

828.3  
H38701

11 July 1977

[Blacked out]

PDAAM 340

211(d) Final Report  
July 1977

COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIVE STUDIES PROGRAM  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, HONOLULU, HAWAII  
FRED W. RIGGS, PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

July 1977

TITLE: COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIVE STUDIES PROGRAM (CLSP)

GRANTEE: UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, HONOLULU, HAWAII (UH)

DIRECTOR: FRED W. RIGGS, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

CONTENTS

A. <u>Statistical Summary</u> . . . . .	1
B. <u>Narrative Summary</u> . . . . .	2
C. <u>Detailed Report</u> . . . . .	8
1. General Background . . . . .	8
2. Objectives of Grant. . . . .	9
3. Accomplishments. . . . .	11
a. administration of grant . . . . .	11
b. instruction . . . . .	14
c. training of students. . . . .	17
d. library and data. . . . .	20
e. faculty . . . . .	22
f. foreign linkages. . . . .	24
g. conferences . . . . .	29
h. consortium. . . . .	32
i. service . . . . .	33
4. Impact on Institutionalization of CLS. . . . .	34
5. Utilization of Institutional Capabilities . . . . .	36
6. Other Resources for Grant-Related Activities . . . . .	39
7. Plans for the Future . . . . .	39

ANNEXES

- A. General Findings
- B. Faculty Reports
- C. Statement by Richard Sisson
- D. Survey Results, by John Grumm
- E. Financial Summary

211(d) Final Report (csd/3293 - authorized 11 August 1971)

July 1977

Title: Comparative Legislative Studies Program

Grantee: University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii

Directors: Fred W. Riggs, Professor of Political Science 1976/7  
 Michael Mezey, Associate Professor of Poli. Sci. 1974/6  
 Norman Meller, Professor of Polical Science 1971/74

A. STATISTICAL SUMMARY\*

Period of Grant: Aug. 11, 1971 to Feb. 10, 1977

Amount of Grant: \$235,000

Expenditures for Period of Grant:

Totals spent by report years:

		<u>Total</u>
1972:	\$10,130	\$10,130
1973:	40,413	50,544
1974:	46,090	96,633
1975:	56,805	153,435
1977:	79,917	233,352

Balance of Grant to be returned: 1,648

Total: 235,000

\*A summary of expenditures by our, AID-approved, budget categories is given in Annex E, Table I. Since the University of Hawaii keeps its books by objects of expenditures, cutting across our programmatic budget categories, a summary of its fund allocation reports is given in Annex E, Table II.

B. NARRATIVE SUMMARY

The Comparative Legislative Studies Program (CLSP) of the University of Hawaii is directed to an understanding of the legislative institution as a sub-system within a variety of national polities. The activities of the Program, supported by a 211d grant (csd/3293 - authorized August 11, 1971) from the Agency for International Development for a five year period, have been intended from the beginning to achieve three major purposes:

- 1) strengthen the University of Hawaii's institutional capabilities in the conducting of instruction, research, and service relative to the legislative institution and its linkage with national development;
- 2) establish cooperative ties with counterpart colleagues in Asia and the Pacific, to the end of reinforcing and operationalizing their interest in the legislative institution and facilitating the continued enrichment of the University of Hawaii's Program from these sources; and 3) contribute to the growth of cross-polity knowledge, including dissemination thereof in ways that are useful to the nations studied as well as to the University.

Although the first "report year" extended, officially, from August 11, 1971 to Aug. 10, 1972, in fact funds for the program did not become available until mid-October, by which time the academic year was already well under way. This made it impossible, of course, to launch any new courses or recruit faculty and students in time for that academic year. We used the available time, therefore, for careful preliminary planning, to recruit a highly qualified scholar interested in pursuing research and teaching on comparative legislative systems, Michael Mezey, and we were able to bring him to the Department in September 1973. We also canvassed the availability of faculty and students already on the campus who might

be brought into the program, and carefully assessed the library's holdings with a view to building up the University's collection for the purposes of CLSP. Externally, we cultivated contacts with colleagues in Asia and the Pacific, and participated actively in the establishment of the University Consortium for Comparative Legislative Studies (hereafter, the "Consortium") in cooperation with Duke University and the University of Iowa. We viewed the development of plans for a publication program as a high priority item, and we began immediately to investigate various possible opportunities for securing supplementary funding.

During the second "report year", 1972/3, with the addition of Mike Mezey to our faculty, we were able to launch new courses and a regular non-credit colloquium, to recruit a few advanced graduate students, facilitate the research of interested faculty members, and start detailed planning for a number of efforts to secure external funding--efforts which, unfortunately, were for the most part unsuccessful. Our activities designed to establish liaison with foreign scholars and to recruit promising students from the Asia/Pacific region were more successful, and the launching of the Newsletter, edited in Hawaii, brought our program more solidly into the mainstream of activities relating to comparative legislative studies.

An important international conference on legislative origins, held in Hawaii during April 1974, was a high point of the third "report year," 1973/4, and during this year two Ph. D. degrees were awarded to students with legislature-related dissertation themes: three graduate students passed their preliminary examinations for the Ph.D. and three more began their dissertation field work in Asia. Doctoral candidates from Japan,

Korea, the Philippines, and Micronesia joined our program. A number of monographs, journal articles, and conference papers growing out of the CLSP were produced and published.

A major step forward in our teaching program was taken during 1974/5, our fourth "report year," when Michael Mezey established, with special funding from the Exxon Education Foundation, a comparative legislative simulation course for undergraduates. Additional publications and conference papers appeared, and work with graduate students made good progress. Our international liaison efforts were significantly forwarded through participation in two special conferences on legislative studies, one in Penang (March, 1975) and the other--in which our associate, Lloyd Musolf played a leading role--in Carmel, California (August, 1975).

The fifth and final "report year"--which was kindly extended by AID for six months, until Feb. 10, 1977, to permit completion of commitments made prior to the original termination date of Aug. 10, 1976--enabled us to carry out a variety of activities designed to bring the total grant-supported program to an orderly termination while consolidating gains that could be made the basis of a continuing program of comparative legislative studies. The research projects of several faculty members have continued, involving the completion of some projects and encouragement within funding limitations of those projects which remain uncompleted. Participation in international conferences and the work of the Consortium was sustained. Graduate students sponsored by the program are completing their studies and field research. Associated scholars in Asia and on the mainland have been assisted in their work.

Unfortunately, the prospects for program continuity were struck a serious blow by the decision of Michael Mezey, for personal reasons, not to return to Hawaii after a year's leave of absence. He asked for a year's extension of his leave, and, at this stage, we cannot be sure he will return. Since he had been recruited under the aegis of the program to be the anchor man of the continuing program and was the only faculty member with a full-time focus on comparative legislative studies, his loss will be irreparable. University retrenchment will compel loss of Mezey's position if he does not return. Other faculty members in the program, as previously noted, typically have had a broad interest in comparative politics and political development providing a context within which they have made significant contributions to the comparative study of legislatures. However, they have not been prepared to make this subject the primary, let alone exclusive, focus of their research and teaching efforts.

During the final year of the program John Grumm of Wesleyan University, who has been an associate of the Consortium, came to Hawaii as a visiting professor to teach the legislative study courses that would normally have been taught by Mezey who, on a leave of absence, substituted for Grumm at Wesleyan University. However, the exchange arrangement was just for the academic year 1976/7, and can not be continued. Meanwhile, due to financial austerity, the budget for the University of Hawaii has been drastically reduced, leading the administration to cancel all positions that have been vacated by reason of retirement, resignation, or other causes. As a result, although we were able to secure a tenure appointment for Mezey, we are not now able to employ anyone to take his place.

The position of the program has also been undermined by the decision of Professor Norman Meller to take early retirement this year. Although he has been teaching courses on legislatures and carrying on related research, he will no longer regularly teach courses in the Department--although he will, of course, continue to pursue his related research interests, and to serve as an adviser on legislative and constitutional development in the Pacific Islands.

Under these circumstances, the firm thrust of the core program at the University of Hawaii has been seriously undermined. Fortunately, the continuing interest of our two associates, Lloyd Musolf and Richard Sisson, at the Universities of California, Davis and Los Angeles, respectively, continue unabated. They, together with several of their own faculty colleagues, can be expected to sustain continuing research and teaching activities on legislatures at their universities. At the University of Hawaii, legislative studies will assuredly continue to be emphasized as an important focus within the discipline of political science, and especially within the field of political development. It will not, however, be able to secure the primacy of faculty attention that has hitherto been our hope.

As for the second major objective of the program, namely the establishment of cooperative ties with counterpart colleagues in Asia and the Pacific, this has been accomplished with special reference to India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Micronesia, and the Philippines. In each of these countries there are individual scholars and institutions with whom we have been closely associated in a number of ways, and it can be expected that, from time to time, these associations will be used

quite fruitfully to sustain continuing research, both in the United States and in Asia and the Pacific, on legislatures and development.

Regarding the third basic objective, it can be said with confidence that the research carried out under the auspices of the program has contributed significantly to our knowledge of legislative performance and potential. Moreover, as the results of our survey of readers of the Comparative Legislative Studies Newsletter have shown, there is a broadened interest in the comparative study of legislatures--in the United States as well as overseas--both in the number of scholars involved and in the range and depth of the questions studied. Obviously the growth of this interest--what amounts almost to a movement--cannot be attributed to the work of the University of Hawaii project, or even to the University Consortium as a whole. Nevertheless, our role in the overall trend is not insignificant. In particular, the support that the University of Hawaii project gave to the Newsletter, from its inception, as a Consortium project, has contributed materially to heightening the consciousness of scholars around the world in the potential and importance of legislative studies. The final assessment of our program will, we submit, have to be judged by the growth of a widespread scholarly interest in comparative legislative studies at many institutions, rather than by the establishment of a concrete teaching and research program at any one of them, such as the University of Hawaii.

C. DETAILED REPORT

C.1. GENERAL BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF GRANT

Significantly, both U.S. foreign aid programs and American scholarship had paid little attention to the rise and role of legislatures in political and economic development prior to 1971 when the 211(d) grants were awarded to the University of Hawaii and the other members of the University Consortium. The Committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council, although it sponsored a wide range of studies on many aspects of political development as reflected in its many publications, never focused attention on the role of legislatures in development. It was, paradoxically, the American Society for Public Administration--financed by AID under the rubric of "institution-building"--that first brought the attention of the academic community to this subject by means of a conference and subsequent publication (Kornberg and Musolf, LEGISLATURES IN DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE, Duke University Press, 1970). The evidence presented in this volume justified the hypothesis that, in a variety of ways, legislative bodies could play an important role in the dynamics of development, even if they did not always do so. Moreover, it seemed reasonable to hypothesize that there were some important functions for development which could only be performed by legislatures so that, if they did not exist, or they worked very poorly, these functions would not be performed. The ASPA report to AID urged support for several academic research and teaching centers to test and elaborate these hypotheses.

With these hypotheses and recommendations in mind--while also mindful of the extraordinarily thin data base on which they were based--AID agreed

to support the growth of teaching and research on legislatures and development at three Universities in the Consortium: Duke, Iowa, and the University of Hawaii. The purpose of the grant was to facilitate the strengthening of faculty and teaching facilities, the training of advanced graduate students, both from the United States and abroad, the conduct of research, and the enlargement of library holdings so that, eventually, in this area of relative ignorance there would be some more solid knowledge and a significant body of experts. The extent to which, at the University of Hawaii, these purposes have been met may be judged from the materials contained in the following pages. At this point, however, it is relevant to mention that a consensual statement on what we now think we know about the role of legislatures in development and in the operation of political systems was compiled during the final year of our program, on the basis of a meeting of all University of Hawaii participants held in Honolulu, January 28-30, 1977, and the subsequent circulation and revision--several times--of the document attached to this report as Annex A.

## C.2. OBJECTIVES OF THE GRANT

a. Objectives re-stated. The basic objectives of the University of Hawaii grant, as originally stated and repeated yearly in previous reports, are to strengthen institutional capabilities in comparative legislative studies, to encourage cooperating colleagues to pursue their interest in the study of legislative institutions, and to contribute to the growth of knowledge on the legislature's link with change. These purposes were to be achieved by the following major activities:

i. Increasing faculty skills at the University of Hawaii, and redirecting the interests of other American and foreign scholars working

with the University of Hawaii toward the comparative legislative field;

ii. Training an increased number of graduate students at the University of Hawaii in the design and execution of research on the role of legislatures in the development of Asian and Pacific island countries;

iii. Expanding and revising the curricula of the University to include systematic study of legislative institutions;

iv. Establishing cooperative relationships with academic and legislative personnel in Asia and the Pacific for the development of research and study programs, bibliography and library materials, and faculty exchange programs; and

v. Development and dissemination of new knowledge about the role of legislative institutions in nation-building in order to stimulate the interest of academics and policy-makers.

b. Review of Objectives and Critical Assumptions. The premises upon which the grant was requested--augmented instruction of students and the conduct of research as the basis upon which to build a body of knowledge about legislatures--remain valid. As noted in previous report years, developments in Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand leading to drastic modification of the legislative institution's role in their respective political systems, and the suspicion and/or antagonism evidenced toward American involvement in the conduct of social science inquiry in Asia and the Pacific have made it necessary to view these countries' legislatures from afar rather than through field work conducted within their boundaries. Also, these same developments

have somewhat discouraged the conducting of research by nationals into the process and product of their respective legislative institutions.

This situation has now changed and we have been able to expand in-country research and liaison with foreign academics in Asia and the Pacific. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that the critical and objective assessment of the role of legislatures in development remains a formidable subject of enquiry, one which can be approached only with the utmost care and political sensitivity. These cautions remain, therefore, as serious constraints within which the purposes of the University of Hawaii program have been pursued.

### C.3. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

a. Grant Administration. As reported in previous years, a flexible approach was adopted for organizing the Comparative Legislative Studies Program (CLSP) at the University of Hawaii. Given the diversity of approach taken by historians, sociologists, and political scientists to the study of legislatures in developing countries, and the make-up of our interested faculty group--taking into account the fact that all but one had been recruited prior to the grant for reasons having nothing to do with legislative studies as such--we adopted a low profile and somewhat amorphous administrative structure.

At its core, CLSP/Hawaii consisted of an "executive committee," whose members were drawn from several departments and the East-West Center which, through its Institute for Technology and Development, has provided continuing support for some of the graduate students involved in the program. Throughout the period of the grant, the executive committee met from time to time, on the initiative of the program director,

who served without extra compensation as general coordinator. The administration of funds was handled through the contract office of the University, the Director of Research, and more specifically the Social Science Research Institute--later the Social Sciences and Linguistics Institute.

