementary to the government, aiding the electorate in the selection of official personnel and in the determination of public policies, and in the larger task of operating or criticising (criticising) the government." (American Party System, 4th ed., 1940.) Also, Friedrich (Constitutional Government and Politics, 1937): "A group of human beings, stably organized for the purpose of securing or maintaining the control of a corporate body...." Lasswell and Kaplan say "a party (political) is a group formulating comprehensive issues and submitting candidates in

elections." (Power and Society, 1950.) David Truman (The Governmental Process, 1951) writes similarly that "the political party has come to be thought of as the instrumentality through which choices are made among aspirants for office....Whatever else it may be or may not be, the political party in the United States most commonly is a device for mobilizing votes...." V. O. Key bridges the explicit power-drive Weberian notion and the Lasswell-Truman emphasis upon elections by saying the political partiy is "a group which attempts to bring about the election of its candidates to public office and, by this means, to control or influence the actions of the government." (Encyclopedia Britannica.) The difference between the two types of definition is not large; the question is whether elections should be specified as the medium for propaganda and agitation, and whether "who gets what" should be stated. Perhaps both forms may be alternately used, depending upon circumstances. Rephrasing the broader (yet very specific) Weberian statement: "a political party is a voluntary society of propaganda and agitation, seeking to acquire power in order to procure chances for its active adherents to realize objective aims, personal advantages, or both." Rephrasing the more contemporary and simpler definition: "a political party is a group publicly organized to capture, through elections, the control of the government." However, it should be appreciated that, of the several definitions in the latter category, only the Lasswell definition permits the inclusion of totalitarian or "elite" parties such as the German National Socialist (Nazi) and Communist parties, whose methods, besides propaganda and agitation, and whose medium, besides elections, predicate physical coercion. Such parties reject theidea of remaining a "part" of politics and see violence as an adjunct to propaganda and agitation. In sum, a definition embracing all phenomena that are regularly called "party" in this age is a difficult task, unless it be reduced to the entirely indicative, unanalytic, unidimensional form of a group framing general issues and putting forward candidates in elections, that is, the Lasswell definition.

author's copy

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS ca. 1953
(An encyclopedia article)

Deriving as it does from two of the most unstable words in the lexicon of social science—"class" (q.v.) and "consciousness"—the phrase "class consciousness" inherits the faults of both and adds its own. Park and Burgess (Introduction to the Science of Sociology, 1924) say that "consciousness" is "a name not merely for the attitudes characteristic of certain races or classes, but for these attitudes when they are in the focus of attention of the group, in the 'fore-consciousness' to use a Freudian term....To be class-conscious is to be prepared to act in the sense of that class." (pp. 40-41.)

Class-consciousness is distinct from the concepts of economic determinism and class struggle in theory. Still its usage is clearly delimited and its Germanic agglutination (the German is Klassenbewusstsein) reveals its place in the political dialectic of modern times, especially in Marxism.

Pre-Marxist expressions of similar meaning are common. Many political writers since antiquity have assumed that society was divided into rich and poor and that the poor would seek their own advantage if given the chance. For instance, in the American Constitutional Convention of 1787, James Madison declared: "In all civilized countries the people fall into different classes having a real or supposed difference of interests. There will be creditors and debtors, farmers, merchants and manufacturers. There will be particularly the distinction of rich and poor....An increase of population will of necessity increase the proportion of those who will labour under all the hardships of life, and

secretly sigh for a more equal distribution of its blessings."

If class-consciousness were always presumed, why did the term come about? Karl Mannheim (Ideology and Utopia) places the origin of the term on a fourth stage of a thousand-year "awareness" evolution: from the objective and united medieval world, to the idea of "consciousness as such," to the concept of a "folk spirit," to concepts of "class consciousness" and "class ideology." But also, it must be stated that the term performed an impressive historical task in organizing a new society for the Marxists. Indeed the only authentic historical usage of the term, "class-consciousness," is the presumed will of the workers to recognize their common "enemy"—the capitalists—, their common "misery," and their common goal, triumph of the proletariat. Marx affirmed the existence of two "true" classes only—~~exploiters and exploited, capitalists and workers~~, Bourgeoisie and Proletariat—rejecting all other modern class divisions and groupings as of minor importance. Marx himself was either confused or deceitful in his propagation of class-consciousness, at one moment letting it appear to be a fact of social life, at another moment promoting vigorously a feeling of class where little or none existed previously. In Die deutsche Ideologie (1846 unpubl., Marx-Engels Archiv, Vol. I, 1927), Marx and Engels alleged that society was forming an outcaste class, bearing all the social burdens but no social advantages, "a class which forms the majority of all members of society, and one from which the consciousness of the necessity for a thoroughgoing revolution, the communist consciousness, proceeds—a consciousness which, of course, can only arise in the other classes thanks to the comprehension of the position of this particular class." A year later, Marx wrote in Misère de la philosophie that "this mass is

already a class confronting capital, though not yet aware of its own position as a class." The concept of class-consciousness was created to express a wish as much as to describe a fact.