In addition, a CLSP Colloquium convened during each academic year in order to give interested students and faculty members an opportunity to discuss common problems and to hear and respond to reports by visiting and resident researchers on their work. The Hawaii program also sponsored one international conference, in association with the Consortium, on "Legislative Origins," and it supported participation by its members in a variety of conferences held elsewhere.

A special complication in the administration of the grant arose from the fact that funds were ear-marked in the proposal for research to be accomplished by two "associates," Lloyd Musolf and Richard Sisson, who were not in residence in Hawaii, but lived and taught throughout the grant period at the Universities of California in Davis and Los Angeles, respectively. Since the University of Hawaii regulations preclude the payment of salaries to persons who are not regularly associated with the University, it was necessary to negotiate and renew from year to year an administrative arrangement whereby Musolf and Sisson could be considered faculty associates, without salary, of this University.

It may perhaps be pointed out here that, given the geographically mobile character of professional careers and the inability of any University to justify, under normal conditions, excessive concentration of its resources in any one subject field, the use of a university contract to administer a program designed to strengthen the American

commitment to and understanding of any single problem area is a peculiarly inflexible and arbitrary arrangement. Our original proposal for a "consortium" to promote research and teaching on legislatures in development called for the use (or establishment) of a national organization through which interested individuals at a variety of universities would be encouraged and supported, together with some of their students.

The decision of Michael Mezey, chief anchor man of the University of Hawaii's CLSP program, to transfer to another university, clearly illustrates the precarious basis on which any university-based institutional development program for a special subject field is founded. As a matter of fact, Mezey himself will continue to work on the comparative study of legislatures, completing the manuscript of his important book on the subject, editing the Newsletter, and teaching related courses. Experience in a variety of contexts has clearly shown that a more substantial basis for the institutionalization of a subject field than any single university is the collectivity of individuals, wherever located, who share a primary interest in that field. It seems regrettable that the rules which govern 211(d) grants and AID policy generally preclude support for the institutionalization of subject fields organized in this way. Had such an administrative mode been feasible, we could now retain a formal association with Mezey and others like him who, regularly, move from one university home to another.

These considerations are mentioned only to show that, within the constraints imposed by the arbitrary format of a university-based grant for institution-building purposes, every effort was made to accomplish those purposes. Unfortunately, for reasons outside our control, we

have not been able to establish as comprehensive and stable a continuing program of research and teaching in the field of comparative legislatures as we had originally hoped.

As to administrative costs, the amount spent to complete the five-year program, during the year and a half of the final "report year," came to \$3,260. This makes the total administrative costs for the whole five-year period \$5,590, which compares with \$6,000 in our original budget projections as reported in 1972, and \$4,900 as projected in the 1975 report. To explain the rising costs of administration over the five-year period it may be noted that during our first years the Social Science Research Institute was able to pick up much of our administrative costs but, following the curtailment of the University's budget and the re-organization of the SSRI into the Social Sciences and Linguistics Institute, each project administered within the Institute was required to cover, on a cost-accounting basis, its full operating expenses.

b. U.H. Instruction. A high point in the instructional program of the Comparative Legislative Studies Program was reached during the Spring term of 1976 when the Exxon-financed course on the simulation of legislative behavior in selected assemblies was conducted with enthusiastic student interest and participation. Unfortunately, Mezey's departure on leave of absence during the academic year 1976/7, and his subsequent decision to accept an appointment at another institution, made it impossible for us to continue offering the same simulation course. However, starting in the Fall term of 1977, Richard Chadwick, with NSF funding, is launching a new simulation laboratory for students taking a variety of courses involving organizational decision-making topics. Students involved in these exercises may choose to focus on decision-making in legislative bodies.

As noted in previous annual reports, other members of the faculty have made a point to introduce material on legislatures in their courses, but they have not been specifically focused on this theme. The contexts have ranged from the study of comparative politics and development to organization theory, American and Hawaiian government, and policy making processes. Those involved have been Harry Ball of the Sociology Department, and the following members of the Political Science Department: Robert Cahill, Harry Friedman, Norman Meller, Glenn D. Paige, Fred W. Riggs, Ira Rohter, and Robert Stauffer.

It should be added that under the leadership of Richard Sisson a set of core courses on comparative legislatures has been established on a continuing basis at U.C.L.A. These courses consist of an undergraduate course primarily devoted to the study of American legislative institutions; a graduate level course more concerned with the analysis of legislative behavior generally, plus a two-quarter graduate course in legislative development and performance. A graduate course on Congress and Human Rights is also offered. Leo M. Snowiss, in addition to Sisson, has been actively involved in teaching these courses. Their syllabus on "The Institutionalization of Representative Government: The Legislative Dimension" is a notable contribution to the organization and documentation of a course in our field of interest. (For more details, see Annex C.)

The colloquium for those interested in comparative legislative studies at the University of Hawaii was continued during the final year and presentations were made by Jack Dukesbury on his field research in Indonesia; Diana Sabater on her work concerning the Philippine political system and its experience with legislative bodies; Norman Meller on his research and observations in Micronesia; Michael Mezey on his simulation

exercise (with Loo and Shimoda) and on the progress of his book dealing with the comparative study of legislatures; Richard Sisson on his research in India; Lloyd Musolf on his research concerning the Malaysian legislature; Norman Meller on legislative reference services in Japan and the U.S.; and Robert Stauffer on the demise of the Philippine Congress.

In financial terms, we spent a total of \$29,473 on the salaries of faculty members (Michael Mezey and Robert Stauffer) during the fifth "report year," bringing our total instructional expenditures for the five-year period to \$87,423. This compares with a projected expenditure for the final year (in our 1975 report) of \$32,197, and \$90,147 for the total grant period. Our original projection in 1972 for the whole period had been \$71,500. Actual costs for faculty salaries were difficult to predict because they are set by University policy, inflationary increases, and the actual salary level of the personnel involved, as determined by arrangements made outside our control. The savings required to meet this higher obligation were made by a small cut in the amount spent for library materials and data, and a more substantial reduction in the amount actually spent on foreign linkages. For reasons explained below, it turned out not to be feasible to establish such linkages at the level originally anticipated.

It should be added that while our associates, Lloyd Musolf and Richard Sisson, taught and promoted the development of instructional programs related to legislatures--especially at the University of California--all the funds paid them from our grant were solely for the support of their research.

c. Student Assistance. As reported in previous years, a portion of the AID funds was spent to facilitate the graduate work of students prepared to focus on subjects relevant to the understanding of legislatures in comparative perspective. We were able to take advantage of the interest of some students whose graduate work had already been funded from other sources, both private and institutional, including fellowships given by the University of Hawaii and the East-West Center. A mixture of American and foreign students, coming from the Asia/Pacific area, were involved in the program. One of the criteria used in selection was not only their academic promise but also the likelihood that they would be able, in their subsequent careers, to contribute further to the growth of knowledge and interest in comparative legislative studies.

Summarizing the program's work with advanced graduate students during the five-year period, we can report the following:

i. Completion of doctoral programs. The following candidates finished their work for the Ph.D.:

Toshiyuki Nishikawa, from Japan, with a thesis on "Newcomers to the House of Representatives of the Japanese Diet 1946-1969: Patterns of Turnover, Recruitment, and Career Development." He is currently engaged in teaching and research in Japan.

Talmadge Day, an American citizen, with a thesis on "Study of Political Opportunity in Hawaii, 1926-66." He took a position with the U.S. Congress upon completion of his degree.

Haingja Kim, from Korea, with a thesis on "Case Study of Female Legislators in the U.S. House of Representative and the National Assembly of Korea." She has returned to Korea to take a position at Ewa Women's University.

ii. Dissertation Research in Progress. The following candidates are matriculated for the Ph.D. at the University of Hawaii and are currently engaged in research and writing on their dissertations.

John Dukesbury, an American citizen, continues to work in Indonesia with the research topic: "Parliament and the Policy Process in Indonesia: Problems of Intergration and Institutional Adaptation."

Diana Sabater, from the Philippines, after having done field work in Washington and at home, is currently in Hawaii working on her thesis under the title: "Legislatures and Economic Development: The Case of the Philippine Congress."

Yung-chul Paik, from Korea, is currently engaged in field work in Korea, on the thesis topic: "Legislative Conflict Resolution in Developmental Perspective: The Case of Korea (1948-1972)."

Carl Heine, from Micronesia, is now in Hawaii, engaged in doctoral research on the legislative process in Micronesia. His monograph, MICRONESIA AT THE CROSSROADS, was published by the University Press of Hawaii in 1974, at which time he also completed his M.A. degree in the Department, and subsequently took a leave of absence to return home and serve in the Micronesian Constitutional Convention of 1975.

iii. Drop-outs. As in every academic program, some students who commence a program change their minds and either drop out of academic life or switch to a different field or topic. In our case we have to report with regret:

Jane Mastro, an American citizen with prior experience in India, Nepal, and Pakistan, after having accepted support from our AID funds for one year's work towards a doctoral degree found out subsequently that the

research in which she was interested was not sufficiently related to legislative studies to justify our continuing support.

iv. Graduate Students as Assistants. It should be added that a significant number of graduate students were employed on an hourly basis to provide research assistance to faculty members. The expenditures incurred in this way were budgeted as research costs, but the incidental support provided for graduate students has enabled some of them to pursue their interests in legislative studies. In addition, two students (Jeffrey Loo and Michael Shimoda) were financed to work with Michael Mezey in the simulation course, and we have classified their support under the heading of student assistance.

v. Funds Used. So far as expenditures for student assistance is concerned, we spent a total of \$10,782 during the fifth "report year" for this purpose, divided as follows: Diana Sabater, \$3,550; Jack Dukesbury, \$2,488; Jeffrey Loo, \$2,372; and Michael Shimoda, \$2,372. Dukesbury's primary support was provided by the East-West Center, supplemented from our grant; Sabater has been principally supported, at the dissertation stage, from grant funds; and Loo and Shimoda, as noted above, were supported while participating in the legislative simulation project.

The fifth "report year" expenditures for student assistance have brought our total costs in this category to \$37,369, as compared with a projected figure of \$37,059 in the 1975 report, and an original round sum of \$38,000 given in 1972.

d. Library Resources. In keeping with the policies explained in previous reports, the program continued to work with and through the University Library to enhance the resources of its collection relevant to the comparative study of legislatures. This involved a dual approach, first preparing comprehensive bibliographies of the field, and then checking the library's current holdings. Against the deficiencies revealed by this process, the library has been asked to order, within the limits of its budget and staff, as much as possible of the missing materials. Simultaneously the program has taken responsibility for securing directly a limited number of items which the library for one reason or another could not acquire.

In order to keep the acquisition of resources within reasonable bounds, an early decision was made to concentrate on a few areas of special interest to our program--bearing in mind also the fact that other libraries in the Consortium would be building up their collections on other areas. Several countries in Asia were given top priority, notably Indonesia, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand. In addition, an effort was made to collect materials concerning the legislatures of Micronesia and Polynesia, including the reports and publications of these bodies.

A special project involved the acquisition, through University Microfilms, of as many as possible of the American doctoral dissertations completed since World War II on topics related to comparative legislative studies. The present holdings of this collection now include 64 dissertations.

Because of the special interest of our program in the staffing and legislative reference facilities of legislatures and their impact on performance, we have also given priority to the acquisition of materials on this subject, including as many as possible of the legislative documents that give a summary report or overview of the legislative reference or research services of these bodies.

In order to facilitate the research of our own students, the materials ordered directly by and for CLSP have been retained in an office within the Social Sciences and Linguistics Institute. They will eventually be divided and transferred to the University Library and the Reading Room of the Political Science Department so as to minimize duplication and optimize the availability of these materials to interested scholars.

Actual expenditures during the final "report year" for library resources and data came to \$1,150, bringing the five-year total to \$1,974. This compares with an original estimate of \$4,000, and the drastically curtailed projection of \$2,000 given in 1975. As reported earlier, we found at first that the University Library could pick up all of the reference materials we required, except for certain categories such as doctoral dissertations, a few Pacific Island legislative reports, and some documents concerning legislative staffs and reference services. Subsequently, however, as the University budget came under extreme retrenchment pressures, the library had to reduce its purchases of "fringe" materials, and we decided to acquire a larger stock of important research materials.

e. Faculty Research. From the beginning of CLSP, as noted previously in our annual reports, the available funds have not been sufficient to employ full-time faculty researchers. We have, however, been able to take advantage of the established research interests of several faculty members to encourage them to devote more time and attention to the comparative study of legislatures, especially as they relate to political and administrative development, primarily but not exclusively in the context of Asia and the Pacific. The main form in which payments have been made to encourage such research has been the support of student research assistants, typing, Xeroxing, and related office services, computer time, and occasional summer overload salary payments.

It should be noted that the category of "faculty" is not limited to employees of the University of Hawaii. Two of our faculty researchers were, from the beginning, "associates" of the program, under the terms of our proposal and budget, namely Richard Sisson of the University of California, Los Angeles; and Lloyd Musolf of the University of California, Davis. In addition, in support of our aim to strengthen cooperative research with scholars overseas, a number of mature scholars working in Asia--notably in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Japan--have received supplementary support for research done in cooperation with one of the Americans at the University of Hawaii. The overall tally of faculty research accomplished under the aegis of the Hawaii contract, therefore, includes a number of studies carried out by scholars not regularly employed at the University of Hawaii.

Because of the disparate interest of the faculty concerned, and also the desirability of encouraging a variety of methods, levels of analysis, and perspective, it would be an exaggeration to specify a single

focus of research efforts. Each researcher, in effect, was permitted to carry on according to his or her own priorities and interests, subject to an overall judgment by the executive committee of the program that the research was in fact germane to our program's overall concern with the comparative study of legislatures.

Subject to this caveat, however, some topics appear to have been given particular attention by our researchers, notably longitudinal studies of legislative membership, providing a basis for evaluating some of the links between recruitment patterns, socialization and career paths with legislative process and product, and the dynamics of political change. Another focus of research has been the relation between legislatures and other governmental structures, especially bureaucracies and political parties, and the role of legislative staffing in the processes of institutionalization.

Despite the diversity and breadth of research interests, it is notable that, at the end of the grant period, faculty participants in the project were able to reach a consensus on some fundamental propositions concerning the role of legislatures in political development, as reported in the statement appended to this report as Annex A.

A list of our faculty researchers with a summary of the work each has undertaken throughout the period of the grant, plus a bibliography of their relevant papers and publications, is given, for convenient reference, in Annex B. More detail on the U.C.L.A. program is contained in Annex C.

Expenditures attributable to research during the final "report year" came to \$31,999--of which \$2,000 can be attributed to the support of

research in Malaysia and Indonesia by local scholars, and hence to our foreign linkage budget, thereby reducing the net research expenditure to \$29,999.

The research funds spent during the final "report year" were distributed as follows:

George Akita	2,270	Fred W. Riggs	1,630
John Grumm	830	Richard Sisson	7,599
Yasumasa Kuroda	3,372	L. W. Shrader	3,209
Norman Meller	5,070	Indonesian associates	1,000
Michael Mezey	1,001	Malaysian associates	1,000
Lloyd Musolf	5,018	TOTAL	31,999

These funds were divided, for the most part, between grants for overload salary during vacation periods, and support for student research assistants.

For the total five-year period of our grant, then, research costs came to \$85,524, of which \$3,519 could be attributed to foreign linkage projects, giving a net research cost of \$82,005. This compares with our original budget estimate of \$90,000, and the 1975 projection of \$83,892--or \$80,383 if the amount attributable to foreign liaison (\$3,519) is subtracted.

f. Foreign Linkages. Previous annual reports have described, chronologically, the diverse efforts of the Hawaii program to create and extend a range of international contacts with scholars and institutions sharing our interest in the comparative study of legislatures. Here, to complete our record and summarize what has gone before we present, by geographical categories, an account of the foreign linkages of our

program. While specializing in relationships with the Asia/Pacific region, we have also not neglected other connections that had a potential for promoting the objectives of our program.

We have participated, primarily through the efforts of Michael Mezey, in the work of the Research Committee on Legislative Development, of the International Political Science Association, which held two international conferences, in Rio de Janeiro, August 1974, and in Penang, Malaysia, March 1975. We have arranged for exchanges of material and communication with the Inter-Parliamentary Union, headquartered in Geneva, and the European Consortium for Political Research, on the basis of visits and follow-up correspondence by Norman Meller and Fred Riggs. Relationships with the Asian Parliamentary Union, headquartered in Manila, were established by Robert Stauffer.

At the individual country level, the following relationships were established:

Fiji. Norman Meller has worked with John Chick of the University of South Pacific, and they collaborated in preliminary planning a Pacific Islands legislators conference. Chick attended the conference on Legislative Origins held in Hawaii in April 1974.

India. Richard Sisson, on the basis of extended field work in India, has created a range of contacts with universities and research centers in Rajasthan and Maharastra notably the SIES in Bombay, where he collaborated closely with Ram Joshi. He also has personal contacts in the Indian Social Science Research Center.

Indonesia. John Dukesbury, who is still doing field research in Indonesia, has worked particularly closely with the Center for Strategic and

International Studies, which we have assisted financially to carry out some related studies. Dukesbury has also worked with the University of Indonesia, the Law Faculty of Gadjja Mada University and the Rural Development Centers of Bandung and Yogyakarta.

Japan. Both Yasumasa Kuroda and George Akita have maintained close relations with individual scholars and institutions in Japan. One of our new Ph.D.'s whose work focused on legislative studies is Toshiyuki Nishikawa, who is currently engaged in research and teaching in Japan.

Korea. The Center for Korean Studies at the University of Hawaii maintains a broad range of contacts with scholarly institutions and individuals in South Korea. These include the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University and the Center for Asian Studies at Korea University, both of which have scholars interested in legislative studies. In addition, Haingja Kim, one of the graduates of our program, is now teaching at Ewa Women's University, and Yung-chul Paik who has received support from our program, is currently engaged in his field research for the dissertation in Korea. Dr. Young-Whan Hahn, who served on the CLSP executive committee while he was a staff member of the East-West Center, Technology and Development Institute, has returned to a position in Korea as a faculty member of Joong-ang University.

Malaysia. Our most active links in Malaysia have evolved from the field work there of Lloyd Musolf, focusing particularly on the Malaysian Centre for Development Studies, but including also the Institute of Public Administration, several of whose staff members were assisted by Musolf. In addition, Michael Mezey has built relations with several faculty members at the Universiti Sains Malaysia, including M. C. Kumbhat and Y. M. Marican,

whose studies of constituency relations between members of Parliament and state legislatures in Malaysia has been facilitated by modest financial support from our AID funds.

Micronesia. Very strong, continuing relations with legislators and scholars in Micronesia have been established by Norman Meller, who continues to serve as an adviser in the area, currently being engaged as a consultant to the Ponape District legislature. In addition, Carl Heine, from Micronesia, is now working on his Ph.D. in our program, and John Haglegam, a Congressman from Yap, is finishing his M.A. in our program.

Philippines. The most active member of our groups in the Philippines has been Robert Stauffer, whose personal contacts there include the Political Science Department and the Graduate School of Public Administration in the University of the Philippines. Riggs, as a former visiting professor at the University of the Philippines, also has personal relationships among interested scholars there. Miss Diana Sabater, who is currently completing her dissertation on the Philippines under our auspices, expects to return to her country and will teach at the University of the Philippines.

Thailand. Mike Mezey's connections in Thailand have been particularly strong, based originally on his year there as a Fulbright visiting professor. He has worked with faculty members at Chulalongkorn University to plan a program of legislative studies there. Riggs has also worked in Thailand--he published a book on the Thai polity in 1966--and has good personal relations with key faculty members at the National Institute of Development Administration. Dr. Chai-Anan Samudavanija of NIDA and Chulalongkorn, who played a key role in the drafting of the constitution for

the democratic regime, was a participant in the Legislative Origins conference in Hawaii, and remains in contact with us.

As for our expenditures attributable to foreign linkages, actual costs during the final report year came to only \$2,000, including \$1,000 for the research of M. C. Kumbhat and Y. M. Marican at the Universiti Sains Malaysia and \$1,000 for two small projects in Indonesia, administered through the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (with assistance of John Dukesbury).

No funds spent for conferences and meetings during the final report year could be attributed to foreign linkages. In 1975 we had, actually, budgeted for a subvention to facilitate the holding of the Pacific Legislators Conference, but this meeting was not held, so we had no occasion to expend these budgeted funds.

Our total, five-year expenditures for foreign linkages, therefore, came to \$5,900, of which \$3,519 is attributable to research, and \$2,381 to conferences and meetings. In Table I, Annex E, it will be seen that these items are shown as part of our research and conference costs, but the figures shown in parentheses indicate the portion of these sums that may be attributed to foreign linkages.

Our original estimate for this type of expenditure in 1972 came to \$12,000, but actual experience soon demonstrated that this was an unrealistic expectation, especially as the opportunities that we had originally hoped to open up in the Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia, and Korea failed to materialize. Although we do maintain the contacts reported above, they did not evolve into active collaborative or partnership research. Meanwhile, growing pressure on our budget for instructional

and research costs, including conference expenses, compelled us to cut back on this item and devote more resources to the others. The projection offered in 1975 put our total foreign linkage budget at \$7,800, almost \$2,000 more than we finally spent.

g. Conferences. One of the important ways in which the research and international linkages of our program could be furthered was by participation in both national and international conferences at which discussions concerning comparative legislative studies were held with colleagues at other institutions, and research findings were presented in preliminary form. To summarize and provide an overview of the participation by members of the U.H. group in conferences, and also to show how foreign linkages were strengthened by helping foreign scholars participate in such meetings, the table which follows has been prepared. The titles of papers given by Hawaii participants are reported in Annex B under the name of each participant.

CONFERENCES IN WHICH PERSONS ASSOCIATED WITH  
THE HAWAII PROGRAM PARTICIPATED

<u>Date</u>	<u>Conference</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Hawaii-related Participant</u>
1972 Nov.	Southern Political Science Association	Atlanta, Ga.	Mezey
1973 Feb.	Society for International Development	Costa Rica	Barber
Mar.	International Studies Assn.	San Francisco	Stauffer
Mar.	Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania	Orcas I., Wash.	Meller
Apr.	American Society for Public Administration	Los Angeles	Meller
Aug.	International Political Science Association	Montreal	Cahill, Kuroda, Riggs, Mezey

## CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION (continued)

1974 Apr.	Hawaii conference (for details see below)		
Aug.	IPSA Research Committee on Legislative Development	Rio de Janeiro	Mezey
Aug.	American Political Science Association	Chicago	Mezey, Riggs, Meller
Nov.	6th Annual Pacific Conference of Legislators	Saipan	Meller
Dec.	Western Association for Asian Studies	Tucson, Ariz.	Meller
1975 Jan.	2d International Conference on Legislatures & Contemporary Societies	Albany, NY	Kuroda
Mar.	IPSA Research Committee on Legislative Development, meeting on the Role of Parliamentary Politicians	Penang	Mezey, Musolf, Dukesbury
Aug.	Conference on Legislatures and Development	Carmel, Cal.	Dukesbury, Musolf
1976 Aug.	International Political Science Association	Edinburgh	Mezey, Musolf
Sept.	American Political Science Association	Chicago	Mezey, Musolf, Riggs
1977 March	International Studies Association	St. Louis	Riggs
April	Association for Asian Studies	New York	Meller

The major input of participants in the Hawaii program, however, was achieved during the conference on legislative origins, jointly sponsored with the Consortium, held in Honolulu from April 1-4, 1974. Detailed information on this conference was given in the report for 1974. By way of summary, it may be mentioned here that participants from the University of Hawaii program, including its associates, were: Harry Ball, Robert Cahill, Yasumasa Kuroda, Norman Meller, Michael Mezey, Lloyd Musolf,

Fred Riggs, and Richard Sisson. Riggs gave one of the major papers of the meeting, entitled: "Legislative Origins: A Contextual Approach." Foreign linkages were enhanced by the attendance, with help from the Hawaii program, of Chai-Anan Samudavanija of Thailand; John Chick from Fiji; Young-Whan Hahn from Korea, and Robert Jackson from Canada, representing the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

During the fifth "report year" we spent a total of \$3,253 for expenses connected with conferences and meetings, primarily for travel costs. This included \$1,514 paid to Mike Mezey, Lloyd Musolf, and Richard Sisson to enable them to come to Hawaii during January 1977 for a de-briefing and evaluation of their research and also to join in a discussion of the research findings of our various studies which led to the preparation of the joint statement given in Annex A. The remaining funds were used mainly to support participation by our members at meetings of the American Political Science Association, and the International Political Science Association, where they presented papers and joined planning sessions. Most of the costs of participation by our project participants in conferences and meetings, however, were covered by non-grant funds.

The conference and meeting costs for the total five-year period came to \$15,472, of which \$2,381 is attributable to foreign linkage, bringing our net cost for American participants to \$13,091. This compares with an original budget of \$13,500 made in 1972, and a projection of \$14,832 made in 1975, or \$10,951 if a deduction of \$3,881 for foreign linkages is taken into account. This means that, although our actual costs for conferences and meetings were more than originally anticipated, they were not much more than we projected in our last report. Since the value to the project of

opportunities for face to face consultation with counterparts working in other institutions is invaluable, we consider this money well allocated.

h. Consortium. As previously reported, Hawaii has been an active participant in the Consortium for Comparative Legislative Studies, together with Duke University--where the Consortium is administered by Allan Kornberg, whose reports provide detailed information about its activities--the University of Iowa, and the State University of New York, Albany. Participation in Consortium meetings has been arranged at minimal cost by taking advantage of conferences and meetings which bring members of the Executive Committee together without additional cost to the University budget--with a few exceptions, when the program's administrative budget was tapped for travel expenses.

Most of the activities sponsored by the Consortium in which Hawaii participated are identified under the heading of conferences and foreign linkages. In addition, apart from participation in the making of Consortium policy decisions, the main contribution of Hawaii has been to the publications program by providing the editorial facilities, under direction of Michael Mezey, for launching and editing the CLS Newsletter. Starting with a survey of interest, it quickly grew to a distribution list of about 500, half in the U.S. and the other half overseas. The lively interest either sparked by or reflected in reports contained in the Newsletter can be measured by the positive results of the survey of Newsletter readers made by the Hawaii program during the final year of our grant--as reported in Annex D.

During the final year, arrangements were completed for inclusion of the Newsletter in the new Legislative Studies Quarterly, and also for the

independent distribution of the newsletter to those of its recipients who do not subscribe to the LSQ. During this period, also, while Mezey was at Wesleyan University, he continued to collect materials and edit the newsletter, a function which he plans to continue from his new position in Chicago, at DePaul University.

i. Service. As previously reported, the CLSP at the University of Hawaii was designed from its inception as primarily an academic activity focusing on research and the development of scholarly competence. It was always recognized, however, that one of the important fruits of such competence should be the capacity of those associated with the program to provide assistance to legislators and legislative staffs, or in other ways to offer practical and technical assistance to those directly concerned with the conduct and utilization of legislative processes.

Within the context of this philosophy, none of the AID funds were directly utilized to support the servicing of any legislatures. Nevertheless, as previously reported, several scholars and legislators have been directly assisted. The most notable achievements in this respect have clearly been those of Norman Meller who, even now, is working in Micronesia as resident adviser to the Ponape District Legislature. Previously, he served as adviser to the Micronesian Constitutional Convention, helping them establish staff services to facilitate their operations, and he also assisted the Congress of Micronesia.

A number of scholars and legislators visiting Hawaii, both on their own initiative and also in connection with the activities of the East-West Center have also consulted with scholars involved in the CLSP on some of the practical problems involved in the work of legislative bodies.

#### 4. IMPACT OF GRANT SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES ON THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIVE STUDIES

As we pointed out in our preceding annual reports, the launching of a campus-based program in Hawaii is only one component of a larger thrust, organized through the Consortium, to institutionalize comparative legislative studies as a significant focus of scholarly and practical activity. Even within the context of the Hawaii program, the association with our program of two leading specialists on legislatures who are based at mainland universities--Richard Sisson at U.C.L.A., and Lloyd Musolf at U.C. Davis--symbolizes the broader framework within which the institutionalization of this important new field of inquiry has to be assessed.

The main tools of institutionalization, previously reported, include the launching of a publications program (including a newsletter, a professional journal, occasional papers and monographs); the stimulation of several national and international professional associations to include panels on matters relating to the behavior and functions of legislatures in their regular program; an increasing number of scholars whose specializations include close study of legislatures, regardless of where, in the United States or abroad, they may be teaching and doing their research; and a growing consciousness of the importance of legislative variables within the context of other foci of interest, whether they be primarily concerned with development, administration, economic growth, social justice, human rights, or ecological concerns.

An important measure of the degree to which the Hawaii program--together with the others embraced in our Consortium--has succeeded in promoting the institutionalization of comparative legislative studies

may be obtained by looking at the results of our survey of the CLS Newsletter's readership, as reported in Annex D of this report.