As a result, Gaetano Mosca (The Ruling Class, 1939, orig. ed. 1895) could declare later that "one of the commonest sophisms of socialist propaganda is that class hatred is not produced by socialist doctrine, but is a natural consequence of the inequalities and injustice that prevail in society." Modifying Mosca's position, Roberto Michels (First Lectures in Political Sociology, 1949, orig. ed. 1927) asserts that an actual impulse to class consciousness came from the modern factory, where "work done in common in the very same shop generated a continuity of mechanical tasks that in the long run ended in the creation of some collective mental similarity. To the community of environment and local surroundings was added the homogeneity of economic conditions. Therefore, the genesis of class consciousness in the new industrial proletariat is quite understandable." ~~(p. 16.)~~

It is clear that class-consciousness to a political partisan, be he Marxist or non-Marxist, is a non-scientific term expressing both a quantity of truth and a desired condition of the non-owning workers. The quantity of truth lends the authority of science to the term. So limited, class-consciousness is sometimes today called "subjective class placement" or "reference class." These concepts are rendered operational by interviews, for example, in which people are asked to what social class they belong. Both are terms probably better suited to the study of social class phenomena than is "class-consciousness." Indeed, the term "class-consciousness" may soon become archaic wherever a free social science exists. An unpublished study by S. M. Lipset and

Juan Linz in 1957 states that "there has been no research explicitly designed to test the relationship between reference class orientation and objective class position and political behavior." Nevertheless, in all related studies and with regard to practically all indices of objective political status and behavior, "class consciousness" (or its equivalents) stands as an independent variable. That is, it may be shown to exist or not exist under all the circumstances that bring forth an objective class system or that provide an objective distribution of goods greatly favoring the few over the many.

Therefore perhaps the least deceiving and most useful meaning is the most empirical and objective, whence it may be defined as a given "high" degree of sharing of attitudes of isolation, solidarity, and collective purpose within a national sub-group, most of whose members also share a common skill, relation to the means of production, and style of life. In easier (and less specific) language, one may say that class consciousness is a group's feeling that its social achievements are specially dependent upon its fortunes as a group. Moving contrariwise toward operational specificity, one may say that class-consciousness exists when a "considerable" grouping in a society, possessing similar economic traits, achieves similar, high scores on tests of their perception of common traits, common needs, and common collective aims. In this sense it can be a constructed statistic or index. As such, it may then be usefully related and lend new meaning to historical events, personality characteristics, indices of social mobility, the imminence of rapid social change (including political violence) and a host of other phenomena and indices.

author's copy

CENTRALIZATION-DECENTRALIZATION

(An encyclopedia article)

Centralization-decentralization (from the French, "centralisation," which is adapted from the Latin "central" [central], which derives from "centrum" [center].) The two concepts are treated together because, often and most recently, they are given polar meanings.

"Centralization" as a term came to be used frequently in the early nineteenth century, particularly in France. The underlying problem of a government increasing its power, especially over different local jurisdictions, is ancient. Yet Roman administration, so self-conscious, imposing, and sophisticated, has no word for it, and uses "authority," "imperium," and other terms to build descriptions of like events. The many religious struggles over the organization and powers of the Roman Catholic Church, running from early Christian times to the present, deal with numerous problems of centralization. Like other modern terms, "centralization" represents a technical abstraction of variable phenomena previously treated largely as indestructible substantive entities (legal "rights" of the King or the Church; federalism; sovereignty; the power of a conquerer, etc.) and is associated with early and continuing attempts at a social science. However, following upon the Enlightenment and the temporary collapse of the bureaucratic rule of the ancien regime, disputation over centralization became common. The term was carried across the English channel; it was also introduced directly into America by Alexis de Tocqueville, among others, who in Democracy in America (1837) wrote:

> Centralization is a word in general and daily use, without any precise meaning being attached to it. Nevertheless, there exist two distinct kinds of centralization, which it is

> necessary to discriminate with accuracy. Certain interests are common to all parts of a nation, such as the enactment of its general laws....Other interests are peculiar to certain parts of the nation, such, for instance, as the business of the several townships. When the power that directs the former or general interests is concentrated in one place or in the same persons, it constitutes a centralized government. To concentrate in like manner in one place the direction of the latter or local interests, constitutes what may be termed a centralized administration. It is not the administrative but the political effects of decentralization that I most admire in America.