At the narrower level of future activities to be carried out within the University of Hawaii, our five-year program has increased the interest and sensitivity of a number of faculty members and students in the further comparative study of legislative problems as they affect development. Nevertheless, the decision of Michael Mezey--as the person with primary interests in this subject who was recruited to join our faculty for this program and, as a sign of the University's good faith, was awarded a tenure position in the Department of Political Science--to take a position at another University, for the present, has seriously undermined the continuity and forward thrust of our local program.

A broader concept of institutionalization, as explained in #C.3.a. above, however, recognizes that, given the spread of modern communications and transportation facilities, and the increasing mobility of professional persons, it is more realistic to institutionalize the study of any subject on the foundation of committed individuals, regardless of their geographic location. A decade ago Riggs prepared an essay called "The Concept of a Floating Center" which explored this subject and spelled out in some detail the specific techniques by which a national or international institution, based on the interest of key individuals regardless of their locations, could provide a strong basis for the institutionalization of the study of many subject fields.

Given this perspective, there is no cause for undue disappointment that our original hopes for a more dynamic and continuously growing campus-based program of legislative studies at the University of Hawaii

has currently encountered some set-backs. Rather, we rejoice in the contributions that we have already made to the institutionalization of what has now become, both nationally and internationally, a recognized field of teaching, research, and action. The increasing number of military authoritarianisms around the world, and the growing consciousness in America of the importance of human rights suggest, we believe, that more attention will now be paid to the conditions under which legislative bodies are born, thrive, and contribute to the effective performance of democratic political systems capable of protecting the rights of minorities and, indeed, of all citizens.

5. UTILIZATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE CAPABILITIES IN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

As previously reported, members of the faculty of the University of Hawaii have often been called upon, under the sponsorship of AID-contract programs, as well as in the context of other operations, to contribute their knowledge and skills to the development programs of countries in Asia and the Pacific.

On some occasions individuals actively associated with our program in comparative legislative studies have participated in such activities. No additional information on them will be added here--in general the volume of such activities has declined but they continue on a modest scale.

So far as the purposes of the Hawaii program for comparative legislative studies are concerned, within the context of a 211(d) grant from AID, it should be noted that the funds available, over a five year period, enabled us to provide regular salary support for the equivalent of only one full-time professional. Other faculty members received purely marginal

support, a little overload research time during the summer, some travel support and student assistance. The remaining funds were utilized for library acquisitions, foreign linkages, and administrative expenses, as indicated elsewhere in this report. No direct financial support for service activities was provided.

It is our understanding of the philosophy behind the 211(d) program that it provides an incentive and some resources to enhance the capabilities of selected American institutions to provide expertise and service in fields of knowledge not normally supported by their routine domestic operations. With respect to legislative studies, American universities had already developed a reasonably high level of expertise concerning the operations of American legislatures, but they had neither the resources nor the incentives to study the operations of legislatures in other countries, especially in the Third World, or to analyze their relation to developmental processes.

The Consortium, and the Hawaii contract, were intended to fill that gap by enabling a few American and foreign scholars to devote more systematic attention to the range of problems called "comparative legislative studies." We feel that, as reported above in #C.4, we have institutionalized the study of this field in a broad sense. However, no provision was made in the contract for the support of concrete services, especially in developing countries. Although members of our faculty, when called upon to participate in technical assistance programs, have done so quite willingly, it must also be said that they could not do so unless some agency or other program picked up the necessary costs. If it was the intention of AID when making 211(d) grants to utilize the institutional resources thereby

created to carry out service contracts, then we must candidly admit that AID has not seen fit so far to make any special use of our capabilities as they have been developed through the CLSP.

Previous annual reports have candidly acknowledged this fact, as indicated by the following quotation for our latest (1975) report.

"While the Hawaii Program both presently and in the future stands ready to apply its institutional capacities to the solution of LDC problems, its abilities to do so must remain conditioned by the necessity of obtaining substitute funding to replace surrendered institutional salaries. In addition, faculty with continuing teaching responsibilities cannot be expected to absent themselves from their classes for more than short periods of time. Briefly put, the Hawaii Program will continue to encourage requests for assistance within the constraints of its competence and its resources. It has no plans for contracting to provide services which will entail the hiring of personnel solely to engage in performing such services."

We may add that our research has, we believe, shown some significant ways in which both the operations and the functions of legislative bodies in Third World countries differ from those familiar to us in the United States, and even in other Western countries. We now feel that it is a mistake, and potentially misleading, to impart knowledge of American legislative procedures, structures, and techniques in training programs for legislators, scholars, and government officials of other countries based, with few qualifications, on American experience. In this sense the fundamental premise of the 211(d) grants for comparative legislative studies have clearly been justified--we have learned that knowledge about

legislatures and development can be systematically gained, and that it is highly relevant to the processes of development, but it can only be gained by special study and not by simply generalizing from our own experience.

#### 6. OTHER RESOURCES FOR GRANT RELATED-ACTIVITIES

For the fifth and final "report year," as for previous years, the amount of support for our program drawn from non-grant related sources substantially exceeded the amount of AID funding provided, especially when one considers that the administrative overhead charges normally taken by the University on the basis of personnel costs incurred under contracts or grants was also borne by the State of Hawaii.

It seems redundant here to repeat the various categories in which non-grant related funding supported relevant activities--they included faculty time, tuition wavers, computer rental and time, library acquisitions and the handling of materials, extra secretarial services, support for travel to meetings, and student support. Overall, we are confident that the contributions made by staff members and the University community to the support of our comparative legislative studies program--plus a few outside sources, such as the East-West Center--substantially exceeded the total cash value of the grant received from AID.

#### 7. PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

In each previous yearly report we specified plans for the ensuing year so as to identify the ways available AID funds would be utilized so as to secure the greatest possible programmatic impact. Moreover,

the availability of the nucleus of AID money made it possible to attract support from other sources so as to encourage an augmented program. In addition, it provided a special incentive for both faculty and students to participate in the activities sponsored by the program--not only in the hope that they might be able to benefit directly through the use of facilities and perhaps of funds made available by the program, but also because beyond a critical threshold, the generation of vigorous activity in any subject field always creates a magnet that attracts others.

a. Teaching and Research. Whether or not the critical threshold can now be sustained is an open question. If we had been able to retain the services of Michael Mezey as the faculty member whose sustained focus of interest was on legislative studies, there would be little doubt at this point that he could have sustained the requisite level of activity and interest through his personal teaching and research notwithstanding the termination of grant funds. As a matter of fact, he will continue these activities, finishing his book manuscript (now accepted by Duke University Press) which will, certainly, make an important impact on the discipline and become a basic text. He will also continue to edit the CLS Newsletter, thereby providing a vehicle for linking scholars around the world who share our concern with the study of legislatures. Unfortunately for Hawaii, however, he will do this in Chicago rather than in Honolulu!

As for Norman Meller, the first director of our program, and a scholar whose concern with legislative problems has been a major focus of his work for many years, he has decided to retire early. This means, of course, that our academic program in Honolulu will not enjoy the benefit of his direct leadership and participation. Nationally, however, he will

continue to serve as an asset for the institutionalization of comparative legislative studies, as noted above in #C. 4. He is currently serving as an adviser to the Ponape District Legislature in Micronesia in its chartering of that district, thereby acting in a service capacity, one of the basic long-term purposes of our program. We expect him to continue to serve in this capacity for some time since he remains in good health and will assuredly receive additional invitations to advise legislatures, especially but by no means exclusively in Micronesia and other Pacific area jurisdictions.

Fred Riggs, currently serving on a pinch-hitting basis as the program's director during its wind-up phase, has for many years focused his attention on the problems of comparative and development administration, which rest at their core on the performance of public bureaucracies. In this context he has seen the role of legislatures (especially when viewed in the context of their organic linkage with party systems) as a major constraint on bureaucratic behavior, and hence as an essential part of the study of public administration. Insofar as his continuing research and teaching--which now includes a heavy emphasis on the ecological aspects of development (or political ecology) and also on bureaucratic politics--will require giving some attention to the performance and characteristics of legislatures, he will remain involved in the sphere of interest of the CLSP. However, he will not be able to devote the amount of time and energy to this field that it requires.

As for the other members of the Department of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, those who have participated in the program will continue to teach and do research, bringing legislative problems and performance into these activities as appropriate. Perhaps the most

actively involved member of the Department will be Robert Stauffer whose primary focus of attention has been on political development and comparative politics. He continues to focus on Philippine politics, and to give special attention, within that context, to the role of the former Congress, and the consequences of its dissolution. He is also supervising several doctoral dissertations sponsored by our program, including that of Diana Sabater, who expects to return to the Philippines as a teacher-researcher. We are confident she will help to sustain an interest in her own country in the study of legislatures.

Yasumasa Kuroda has a long-term interest in Japanese politics, which he will continue to teach, and in this context, he will assuredly devote more attention to the Japanese Diet, especially to its members. He may be expected to publish a good deal of material on this subject in the years ahead. His interest in this topic is reinforced by the biographical-historical work of George Akita, of our History Department, who also has a continuing, and related, research interest. Akita is currently director of the University's Asian Studies Program which, while it consumes a great deal of his time for administrative work, also puts him in a strategic position to further some of the goals of our program.

As for participants in other related disciplines, important contributions will be made by Harry Ball of the Sociology Department, whose interest in problems relating to the sociology of law has led him to devote considerable attention, in a comparative perspective, to the relation between legislative performance and the shaping of law and legal institutions.

Richard Sisson and Lloyd Musolf, as our mainland associates, have worked with us in the Hawaii program. From now on the financial supports which have nourished this relationship will no longer be available. Nevertheless, their personal interest in the comparative study of legislatures will continue, and they may be expected to carry out related research and teaching activities. In particular, at the University of California, Los Angeles, Sisson and his associate, Leo M. Snowiss, will not only continue their research and publication program, but they have established several courses dealing with legislatures and development that will continue to attract growing interest and support.

b. Library and Data Resources. As previously noted, the University Library has cooperated within the limits of an attenuated budget by purchasing, on our behalf, materials relevant to legislative studies, over and above what it would normally have acquired. As the library's resources have become more constricted, we have devoted a somewhat larger share of our resources to the purchase of materials for the program's special collection, concentrating on a few categories, and especially on doctoral dissertations. These materials now remain in a room set aside for the program in Porteus Hall. Our intention is to review these holdings next year in the context of the Library's holdings, and the facilities of the Reading Room in the Political Science Department, so as to determine their optimal placement. In any event, they will remain continuously available to faculty and students working in this field.

In addition to materials in printed form, a very substantial collection of data in machine-readable form has been collected by Professors Akita

and Kuroda on members of the Japanese Diet, from its beginning up to the present time. This data file, after it has been used by Kuroda and Akita for their own research, will also be made available to any other scholars who wish to tap it for secondary research purposes.

c. Conferences and Scholarly Meetings. With the termination of AID funding, the supplementary resources needed to organize special meetings and conferences on legislative subjects will no longer be available. Unless and until we secure additional funding for such purposes, we shall be limited to participation in regularly organized conferences of professional associations. Since, individually, our faculty are members of several such bodies--the American Political Science Association, the International Political Science Association, the International Studies Association, the International Sociological Association, the Association for Asian Studies, and the American Society for Public Administration--we shall use every opportunity to participate in their meetings, to organize panels, and to present papers that will promote research and communication concerning the problems and performance of legislators and legislative bodies.

As a result of our Consortium's efforts, the IPSA has established a standing research committee on legislatures and development. We expect much action to occur in this context, a context which encourages participation by foreign as well as American scholars. The only member of our Hawaii group who is a formal member of this committee is Michael Mezey, and his departure from Honolulu will therefore somewhat attenuate our contacts with the IPSA group. Nevertheless, several of us have been involved in the IPSA panels and conferences, a relationship which may be expected to continue.

Recently the American Political Science Association, under the leadership of a Consortium member, has moved to establish a continuing section for legislative studies, an activity with which we shall associate ourselves. So far as the other societies mentioned above are concerned, we expect them to organize panels relating to legislative studies, from time to time, on an ad hoc basis.

These activities will be continuously stimulated by the CLS Newsletter, and by the Consortium-sponsored publications, especially the Legislative Studies Quarterly, which provides not only a relevant intellectual stimulus but also the inducement of an opportunity to publish, a consideration which those who prepare panel sessions and participate in them always keep in mind.

d. Foreign Linkages. Lacking any special resources for the maintenance of our foreign linkages, we anticipate a slacking off in the level and intensity of such relationships as they have been built up with the support of our AID grant, but we do not expect them to wither away. Quite to the contrary, we are confident that personal relationships built over the years with established scholars in Asia/Pacific countries, and especially with those who have taken their doctorates in our program, will be maintained.

Opportunities will arise, under the aegis of the research committee of the IPSA, the East-West Center, the IPU and the Asian Parliamentary Union, the IDRC of Canada, and other possible funding agencies, to sustain and nourish, at a modest level, some of these relationships and, indeed, to establish new ones. The Newsletter, and the Quarterly, will also sustain an expanded communications network that will play a crucial role in the maintenance of our international linkages.

In this connection it is important to re-emphasize a point made previously (#C.4 above), namely that fundamentally what has been institutionalized through our efforts--including those of our Associates and the other Universities in our Consortium--is the study and teaching of comparative legislative studies on many campuses, not a localized center in Hawaii. In this context, our colleagues in Hawaii are confident that we shall be able to participate, both to contribute to and to benefit from, the concurrent work in this field going on at many locations.

e. Service. Apart from receiving visitors as they come through Hawaii--a not infrequent occurrence--our capacity to provide direct services to legislators and governments is contingent on invitations and contracts. The University of Hawaii, as previously reported, is actively involved in a wide range of technical assistance programs under the sponsorship of AID and other agencies. However, as an entity, the program in comparative legislative studies has not yet been asked to participate in any such project or contract. We are available if required, but it is not our intention to take any active measures to solicit such contracts. The persons who might have had the greatest interest in taking such an initiative--Michael Mezey and Norman Meller--have both now left the active service of our Department.

It seems probable, therefore, that if the special skills available in Hawaii are to be tapped for purposes relevant to technical assistance programs, this would best be done by recruiting individual faculty members for specific tasks, rather than by seeking to make an institutional contract through the University of Hawaii. An example may occur in 1978

when, if tentative plans go through, Fred Riggs will go to Indonesia during the summer months on a technical assistance project sponsored by the International Bank. Although his assignment will be primarily to conduct some high level training programs in the field of development administration, no doubt some aspects of legislative performance--or non-performance--will be included in his work.

f. Administration and Miscellaneous. Without the tangible urgency of pressure to make decisions concerning the allocation of grant funds, the need for a continuing CLSP executive committee is reduced. Undoubtedly some meetings of our group will continue to be called, from time to time, in order to plan colloquium sessions related to legislative studies, to make decisions concerning the use and distribution of our small special library collection, and to take up any special projects that may be proposed. For the most part, however, we anticipate that matters relating to legislatures will be included within the routine teaching and research operations of our faculty members, each proceeding according to his or her own interests. For such purposes, no special administrative machinery is called for.

Obviously with the termination of the grant, additional office work and associated financial administration will not be required. Administratively, therefore, we return to the status quo ante, but substantively it is now clear we have added an important dimension to the academic work not only of scholars involved in the study of development and Third World problems, but also those interested in the study of American legislatures. No longer will the latter be able to handle their subject in the parochial, non-comparative way that was formerly considered acceptable by the profession.

In summary, we feel that the Hawaii program has contributed to the institutionalization of the comparative study of legislatures as an intellectual and substantive focus of research and teaching, and that a significant core of human resources are now available to engage in technical assistance programs where legislative problems are a subject of concern. Although we regret that we shall not be able to sustain, in the immediate future, on the campus at the University of Hawaii, as active a continuing program of research and teaching as we originally planned, we have done our best. We are also pleased with the joint statement, given in Annex A, which provides some measure of the degree to which, intellectually, the field has made progress. This statement provides, we hope, a paradigm or platform for future teaching and investigation.

University of Hawaii

### GENERAL FINDINGS

The results up to now of individual research projects sponsored by the Comparative Legislative Studies Program are reported in the papers and publications authored separately by each participant. They reflect a wide diversity in country situations, developmental stages, and political/administrative structures. Documentation of specific country situations may be found in the monographic reports. Here, by contrast, an attempt is made to state some general conclusions that emerge from the studies carried out by the University of Hawaii group, including its two associates.

1. The Legislative Model. When expectations about legislative performance based on the role played in the U. S. by Congress and the state legislatures--or even on the analysis of parliamentary institutions in other Western democratic political systems--are imposed on the popularly elected assemblies of non-Western countries, they can lead to a sense of disillusionment. In many--though certainly not all--of them, the performance of such assemblies might be treated as insignificant if the criteria used to assess Western legislative performance were used. Empirical studies of the activities of legislators and legislatures in these countries, however, reveal that they can and often do perform a variety of functions that are intrinsically important for the effective operation of their political and administrative systems, and make a useful contribution to their country's development. We conclude that the

performance of Western legislatures provides an inadequate model for the assessment of Non-Western legislatures.

2. The Legislative Promise. In a sense, it is always unfair to judge an institution during the early stages of its establishment and institutionalization. To make a final assessment of any innovation, one needs to wait to see what its results will be after sufficient time has been allowed for growth and maturation. Suspension of judgment about so politically vulnerable a new institution as a legislature is surely called for as much as a delay in assessing such other modernizing institutions as community development programs, factories, banks, schools, hospitals, agricultural extension and public health projects. Nevertheless, some provisional assessments are necessarily called for on the basis of any institution's performance up to the date of the evaluation, augmented by forecasts of likely subsequent changes, in the light of comparable experience elsewhere.

With such caveats in mind, members of the Comparative Legislative Studies Program of the University of Hawaii join in offering some tentative assessments of the functions of legislatures in general--reserving particularistic evaluations of their role in selected countries for separate analysis, as noted elsewhere in this report.

3. Functions of Legislatures. Consonant with the implication of its name, it is often assumed that the essential function performed by "legislatures" is to "legislate"--this would appear to be basic to the

way we conceive of the role of American legislatures.\* However, in many countries this is clearly not the most important function of the elective assemblies we call "legislatures." Certainly in a well-established democracy like Great Britain, this is not the only or perhaps even the main function of "Parliament." Some of our members prefer to use a neutral, structural term like "assembly" to emphasize the importance of leaving open questions about the functions legislatures actually do perform.

While we are agreed that, structurally, what distinguishes a "legislature" is its representative character (the election of its members) and its collegial processes of making decisions, we find that no single function can be identified as an essential characteristic of all elected assemblies (legislatures). Conversely, it is also true that in most Third World countries today the executive departments of government (public bureaucracies) actually take the lead in formulating as well as in carrying out public laws and policies. In some others, it is the political party that assumes this role. Therefore, to evaluate

---

\*The word "function" is sometimes misinterpreted as implying a commitment to some particular framework of "structural-functional" analysis. However, we use the word here in its general meaning of the output or consequences of an activity for the systems of which it is a part. Thus the "functions" of a legislature are simply the consequences of its activities for the performance of the political system in which it is lodged, including, of course, its impact on any of the policy issues or programs to which a government may address itself. In this sense, functions may be negative as well as positive--which is to say, dysfunctional as well as eufunctional. The use of the term, "function," therefore, need not imply a positive contribution of the element under study to the system of which it is a part.

elected assemblies by reference to the degree to which they initiate policy, or even amend and veto legislation proposed by the executive powers, would be to miss the mark by a wide margin.

a. Penalties of Failure. It is important to recognize that the most useful functions of an assembly can scarcely be performed well if the assembly concerned has but minimal power, is unstable, lacks autonomy, public recognition or prestige, and has acquired a reputation for corruption. The same, of course, can be said of any institution. A bad school contributes little to a child's education. Nevertheless, we do not reject the idea of having schools but instead support efforts to improve them on the assumption that well-run schools can make an important contribution to the education of children.

Similarly, a legislature may perform very badly or, from the perspective of those in power, may challenge the way they exercise authority in an embarrassing and frustrating way. Clearly the prevalence of legislative corruption, incompetence, elitism, or obstructionism may discredit the institution, and such charges have, of course, been leveled against elective assemblies when they have been dissolved or replaced by executive authority or military fiat.

Sometimes public opinion has become so alienated that the dissolution of a legislature is widely welcomed. Inappropriate conduct by legislatures (and legislators) has, naturally, served to undermine popular support for the institution and has made it easier for executives to restrict or dissolve recalcitrant assemblies.

b. Signs of Vitality. Nevertheless, even those who dissolve an assembly have often re-established it--or their successors have done so.

Such recurrent restorations naturally suggest that legislatures may have greater vitality than has been assumed: they are often viewed, even by their opponents in the executive branch of government, as making some important contributions to the working of the political system, or perhaps as providing an effective means to blunt or deflect the demands of groups that appear threatening to the established elites. If the functions of a legislature, however weak or perverse they may appear to be, were solely negative or inconsequential, one might assume that after having experimented with and dissolved an elected assembly, no government would want to re-establish one.

These considerations impel us to ask what positive functions are in fact performed by legislatures in the Third World. In seeking an answer to this question, it is useful to assess the functions of legislatures at two levels: 1) what they actually do, typically, even under the most unfavorable circumstances, and 2) what they might do, or indeed really do, when conditions are more propitious. The opposite side of this coin, of course, is to ask what functions cannot be well performed in any polity unless it has an elected assembly that performs them or, by its very existence, induces their performance by other institutions.

4. Minimal Functions. It appears that the very persistence of poorly institutionalized and politically weak legislatures reflects the fact that they do perform some socially and politically useful functions, as judged by the political leaders of the country concerned. On the basis of research into the operations of these legislatures we conclude that they typically perform the following functions:

a. Feed-back of information. The presence of elected assemblymen permits any regime to get information about local conditions that supplements the data otherwise provided, typically by its field bureaucracies. Instrumentally, the availability of such information serves an important controlling function, giving the regime a broader and more reliable understanding of local attitudes and events than it would otherwise be able to get. Through the informal communications of its incumbents, it can give the regime more reliable information about the effectiveness of local administration than might otherwise be available to it.

No doubt all regimes do not choose to make full use of the potential offered by an elective assembly for obtaining this kind of control information, but at least they have the opportunity to do so, and in many cases they do make good use of it. This feed-back function can enhance the stability of a regime and enable it to assess the effectiveness of ineffectiveness of its diverse policies and programs. In the case of India, as one example, this was an important factor prompting the early development of representative institutions, and the unfortunate consequences of their absence became abundantly clear to the government when the Congress party suffered a stunning defeat at the polls during the national elections of March 1977.

b. Constituency Services. The primary beneficiary of feed-back information is the government itself. By contrast, when legislators respond to demands from their constituents, they act directly to gratify demands made by individual citizens. Especially in the new states, where the institutional mechanisms of pluralistic representation--including interest or pressure groups and political parties--are not well established,

particularistic demands are made by individuals on the government, and legislators may easily be seen as appropriate vehicles not only to transmit demands but also to provide responses. As a result, legislators in these countries often become actively involved in the work of public administration, facilitating, diverting, moderating, or reinforcing the efforts of the government to provide a wide variety of services and to impose diverse controls on the population.

In some countries the performance of constituency services may seem to be the main function of weak or poorly institutionalized legislatures. Executives, jealous of their own prerogatives and power, may well encourage such activities, expecting them to divert the attention and energies of legislators from the more sensitive issues involved in making public policy. However, there are serious risks in the performance of this function. Clearly the interests and perspectives of legislators differ from those of administrative officers and ruling elites. Moreover, they are typically more sensitive to the aspirations and demands of some elements of the population than of others. Depending on local circumstances, therefore, legislators who strive to enhance their role by serving particularistic constituency interests are likely to find themselves at odds, not only with public officials and elites, but also with disaffected elements of the population.

c. Administrative Responsiveness and Fidelity. Sometimes, while avoiding direct intervention in the administration of local programs, legislators perform a function fully acceptable to the ruling circles by monitoring the performance of local officials and reporting to the

government on problems that requires attention from the center.

Frequently bureaucrats are recruited from the families of rural notables and they are primarily interested in their own career prospects: seeking transfers to an urban setting, they may neglect to pursue energetically some public policies designed to promote social and economic change.

A weak legislature may, therefore, cultivate executive support by serving an "eyes and ears" function that promotes administrative responsiveness and more fidelity to government policy by local bureaucrats.

d. Social Changes. On a longer term basis, one can see that, if a legislature survives, even though minimally institutionalized, it is likely to provide an important channel of social mobility and change, facilitating the emergence of political leaders recruited from new geographic regions, social classes, and ethnic groups. This is not to say that the electoral process assures personal participation in an assembly of a broadly representative cross-section of the population, but all legislators, even including those recruited from the privileged classes, tend to see that their election depends on the support of voters from diverse social strata other than their own, and this provides both a channel and a motive for making the latter's needs and demands more visible. It is possible to see the existence of elected assemblies in this respect as a kind of benign substitutes for revolution. Even autocratic regimes are likely to appreciate that if they can identify and meet the demands, however inadequately, of newly mobilized and aspiring groups, they may well be able to prevent the formation of social or political movements which would feed on unrest and, eventually, jeopardize the survival of their own power.

e. Nation-Building. In relation to the increasingly urgent need of would-be nation states to assimilate mobilizing minorities and prevent the rise of separatist movements, an elected assembly frequently facilitates the creation of trans-local and supra-ethnic identifications and institutions. Indeed, to the degree that legislatures persist for any length of time, their members and would-be-members have to forge trans-local affiliations in order to survive as members or obtain legislative seats.

Moreover, through participation in legislative bodies, local elites who might otherwise have no contact with national and regional society are given an opportunity to broaden their perspectives and play a linkage role between the center and periphery in their own countries. No doubt legislatures cannot be counted on to prevent the rise of militant ethnic groups--indeed, they may well contribute to the sense of identity and distinctiveness that such groups experience, as well as to their political visibility. However, they do provide opportunities for the appearance of "marginal" or "linkage" personalities who can build bridges between the dominant community and the various minorities. Thereby they may also ameliorate the sense of injustice which rising ethnic minorities so frequently experience.

Admittedly this may happen only when multi-ethnic disintegrative forces are not great, or when the ameliorative function is not being better performed by political parties or other institutions. However, it should be pointed out that the rise of legislatures is organically related to the rise of political parties, and since ethnic movements tend to start with modest demands which escalate only as they are resisted,

or rejected, the ameliorative impact of legislative bodies depends on their timing in relation to the spread of social mobilization.

f. Legitimize the Regime: A Ceremonial Role. It is notable how often dominant regimes, making their own laws, nevertheless insist punctiliously on the need for ratification by rubber-stamp legislators. Clearly they seem to expect that the performance of such ritual or ceremonial acts will actually enhance the legitimacy of the regime, both at home and internationally. It is believed that powerful states in the world community are more favorably inclined toward governments with a legislature which may, therefore, be considered "democratic." Similarly, there may be powerful elements of the population, especially in the main urban centers, who, even if not numerous, are more inclined accept the legitimacy of governments with a legislature than those without them.

Although such expectations may not, in practice, be born out, nevertheless it is likely that in some degree legitimizing or ceremonial legislatures do contribute to the goals of national integration and political stability. They may help to educate the general public on the duties of citizenship and also mobilize support for the government. Surely this is the rationale underlying the efforts which are expended to secure this outcome whenever pliant legislatures are controlled by the executive authorities.

Needless to say, if that is all a legislature does, it not only disappoints its external critics but also--unless they are firmly controlled by a ruling party--it tends to alienate its own members, for no legislator is likely to relish the passive and complaisant role of a

public relations officer, or, in terminology once popular, being a "Charlie McCarthy." Consequently, it can be anticipated that some rebels in even the most pliant legislature will begin to look for alternative modes of action in order to enhance their own influence and to make the role of legislator more of a challenge, more interesting and exciting.

5. Optimal Functions. By contrast with the foregoing functions, elected assemblies which have attained for themselves even a modest degree of autonomy and power within the political system have an opportunity to perform more significant functions, functions which contribute significantly to the effectiveness of political systems. These include the following:

a. Law-making Functions. To say that legislating is not a necessary function of elected assemblies is not, of course, to deny that it can be an important function. To the degree that a polity turns to its legislatures for help in making laws, it facilitates more widespread participation by the public in the shaping, evaluation, and revision of public policy. Although undoubtedly there are cases in which legislatures are more conservative than technocrats or political bureaucrats (or, for that matter, the party leaders in one-party regimes) we suspect that typically an elected assembly is more sensitive than the executive branch to the requirements of social equity, to the difficulties of applying general principles to specific instances, and to the nuances attendant on translating policy into action. In some cases, indeed, where a legislature has been captured by counter-elites rising from previously submerged positions in the social order, it has taken a

leading role in directing the processes of social change, primarily at the local, rural levels of society.

Even in those instances where a legislature does not presume to confront a regime openly by rejecting its legislative proposals, its policy influence may be quite substantial. This may be, for example, because executive officials take pains to clear new laws and policies in advance with legislative leaders, privately reaching compromise accommodations so as to avoid the embarrassment of public repudiation.

b. Budgetary and Administrative Restraints. One of the ways in which an assembly can enhance its own power and therefore improve the status and rewards of its members is to monitor administrative performance and to control the use of public funds by reviewing budgetary estimates and auditing actual expenditures. Again, there is no assurance that elective assemblies will be able to perform these functions effectively, but as soon as they achieve a moderate level of institutionalization, they will assuredly want to perform them since they both enhance and reflect the rise of any assembly's power.