Nineteenth century liberals and conservatives found much to abhor in the apparent tendencies of national governments to take powers and functions from local authorities and the citizenry. Jacob Burckhardt (Reflections on History, 1871) decried how "step by step, there came into being the modern centralized State, dominating and determining culture, worshipped as god and ruling like satan." Gaetano Mosca (Elements of Political Science, 1895) said that "the surest and most effective remedy for the evils of parliamentarism would be extensive and organic decentralization. That would not merely imply shifting prerogatives from central bureaucracies to provincial bureaucracies, and from national parliaments to local assemblies. It would imply transferring many of the functions that are now exercised by bureaucracies and elective bodies to the class of public-spirited citizens." Indeed few politicians and writers defend centralization (though most practice it at every opportunity), so the term carries a negative emotional loading and "decentralization" a positive one. Perhaps this is why the Soviets often use "democratic centralism" as a synonym for their kind of centralization, while some Americans (as well as Russians) prefer "efficiency" as their synonym for it. There are nowadays other abstract concepts in the same area of meaning--control, integration, autonomy, hierarchy, discipline, coordination, etc.--which, together with the ancient

substantive concepts referred to above, make it perfectly possible to treat at length of centralization-decentralization without ever mentioning the term. Whether this is politically or scientifically desirable depends upon the circumstances of each decision whether to use the term.

Varieties of usage, besides the foregoing, abound in different fields of Political Science. Nathan Leites (A Study of Bolshevism, 1953, p. 289) writes: "In accord with the overall Bolshevik tendency to perceive the powerful enemy as similar to the self...a very high degree of centralization is attributed to major enemy governments. In 1902 Lenin described 'our immediate enemy in the political struggle' [as] '...a purely militant, strictly centralized organization led in all its minutest details by the single will of the organized Russian government....'" Woodrow Wilson (The State, 1898, p. 210), writing of France after Louis IX, says: "This expansion of the central organs of administration meant that the royal government was entering more and more extensively into the management of affairs in the provinces, that local administration was being centralized."

Hans Kelsen (General Theory of Law and State, 1945, pp. 304 ff) declares: "The conception of a centralized legal order implies that all its norms are valid throughout the whole territory over which it extends....A decentralized legal order, on the other hand, consists of norms that have different territorial spheres of validity." Further, "the centralization or decentralization of a legal order may be quantitatively of varying degree." Albert Lepawsky (Administration, 1949, p. 377) speaks of "the possibility of combining economic and social decentralization with a high degree of political centralization." David Lilienthal (T. V. A.--Democracy on the March, 1944) says overcentralization "is the tendency all over the world, in business as well as government." Also Ordway Tead (The Art of Adminis-

tration, 1951), "the big organization is the irreconcilable foe of humane existence, and the only answer is some drastic program of decentralization." Robert Michels (Political Parties, 1915) writes: "In the modern labour movement, within the limits of the national organizations, we see decentralizing as well as centralizing tendencies at work." Then, a "decentralizing movement which manifests itself within the various national socialist parties does not conflict with the essential principle of oligarchy." Maurice Duverger (Les Partis Politiques, 1951): "In contrast with the semi-decentralization of Socialist parties they [the Communists and Fascists] have in common a very strict centralization, a system of vertical links ensuring that the elements at the base are strictly divided into cells, this being a protection against any attempt at schism and division, and ensuring very strict discipline." Roland Pennock (Liberal Democracy, 1950) states that both "in England and in the United States, but especially in the latter because of the greater degree of decentralization previously prevailing, there has been a steady and rapid movement toward centralization of Government." J. C. Charlesworth (Governmental Administration, 1951) declares that "all custodians of the democratic faith agree...that centralization is inimical to the preservation of popular government....The study of centralization in administration is really the study of decentralization." Simon, Smithburg and Thompson (Public Administration, 1950) broaden the term considerably and then narrow it for purposes of practical analysis: First "any specialization in terms of a particular activity represents a centralization of that activity." Thus personnel functions of the smallest units of an organization might be gathered together on the next hierarchical level, the section. Then they discuss only cases of specialization in which occurs "centralization of activities above the level at which unitary organizations are found," prin-

cipally separate staff and auxiliary agencies. The same authors also point out the reappearance of decentralized "echo" offices on levels of organization from which functions had been previously removed for purposes of centralization, as a result of counterattack or efficiency reactions. Lasswell and Kaplan (Power and Society, 1950) define centralization-decentralization together as "the territorial and/or functional distribution of power. A unitary state is one in which the rule is centralized; a federal state, decentralized territorially; syndicalist, decentralized functionally....The scope, weight, and domain of power are all three involved in centralization-decentralization."

The last definition of the terms is probably the most useful. That is, centralization is a high concentration of power (measured by criteria of scope, weight and domain) in a few hands within an organized social group. Sub-categories of centralization would be of a geographical, functional, or other kind. Decentralization is a low concentration. For specific purposes, the term might be restricted through adjusting the "degree" being specified and adjusting the definition of an "organized social group." Also the type of group might be narrowly specified to include only geographically-defined groups. Or the term might be used only to describe the distribution of powers between hierarchically superior and inferior loci, and the term "integration" employed in L. D. White's usage, when the "concentration of power" relates to hierarchical equals (e.g., the major and city council; the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Presidency Commerce Department.) The common and slightly different definition of centralization as the increasing concentration of power, rather than a high concentration, is quite acceptable.