So much is this the case, indeed, that despite the superficially technical character of budgetary control, it has become the touchstone of legislative power. Although the demand for budgetary control is one of the first issues a rising legislature puts to existing executive elites, it may well be the last "victory" to be achieved--if, indeed, it is ever secured.

c. Safeguarding Human Rights. As the custodian of coercive power, authoritarian regimes characteristically yield to the temptation to imprison and persecute their political enemies. In the absence of

effective countervailing power, chief executives and high officials often take umbrage at even minor criticisms and quickly move to suppress opposition or political dissent.

By contrast, the effectiveness of any elected assembly requires that the right to criticize the regime may be safeguarded. Even the most pliant legislatures are particularly concerned about the protection of human rights, especially those of their own members. But if an assembly is to exercise a significant political role, it must be able to protect its power, or claims to power. Therefore, a legislature needs to keep its options open, which means that it must try to safeguard its capacity to disagree, even to vote against the regime. Obviously this is not possible if the right to dissent is not safeguarded, and that right, to be effective, has to extend not only to the legislator but equally to the common citizen.

Human rights rest on the right of dissent and on safeguards against a government suppressing those who disagree with its policies and procedures. But citizens, individually and without organization, can scarcely protect themselves from an oppressive regime. They require the shield of a powerfully entrenched institution. Since the violation of the rights of dissenting citizens also threatens the power of legislators, they need to come to the defense of constituents who are persecuted for their political views. It seems clear, therefore, that the most effective way to build an institutional foundation for safeguarding human rights is to establish an autonomous and politically potent legislature.

In more general terms, the viability of any legislative regime presupposes the existence of certain fundamental and inviolable human

rights which must be shared equally by all individuals and groups within the society concerned. Not only are the legislators beneficiaries of these rights but they must surely act to safeguard them if the integrity of their own legislative roles is to be assured.

d. Contributions to Development. When the word "development" is used, many diverse ideas come to mind. If one thinks of economic growth, for example, then it is not clear that even the most highly institutionalized legislature will contribute in any straightforward or simple way to the process. Indeed, legislators may well question a single-minded drive to maximize annual increases in the GNP and raise questions about its relation to environmental problems, social equity, urbanization, unemployment, and related issues. On any particular policy issue, an outside observer may well think that a legislature, by contrast with the executive authorities, has perversely chosen to espouse the "wrong" rather than the "right" side of the issue. However, what strikes one observer as "right" often appears to another as quite "wrong." For example, legislatures may demand that more resources be invested in small-scale rural development schemes which maximize employment, whereas an urban-based executive elite may prefer to concentrate on large-scale capital intensive projects that contribute more rapidly to increases in the GNP.

However, if the word "development" is used in a broader sense to refer to the increasing capacity of a society to define its goals and to take appropriate steps to achieve them--including the promotion of economic growth as a possible, but not a necessary, policy objective--then the institutionalization of relatively autonomous and powerful

legislatures surely contributes to development in this sense, since it broadens the basis of support for the functions of interest articulation and aggregation, and hence for the clarification of issues and the assimilation of a wider range of interests in the decision-making process. Even in a parliamentary system where the government of the day can expect virtually automatic endorsement of its programs, the prospect of a no-confidence vote and the continuing need to win popular electoral support for a parliamentary majority impels government to heed a wider range of popular interests in its policy making and administration than might otherwise be the case.

We find, indeed, that even in marginally authoritarian regimes which, nevertheless, tolerate a moderately autonomous and powerful legislature, reform is encouraged to the degree that organized, often radical, protest movements arise. The legislatures in these societies safeguard, even if they do not encourage, such protests--but often enough opposition leaders in the legislature are associated with popular protest movements, and work with them to promote policies of social change and rural reform.

6. Conclusion. The range of functions actually and potentially performed by elected assemblies in Third World countries is surely much greater than the foregoing list would indicate. Nevertheless, enough has been said to illustrate a general proposition, namely that legislatures are multi-functional--they are by no means limited to the law-making functions, and they may indeed make little contribution to that particular function.

By contrast with any particular unit in a bureaucracy, which typically has limited functions and, in part at least, derives its influence from its specialized knowledge and authority, an assembly is remarkably flexible as an institution. Its members, individually and in committees, can work with constituents, party units, and bureaucrats--all in a wide variety of contexts. For this very reason, of course, the actual functions performed by legislatures are understandably diverse and no one of them can be pointed to as a necessary or unique function of these unusual bodies.

Public administrators and chief executives often enough find legislators and assemblies to be politically obstructive and a great nuisance. Conversely, of course, assemblymen often see bureaucrats and executives equally pernicious. The truth seems to be that, in line with the basic thinking that lay behind the establishment of the American Constitution, there is indeed greater safety for human rights in the institutionalization of countervailing powers than in their absence, and frequently a variety of public purposes can be better achieved when legislatures exist than when they do not. Some among us would endorse an even more far-reaching proposition asserting that, not only logically but historically, authoritarianism cannot exist in a country that has a politically autonomous and effective legislature, and democracy will not thrive without one.

a. Democracy at Issue. It is fashionable to decry talk of "democracy" as an objective in foreign policy--it is condemned as a sign of ethnocentrism. If a people live under authoritarian rule, it must allegedly be because they prefer that mode of government--

it is said to fit their cultural and historical circumstances. Democracy, by contrast, is said to entail the establishment of institutions and norms that are too difficult to create and sustain. Alternatively, it has been argued that Non-Western societies should evolve their own forms of "democracy" without reliance on legislatures, a peculiarly Western institution. If so, one must ask, then why have so many Non-Western societies opted to establish their own elected assemblies, even though they have been dissolved or appeared to fail?

It seems clear, moreover, that once authoritarian rule, buttressed by military and police power, control over the mass media, and the suppression of human rights, has been imposed on a subject population, it can scarcely give free voice to dissenting opinions--demonstrations of support for a regime can easily be mobilized by any authoritarian ruler, regardless of its historical or cultural background, while dissidents face death or imprisonment. If this be true, then surely it is incumbent on the United States to do what it can in its foreign policy and its technical assistance programs to encourage those who are striving to establish and strengthen politically autonomous legislative institutions, and to withhold aid from, or stop helping, regimes that condone racism, religious discrimination, and the suppression of human rights.

b. Teaching and Research. In this conviction, the participants in the Hawaii Comparative Legislative Studies program agree that it is important to continue studying and teaching about legislatures in a

comparative context, and they are individually and collectively determined to do so.

In this determination we also take satisfaction in noting that some scholars whose teaching and research has hitherto been largely focused on the performance of American legislatures--federal, state, and local--have not only been recruited to contribute from their knowledge and experience to the growth of comparative legislative studies, but they have induced a significant feed-back from that activity into their own customary work. The study of American legislatures will never again be so parochial as it has been in the past.

By a kind of ripple effect, therefore, the number of social scientists who will, in the future, be able to contribute relevant and expert knowledge to the study of legislative problems overseas is certain to increase. In short, not only at the University of Hawaii, but also at other American Universities and, indeed, internationally the comparative study of legislatures has already shown itself to be a fruitful activity and one which will, in due course, make an increasingly significant contribution to social and political science and to our understanding of development.

FWR  
May 77

## FACULTY REPORTS

Summaries of the CLSP-related research and teaching activities of faculty members associated with the University of Hawaii are given below, followed by a chronological listing of those of their papers and publications which have been judged to be relevant to the purposes of CLSP. The scholars included in this report are:

Harry V. Ball

George Akita

Yasumasa Kuroda

Herbert F. Margulies

Norman Meller

Michael Mezey

Lloyd D. Musolf\*

Fred W. Riggs

Richard Sisson\*

Robert B. Stauffer

---

\*Musolf and Sisson, at the Universities of California, Davis and Los Angeles, respectively, have been Associates of the University of Hawaii CSLP program.

## GEORGE AKITA

Akita, of the History Department, has been engaged for many years in a three-pronged approach to the study of the National Diet of Japan, including the following elements:

1. The first prong involves studying the Diet leadership. On the one side is the Meiji-Taisho (1868-1926) government leadership and on the other, the party leadership. The focus of their conflict-compromise-political relationship was the Diet. He has already published a work which deals with the central role of Ito Hirobumi and his relationship with the parties in opposition in the Diet. He is now working on the other major Meiji-Taisho government leader, Yamagata Aritomo, who also had to come to terms with the parties in the Diet.
2. The second approach centers around the parties in the Diet and party leadership. For this purpose, collected the backgrounds of all the members elected to the House of Representatives from 1890-1960. The data has been shared with Yasumasa Kuroda who has cleaned it and updated it. Akita, accordingly, has limited his attention to the first ten and highly crucial years of the existence of the Diet [1890-1900]. (It should be noted that the Japanese Diet is the only successful non-Western legislative body with a consistent and evolutionary development toward wider participation by the people) This study involves a close-up inquiry based on the political biography of Hoshi Toru, the premier party leader of the decade in question. His relationship with his own party and other parties in the House of Representatives, and his ability to utilize the structure and mechanics of the HOR should give us insights into developmental parliamentary politics in a non-Western setting.

3. The third approach is regional. The parties were strongest in regional blocs. Tokyo, while admittedly the center and most important, is also a region; one of Akita's graduate students is working on an anti-government region near Tokyo. Hoshi Toru was from Tokyo, but he held an electoral seat from a region outside of Tokyo. The relationship of the regions with each other and with the center should provide us with some insights into developmental parliamentary politics in a non-Western environment. CLSP grants to Akita were used for the Hoshi Tôru research.

**HARRY V. BALL**

Since 1972 Ball, a Professor of Sociology, has been concentrating upon the developmental relationships between legislatures, courts and administrative agencies, especially as these are crosscut by diverse ethnicities (whose initial contacts are the result of initial development plans and whose subsequent relations have major impacts upon later development plans). Upon the basis of preliminary work on early Hawaii, he participated in the Waigami Seminar at the University of Papua New Guinea in 1973. During the past two years he has intensified his work on the development of the legal order of Hawaii and its relationship to economic development by initiating (1) a systematic coding of all judicial cases, legislation and administrative rules; (2) a systematic description of the structural changes of the legal order; and (3) the identification of all personnel occupying major positions in these structures since 1840. This will lay the groundwork for a continuing series of much more intensive studies by Professor Ball and others.

1973 "Early Developments of the Justice System in Hawaii," a mimeographed paper.

## YASUMASA KURODA

Kuroda, who has long had an interest in various aspects of Japanese government and politics, started detailed work on the Japanese Diet since the Meiji Constitution when the CLSP enabled him to take over from George Akita an extensive file of information on Diet members. Kuroda has "cleaned" and up-dated this file, which soon included information on more than 5,000 Diet members.

During the first "report year" Kuroda was able to read papers based on this material at meetings of the American Political Science Association, the International Congress of Orientalists, and the Association for Asian Studies. During the second year, he began to compile his data in a form suitable for publication in a "data book," but decided during the third year to place all the material in machine-readable form, using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Much time was consumed in the checking of data and preparation of his first book-length manuscript based on this data.

During the fourth and fifth "report years" (1975) Kuroda completed the "cleaning" of his file on members of the Diet, House of Representatives, covering a period of more than 80 years, including the latest elections. He has completed all but one chapter of his first book-length manuscript based on this material, called: THE JAPANESE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 1890-1976: A DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS. He is currently adding the 1976 General Election materials to the existing SPSS data file, and plans soon to start writing his second book on the Diet, based on this material. The relevant papers and publications prepared by Kuroda include:

- 1970 "Patterns of Recruitment: Japanese Diet, 1946-1963." Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 1970. Los Angeles.
- 1971 "Patterns of Recruitment: Japanese Diet, 1890-1945." Paper presented at 28th International Congress of Orientalists, A.N.U., Canberra, Australia, Jan. 1971.
- "The Japanese Diet, 1890-1963: Recruitment Opportunity and Recruitment Paths." Paper delivered at Association for Asian Studies, Washington, D.C. March 1971.
- 1972 "Historical Data and Computer: The Japanese Diet, 1890-1970." First USA-Japan Computer Conference, October, 1972. Published in The Proceedings.
- 1974 "Successful Politicians in the Japanese House of Representatives, 1890-1972." Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, August-September, 1974.
- 1975 "The Japanese Diet and Socio-Economic Development: Organized Business, Bureaucracy, and the Ruling Party." Presented at the Second International Conference on Legislatures and Contemporary Societies, January 20-24, 1975, Albany, New York.
- 1977 "A Triumvirate Model of Economic Policy-Making in Japan: Organized Business, Bureaucracy, and The Ruling Party in the Japanese Diet." In James Heaphey and Abdo Baaklini, eds. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1977.
- THE JAPANESE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 1890-1976: A DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS. (Book manuscript near completion)

## HERBERT F. MARGULIES

Margulies, of the History Department, has been working since the start of the CLSP on a biography of the Honorable Irvine L. Lenroot, Wisconsin state legislator and later, U.S. Congressman (Representative, 1909-1918; Senator, 1918-1927). In addition to identifying his contribution to the shaping of both state and national legislative processes, his work has included an analysis of Lenroot's role as a leader of insurgents within the Republican Party, thereby constituting a transitional study of the Progressives in American legislatures. Publications resulting from his work include the following:

- 1974 "Irvine Luther Lenroot," Dictionary of American Biography.
- 1976 "Robert M. La Follette Goes to the Senate, 1905," Wisconsin Magazine of History 59:3 (Spring, 1976), 214-225.
- "La Follette, Roosevelt and the Republican Presidential Nomination of 1912," Mid-America 58:1 (January, 1976), 54-76.
- "The Senate and the World Court," Capitol Studies, 4:2 (Fall, 1976), 37-52.
- 1977 SENATOR LENROOT OF WISCONSIN: A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY, 1900-1929 (University of Missouri Press, Fall, 1977).
- "Irvine L. Lenroot and the Republican Vice Presidential Nomination of 1920," forthcoming, Wisconsin Magazine of History 60:3 (Spring, 1977).
- "The Collaboration of Herbert Hoover and Irvine Lenroot, 1921-1928," forthcoming, North Dakota Quarterly, (Fall, 1977).

## NORMAN MELLER

Meller has had a long-time interest in legislative service agencies, the nature of their assistance to their parent bodies in the latter's performance of their various functions, and the role of these agencies in the institutionalization of the legislature. The interest is world-wide in scope, and encompasses all political systems, premised upon the hypothesis that service agencies are in good part the mirror image of the parent body, so that the comparability of legislative functions and processes may be studied through depth inquiry of the agencies providing the services therefor. In addition, Meller has for several decades been an academic observer of political development in the island polities of the Pacific, focusing attention particularly upon the organized legislature, and its members, as these have been major contributors to the rapid movement toward self-government and independence which has been sweeping the area. As legislative staff have been particularly instrumental in assisting Island legislators to actively direct the course of this political change, Meller's two interests nicely converge in the Pacific scene.

In 1969-70, while living in Tokyo, Meller conducted extensive interviews in the Research and Legislative Reference Department of the Japanese National Diet Library. In the summer of 1971 he replicated this research in the Legislative Reference Service (now the Congressional Research Service) of the Library of Congress in Washington. Subsequently, the comparative data amassed were analyzed, several papers prepared for learned societies, and a Sage monograph published in 1974.

During the course of the grant period, interviews have been conducted in, and materials on their on-going activities obtained from, research and reference agencies servicing the national legislatures in Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, and Switzerland in an effort to determine the differential nature (if any) of the functions performed by such agencies in non-presidential political systems. A two-week visit in the House of Commons Library during the summer of 1976 permitted comprehensive coverage of the "Mother of Parliament's" reference and research servicing. In the same summer, all of the library resources and replies on three, world-wide questionnaires in the custody of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Geneva pertinent to legislative staff services were reviewed over a month-long period. Work has been proceeding on the materials collected, and manuscript will shortly be written to provide a factual survey of the research and reference services being received by national legislatures and to analyze their significance for the understanding of the legislative process.

In the Pacific region, during the grant period, the embryonic services of the legislatures in American Samoa, Cook Islands, Fiji, Niue, Tonga, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Western Samoa have been researched as part of studying political change in those areas, the institutionalization of their respective legislatures, and the latter's role in initiating and shaping political development. Eight months of 1975 were devoted to consultation work with the Micronesian Constitutional Convention on Saipan, a body in which legislators played a major role and which has proposed a national legislature embodying several structural and procedural innovations. This consultancy was followed with a comparable shorter period in 1977 with the Ponape District

Legislature, aiding it to draft a district charter which will be its state constitution, should the Federated States Constitution become effective. Relevant papers and publications include:

1971 "WITH AN UNDERSTANDING HEART": CONSTITUTION MAKING IN HAWAII. New York: National Municipal League, 1971.

"Hawaii: Themes in Land Management" (with Robert Horwitz) in Ron Crocombe (ed.) LAND TENURE IN THE PACIFIC. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1971.

1972 "The Congress of Micronesia: A Unifying and Modernizing Force," Micronesia, 8:1-2 (December, 1972).

1973 Legislative Staff in Oceania as a Focus for Research," in Allan Kornberg, (ed.) LEGISLATURES IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE. New York: David McKay, 1973.

"The Pacific Legislature: Spearhead for Political Change," paper prepared for Association for Social Anthropology, March, 1973.

1974 "Micronesian Political Change in Perspective," in Aniel Hughes and Sherwood Lingenfelter, (eds.) POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT IN MICRONESIA. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1974.

"Traditional Elites in the Emerging Governments of Oceania." Prepared for Western conference of Association for Asian Studies. Tucson, Ariz. Dec. 1974.

INSTITUTIONAL ADAPTABILITY: LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE IN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES. Sage Research Paper, 1974.

1975 "American Samoa Rejects an Elected Governor," State Government, 48:1 (Winter, 1975)

1976 "Pacific Politics and Communications," in Daniel Werner and Jim Richstad (eds.) COMMUNICATION IN THE PACIFIC. Honolulu: East-West Center, 1976.

1977 "The Micronesian Constitutional Convention," paper prepared for Association for Asian Studies, New York, March, 1977.

## MICHAEL MEZEY

Mezey joined the Political Science Department in 1973 under CLSP sponsorship, having previously written and published on American and Thai legislative bodies. He carried out a survey on attitudes toward legislatures among students from developing countries at the University of Hawaii, and started a study of the legislature of Hawaii. Commencing a broad study of the literature on legislatures, especially in developing countries, and making use of the data collected at the University of Iowa, he began work on a projected book to be called "Comparative Legislative Behavior," now accepted for publication at Duke University Press.

During the third and fourth "report years" Mezey devoted a good deal of attention to the planning, funding (from Exxon Education Foundation), and conduct of a course in which students simulated behavior in several key legislatures.

A great deal of Mezey's time has been devoted to the editing of the CLS Newsletter, which commenced quarterly publication in May 1973. Since February 1976 it has also appeared as a section of the Legislative Studies Quarterly. The Newsletter has provided a major communication medium for scholars and professional parliamentarians interested in the comparative study of legislatures.

Mezey is a member of the editorial board of the Legislative Studies Quarterly, a member of the Research Committee on Legislative Development of the International Political Science Association, and frequently reviews manuscripts on legislatures from various journals and presses. He has continuously taught courses on comparative legislative behavior, and on legislatures and political development, not only at the University of

Hawaii, but also at Wesleyan University, and now at DePaul University. His use of simulation adds a new dimension to the techniques of teaching in this field.

Mezey's relevant papers and publications are listed below.

1970 "Ambition Theory and the Office of Congressman," Journal of Politics 32:3 (August 1970), 563-579.

"The Functions of a Minimal Legislature," prepared for delivery at the 66th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Los Angeles, September 1970.

1971 "Legislative Development and Political Parties: The Case of Thailand," prepared for delivery at the Shambaugh Conference on Legislatures in Non-Western Political Systems, University of Iowa, Iowa City, November 1971.

1972 "The Functions of Minimal Legislature: Role Perceptions of Thai Legislators," Western Political Quarterly XXV:4 (December, 1972), 686-701.

"Parties and Legislatures: An Explication," prepared for delivery at the 1972 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, November 2-4, 1972.

1973 "The 1971 Coup in Thailand: Understanding Why the Legislature Fails," Asian Survey XIII:3 (March, 1973), 306-317.

1974 "The Policy-Making Role of Legislatures in Developing Political Systems," prepared for delivery at the Seminar on Legislative Development sponsored by the Research Committee on Legislative Development of the International Political Science Association, Rio de Janeiro, August 1974.

Mezey-3

- "A Classroom Simulation Design for an Undergraduate Course in Comparative Legislative Behavior." A Report to the Exxon Education Foundation on work completed under a grant to "Develop and Extend Classroom Simulation Techniques to the Study of Comparative Legislative Behavior," October 1974.
- "Student Attitudes Toward the Legislature: A Cross-National Multi-Institutional Approach," prepared for delivery at the 70th Annual Meeting, American Political Science Association, Chicago, August 1974.
- 1975 "Legislative Development and Political Parties: The Case of Thailand," in C.L. Kim and G.R. Boynton, eds., Legislative Systems in Developing Countries (Duke University Press: 1975), pp. 107-141.
- "Legislators, Legislatures, and Constituency Demands," prepared for delivery at the Conference on the Role of Parliamentary Politicians, sponsored by the Research Committee on Legislative Development of the International Political Science Association, Penang, Malaysia, March 1975.
- 1976 "Constituency Demands and Legislative Support: An Experiment," Legislative Studies Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1 (February 1976), 101-128.
- "Legislators and the Particularized Demands of Their Constituents: A Theoretical Framework." Prepared for delivery at the Xth World Congress of the International Political Science Association, Edinburgh, Scotland, August 16-21, 1976.
- 1977 COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIVE BEHAVIOR. Durham: Duke University Press, forthcoming.
- "Legislative Policy-Making Through the Imposition of Constraints," Policy Studies Journal (Summer 1977).

"Support for the Legislature: Clearing Away the Underbrush,"  
prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the American Political  
Science Association, Washington, D.C. September 1977.

LLOYD D. MUSOLF

Musolf, as an associate of the University of Hawaii CLSP program, was provided with funds in support of his research, supplementing the resources initially available to him on a sabbatic leave. His research, focusing at first on the subject of "economic regulation, national development, and legislatures," was launched with a comparative study of two "developed" locales, British Columbia and California. By studying two provincial-level governments, it was possible to approximate the scale of developing countries more closely than by using national governments. A start on research was made in a "developed" atmosphere in order to provide needed information for an anticipated research visit to developing countries.

During 1972-73, a number of activities were undertaken that could serve as a transition to legislative research in developing countries. Among these activities were: beginning a manuscript, based upon research in Victoria, B.C., and California, on legislative roles in environmental protection efforts from the perspective of the economic development goals in British Columbia and California; participating in the drafting of the University of Hawaii's application to the National Science Foundation for funds to establish a Comparative Legislatures Project; supervision of a graduate student paper entitled "Economic Regulation and Development Goals: the Role of the California Legislature," which was used in his study and also was published by the Institute of Governmental Affairs; assistance to two faculty members in developing a research application to study the California legislature's relation to coastal development; and, last but far from least, collection of many research materials on legislatures and development in Malaysia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, and Israel, in anticipation of field visits to one or more in 1974-75.

During 1973-74, special efforts were made to complete preparations for the sabbatical year. Because of limited time and funds for overseas research, it was decided to concentrate upon one country in depth. The collection of materials on Malaysia, the selected country, was greatly expanded. A variety of other activities contributed to the acquisition of knowledge on legislatures, particularly in relation to development: with a Duke University sociologist, planning began on a scholarly conference, to be financed under the AID grant, at which papers would be related to the topic of legislative roles in economic and social development; acting as chairman and rapporteur for a panel on bureaucracy and legislatures at the Grant-financed Hawaii conference on the Origins of Legislatures; completing the manuscript described earlier on "Legislatures, Environmental Protection and Development Goals" (Sage, 1975); and evaluating a book-length manuscript for the Duke University Press Comparative Legislative Series.

During the sabbatical year of 1974-75, efforts were mainly directed toward gaining access to Malaysia for research purposes, undertaking four months of field research in that country, and beginning the process of digesting research results. In addition, the planned conference on Legislatures and Development was held early in 1975, and a good deal of time was spent in supervising the revision of papers given at that conference. As to the Malaysian research, it became apparent after orientation to the setting that a study of the legislature's role in economic policy, which had been planned, should be somewhat modified to include a study of individual legislator's roles as well. The shift was made not only because of the difficulty of finding sufficient reliable material on

the collective role of the legislature but because of a desire to furnish more comparative information under Grant auspices. As the University of Iowa, also using Grant funds, was making comparative studies of legislators in Korea, Turkey, and Kenya, Musolf intensified his earlier contacts with the Iowa group and also made arrangements, after much difficulty, to obtain lengthy interviews with a substantial sample of Malaysian MPs.

During the final "report year" much effort has gone into following up the two projects on which so much time was spent in 1974-75. Papers from the Legislatures and Development conference were received, edited, and assembled into a volume to be considered for publication in the Duke University Press Comparative Legislatures Series. Joel Smith of Duke and Musolf wrote a lengthy introductory chapter and a briefer concluding chapter. The book-length manuscript is now in the hands of readers and may require the elimination or revision of several papers before acceptance for publication. Among the field studies in the volume that has been well-received by the manuscript reviewers is the following paper: Lloyd D. Musolf and J. Fred Springer, "The Parliament of Malaysia and Economic Development: Policymaking and the MP." This is the first fruit of the Malaysian research and was initially read at the meeting of the International Political Science Association in Edinburgh, Scotland, in August 1976. A second paper by the same authors, "The Malaysian Parliament and Consociational Democracy: Extensions and Limits of Communal Politics," was given at the convention of the American Political Science Association in Chicago in September 1976. This paper has been drastically revised and is being submitted to the Legislative Studies Quarterly for publication.

Musolf and his colleagues are planning to combine these and some additional papers still to be written into a volume with the working title,

The Malaysian Parliament: Experiment in Democratic Development, with an anticipated completion date in 1977.

Relevant publications include:

- 1970 ed., with Allan Kornberg, LEGISLATURES IN DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE. Duke University Press. Contains introductory essay, with Kornberg, "On Legislatures in Developmental Perspective," and second essay, with Fred Riggs, "Comparative Legislative Studies and Services."
- 1975 LEGISLATURES, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, AND DEVELOPMENT GOALS: BRITISH COLUMBIA AND CALIFORNIA. Sage Research Paper, 90-016.
- 1976 with J. Fred Springer, "The Parliament of Malaysia and Economic Development: Policymaking and the MP." Paper presented at IPSA Congress, Edinburgh, Scotland, Aug. 1976.
- 1977 with J. Fred Springer, "Legislatures and Divided Societies: The Malaysian Parliament and Multi-Ethnicity," Legislative Studies Quarterly, v. 2 (May). (revision of APSA paper)
- ed., with Joel Smith, LEGISLATURES IN DEVELOPMENT. Duke University Press (in press). Contains introductory essay, with Smith, "Some Observations on Legislatures and Development," and concluding essay, with Smith, "Retrospect and Prospect." Also contains a revision of the 1976 paper presented at the IPSA Congress.
- In preparation: a monograph tentatively entitled THE MALAYSIAN PARLIAMENT: EXPERIMENT IN DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT, with J. Fred Springer. Table of contents follows:

I. Requirements of a Plural Society

Political community and plural society

Economics and plural society

Political institutions and plural society

- II. The Malaysian Parliament
  - Literature of comparative legislatures
  - Introduction to Malaysian Parliament
  - Methodology and sample
  - Issue concerns and attitudes of MPs
- III. The Role of the Malaysian MP
  - Role perceptions
  - Specific linkage activities
  - Involvement in two examples of economic policy
- IV. The Role of Parties
  - The Malaysian Parliament and consociational democracy
  - Cleavage patterns among Malaysian MPs
  - Party differences in linkage activities
- V. Recruitment and Change
  - Social/political background
  - Urban/rural differentiation
  - Background differences and role perceptions and activities
  - Length of service and differences in role perceptions
- VI. Parliamentary Processes
  - MPs' perceptions of the performance of Parliament
  - The role of parliamentary leadership
  - The role of backbenchers
  - Internal dynamics and constituency interests
- VII. Conclusion

FRED W. RIGGS

Riggs, in the context of his theoretical work on bureaucracy and comparative administration, has for many years given some attention to extra-bureaucratic institutions, notably the legislature and party system, as centers of power and authority that may contribute to the capacity of government agencies to carry out public policies. He has also been interested in the role played by legislatures, in conjunction with party systems, in the maintenance of an open society and the defense of human freedoms. He has not assumed that the mere existence of these institutions assures the successful performance of these functions since, clearly, in many countries they fail to perform them. Rather, his starting hypothesis has been that unless a politically effective legislature and party system exists, it is unlikely that these functions will be well performed.

His first work in this area involved participation in the AID-funded conference at Planting Fields, New York, under the auspices of the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, which led to a report to AID, published in a volume edited by Kornberg and Musolf and published in 1970. His essay, co-authored with Musolf, on "Comparative Legislative Studies and Services," contained the main recommendations growing out of the conference, including a proposal for the establishment of centers for continuing research in comparative legislative studies. The CLSP consortium was a direct outgrowth of that report.

During 1970 a conference on comparative legislatures was held at Duke University, following up on some of the recommendations of the Planting Field conference. Riggs gave a paper at this conference entitled

"Legislative Structures: Some Thoughts on Elected National Assemblies," which was later published in a volume edited by Kornberg that grew out of that conference.

In August 1972, when the CLSP project was starting, Riggs presented a paper at the Congress of the International Political Science Association, Montreal, Canada, entitled, "Parties: A Tentative COCTA Treatment." Although focused primarily on conceptual problems associated with the analysis of parties and party systems, this paper also formulated some propositions on the relation between party systems and legislatures, forming together a single political entity which Riggs referred to as a "constitutive system." He argued that the significance of legislatures can be properly appreciated only if their relations to party systems are taken into account when assessing the role they play in the total system of governance.

Following up this line of reasoning, Riggs decided to seek foundation funding for a major research project in which materials from a wide range of sources on the actual performance of a selected sample of legislatures, primarily in Asian and Pacific countries, would be collected on microfiche and indexed in such a way that a group of participating scholars associated with the Consortium could use the material to elaborate and test their own hypotheses about the conditions favoring or detracting from the effective performance of legislative functions. The preparation of a research design for this project involved extensive consultation with colleagues at the University of Hawaii, plus correspondence with other participants in the Consortium, with the Human Relations Area Files, the Information Utilization Laboratory at the University of Pittsburgh, and the Comparative Political Parties project at Northwestern University.

A research proposal entitled "Comparative Legislatures Project" containing several hundred pages of text and annexes was submitted by Riggs, as principal investigator, to the National Science Foundation in April 1973, but after extended review, was rejected.

For the conference on legislative origins organized by the University of Hawaii and the University Consortium in April 1974, Riggs presented a paper entitled "Salience and Durability: On the Origins of National Elected Assemblies," accompanied by a set of country studies drawn from historical data on Southeast Asia. The underlying premise of this work was that the timing of a legislature's origins, in relation to the previous expansion of bureaucratic power and the character of revolutionary movements explained, in considerable measure, the characteristics and role that the legislature itself would subsequently be able to play. The material originally prepared for this conference was subsequently revised and expanded for publication as a monograph in 1975 with the title: Legislative Origins: A Comparative and Contextual Approach.

Since 1976 Riggs has not carried out any research focused directly on legislatures, but in the broader context of his current work on "Ecology and Development," he has emphasized the importance of trying to understand the relation between legislative and other major governmental institutions as a key to the study of development in its ecological and contextual dimensions.

His relevant papers and publications follow:

1970 With Lloyd Musolf, "Comparative Legislative Studies and Services," in Allan Kornberg and Lloyd Musolf, eds. LEGISLATURES IN DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1970) pp. 501-520.

- 1972 "Parties: A Tentative COCTA Treatment," Paper presented at the Congress of the International Political Science Association, Montreal, Canada. Aug. 1972. (Contains remarks on legislatures)
- 1973 "Legislative Structures: Some Thoughts on Elected National Assemblies." in Allan Kornberg, ed. LEGISLATURES IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE. (N.Y.: MaKay, 1973)
- "Comparative Legislatures Project." A Research Proposal Submitted to the National Science Foundation. April 1973.
- 1974 "Salience and Durability: On the Origins of National Elected Assemblies." Paper presented at conference on legislative origins, Hawaii. April 1974.
- 1975 LEGISLATIVE ORIGINS: A COMPARATIVE AND CONTEXTUAL APPROACH. Pittsburgh: International Studies Association. 79 pages.

Sisson

Comparative Legislative Studies at UCLAResearch

Professor Sisson's research has concerned the theoretical dimensions of legislative development as well as the development and performance of subnational legislatures in both preindependence and postindependence India. His work on theoretical dimensions has been principally devoted to isolating those conditions which have encouraged the creation and continuance of legislative bodies able consistently to make an important impact on public policy and to provide protection and sanction for individual freedoms and liberties as distinct from those which encourage legislatures as dependent bodies and as instruments to the interests of other governing agencies. These concerns have required investigations of cases from the Western European experience as well as from those of former colonial areas of South and Southeast Asia and Subsaharan Africa. Much of the work resulting from this line of inquiry has been written jointly with Professor Leo M. Snowiss of the Department of Political Science, University of California at Los Angeles. This theoretical work and comparative survey has also been an integral part of the development of curriculum in comparative legislative studies at UCLA as discussed below. It also informs the more detailed analysis of the development of provincial legislatures in India.

The study of legislative development and performance in South Asia is related to a larger concern with the origins and different routes of development of legislatures shared by members of the Hawaii Group. While now proceeding apace the work on South Asia suffered several setbacks due to political unpredictabilities and conditions which were inhospitable to political science research in this region during the first half of the 1970s. An initial visit was made to India, although not under the Hawaii program, during the summer of 1974 at which time inquiries were made concerning the feasibility of conducting a comparative study of legislative performance and development. While it proved impossible to conduct any original work at that time, public documents germane to such a study were acquired. The summer of 1976 was spent in India by Professor Sisson and Professor Lawrence L. Shrader of Mills College, a collaborator in the study of legislative development in Maharashtra, was more productive in making arrangements to conduct the study and to acquire necessary data.

The current inquiry concerns an analysis of the role of the legislature and legislators in policy making at the provincial level in India from 1920 through 1977 as well as an analysis of the impact of the legislature as an increasingly authoritative and influential institution on changing patterns of power relationships in Indian society. In this way data has been acquired on the backgrounds, social and economic activities, organizational entrepreneurship and political careers of legislative elites for the period extending from 1920, when provincial legislatures first achieved a modicum of

power, through the more heady periods of legislative influence in the 1930s and post-independence to the significant period of legislative atrophy during the 1970s. These data are substantially complete for this period for Maharashtra, through 1962 for Gujerat, through 1937 for the Pakistan province of Sindh, and are complete for the state of Rajasthan from the commencement of legislative life in 1952 in this former feudal area. A fuller statement of direction is set forth in the note entitled "Direction and Context of Current Legislative Research" appended to this report.

The past year has been devoted to the development of coding schemes adequate to handle these data and in organizing raw data for coding. The summer of 1977 is being spent by the principal investigators together with three full-time and one half-time research assistants in completing the work of coding and in cleaning the data preparatory to more refined statistical analysis. Final data processing and analysis will commence by the end of the summer as will the writing of the first drafts of the manuscripts to be prepared from the data. The studies to be written from this project should elucidate the process by which legislatures can assume power in an authoritarian system and serve to effect changes in societal relationships.

#### Library and Research Archives

In consonance with this line of research and with teaching at UCLA the Graduate Research Library has embarked upon a program to develop its holdings in legislative, party and viceregal activity during the preindependence period in India. The objective is to make the university a major center of research in this area. The proceedings of the Central Legislative Council have been acquired from 1862 to 1947, while the proceedings and records of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies have been acquired for the Bombay Presidency, for the provinces of Punjab, Madras, and Sindh as well as for Burma. Likewise the personal records of British viceroys have been acquired for much of this same period as have the published records and documents of major nationalist parties. These records constitute an important part of a long-range plan to establish a complete inventory of legislative records, party documents and minutes, and viceregal papers for preindependence India at UCLA.

The Library has furthermore purchased microfilm copies of the private papers, correspondence and diaries of important Chief Ministers in Bombay and Rajasthan during the preindependence period as well as the early post independence period. These documents together with the legislative and viceregal records data concerning the character of legislative incumbents already constitute an important archive for original research on political development at the provincial level in twentieth century India.

#### Teaching and Curriculum Development

During the past five years the emphasis given comparative legislative studies in the Department of Political Science at UCLA has

substantively increased. There are two faculty members in addition to Professor Sisson and Snowiss who devote considerable research time to the comparative study of legislative institutions. They are Professor Hans Baerwald (Japan) and Professor Shimshon Zelniker (Israel). Five courses are now offered in the areas of legislative behavior and development. There is an undergraduate course which is concerned primarily with the study of American legislative institutions. There is a graduate level course which is more concerned with the analysis of legislative behavior generally. A significant development in the graduate program has been the creation of a two-quarter graduate course on comparative legislative development and performance. This course was first taught on a provisional basis jointly by Professors Sisson and Snowiss during the 1975-76 academic year. It was subsequently adopted as a permanent part of the curriculum by the department and the Graduate Council of the University as a part of two fields within the department. During its first year the course attracted 15 students. Finally, Professor Snowiss has offered a new course on Congress and Human Rights, a subject which he ultimately plans to treat in a comparative context. During the coming year we hope to attract new faculty involved in the area of policy analysis hopefully with a substantive legislative dimension. The research and teaching in comparative legislative behavior development and performance at UCLA has become substantial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: RICHARD SISSON AND ASSOCIATES AT UCLA

- 1972 Richard Sisson, The Congress Party in Rajasthan: Political Integration and Institution-Building in an Indian State, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1974 Richard Sisson, Representative Institutions and the Democratic Polity: Some Socioeconomic Explanations, (Manuscript)
- 1974 G.C. Thomas, Ideological Distance Among Candidates and Party Cadres in India: A Theoretical Exploration, (Manuscript being revised for publication)
- 1975 Richard Sisson and Leo M. Snowiss, "Legislatures in a Context of Modernization," (Paper presented at a Conference on Legislatures in Contemporary Societies, Albany, New York, January 20-24, 1975).
- 1975 Richard Sisson and Leo M. Snowiss, "Legislative Viability and Political development," (Paper presented at a Conference on Legislatures and Development, Carmel, California, August 11-16, 1975).
- 1976 G.C. Thomas, "The Location of Power and Authority in Indian Defense Decision-Making," in his The Politics of Indian Defense Spending: The Rearmament Decade, 1963-72, (Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of California at Los Angeles). Revised for publication by MacMillan and Company, New Delhi, India, 1978.
- 1977 Richard Sisson and Lawrence L. Shrader, "Social Representation and Political Integration in an Indian State: The Legislative Dimension," in Albert Eldridge, ed., Legislatures in Plural Societies, Durham: Duke University Press.
- 1977 Richard Sisson, "Political development in South and Southeast Asia; The New Corporatism in a Context of Radical Dissent," (Paper presented at the Conference of Soviet and American Asian Specialists, Berkeley, California, May 1977).
- 1977 Richard Sisson, "Direction and Context of Current Legislative Research," (Includes information concerning the development of current research and teaching in comparative legislative studies at UCLA together with a statement on the content, direction and status of current research projects and library and other research acquisitions).
- 1978 Richard Sisson and Leo M. Snowiss, "Legislative Viability and Political Development," in Lloyd Musolf and Joel Smith, eds., Legislatures in Development, Durham: Duke University Press (forthcoming)

## ROBERT B. STAUFFER

Stauffer began his research on the Philippine legislature while a Fulbright professor in the Department of Political Science, University of the Philippines in the academic year 1963-1964. At that time he collected background data on legislators for two pre-independence legislatures and for three (at eight year intervals) following the establishment of the Republic of the Philippines. These data were later analyzed and written up in three articles published in 1966, 67 and 70.

While on sabbatical leave from the University of Hawaii during the academic year 1971-1972, Professor Stauffer taught at the College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines during which time he continued work on the Philippine legislature, adding data from a fourth post-war congressional session to the previous three for which data had been collected earlier. Plans were made to return to the Philippines during the summer of 1973 for final interviewing of legislators after which time a monograph would be written. However imposition of martial law in the Philippines in September, 1972, changed these plans.

Because one of the strongest legislatures in the Third World was so easily eliminated, a new research perspective was adopted, namely, a search for the causes for the breakdown in the existing Philippine political system as marked by the overthrow of the legislature, the outlawing of political parties, suppression of the free press, mass arrests, etc. The search called for probing relationships far beyond the narrow boundaries of the "legislative system," as subsequent publications illustrate.

An examination of macro-level, inter-systemic relationships impinging on the Philippine polity produced a series of papers on the political economy

Stauffer-2

of the 1972 coup and on the new linkage framework for integrating the Philippines more thoroughly into a dependency relationship in the world economy. These papers were published in 1973, 1974, 1975 (WCSF Dossier), and 1977 (Pacific Affairs).

Stauffer then applied this conceptual framework to the Philippine legislative data in an attempt to place the overthrow of Congress in the larger context developed in the papers just enumerated. The result was a Sage monograph published in 1975. Work has also been done on the slowly emerging representative system being created for the "New Society." Some discussion of this system is contained in an essay in Asian Survey (1977).

Stauffer expects to continue research on the new representative system taking form in the Philippines and, in the process, to analyze its particular characteristics in relation to the system-type of which it seems to be an example, and to evaluate its performance against what is known about the performance of the discarded congressional system. In the process he expects to continue to guide graduate students into research on legislatures in the Third World.

The publications referred to are listed below:

- 1966 "Philippine Legislators and Their Changing Universe," Journal of Politics 28 (August, 1966), 556-597.
- 1967 "A Legislative Model of Political Development," Philippine Journal of Public Administration, 11 (January, 1967), 3-12.
- 1970 "Congress in the Philippine Political System," in Allan Kornberg and Lloyd D. Musolf (eds.), Legislatures in Developmental Perspective (Durham: Duke University Press, 1970).
- 1973 "The Marcos Coup in the Philippines." Monthly Review 24 (April, 1973).

- 1974 "The Political Economy of a Coup: Transnational Linkages and the Philippine Political Response," Journal of Peace Research, 11:3 (1974), 161-177.
- 1975 "Philippine Martial Law: The Political Economy of Refeudalization," WSCF Dossier (November, 1975).
- THE PHILIPPINE CONGRESS: CAUSES OF STRUCTURAL CHANGE. Sage Research Papers in the Social Sciences, vol. 3, series no. 90-024 (Comparative Legislative Studies Series. Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications, 1975).
- 1977 "Philippine Corporatism: A Note on the 'New Society'," Asian Survey, 27:4 (April, 1977), 393-407.
- "Philippine Authoritarianism: Framework for Peripheral 'Development'," Pacific Affairs (Fall, 1977).

The following report from Dukesbury, dated 21 July 1977, covers both his own field work and some of his activities in association with the Indonesian Centre for Strategic and International Studies.

During the course of my stay here in Indonesia I have been involved (directly or indirectly) in three legislative research projects which have been funded either wholly or in part by the Comparative Legislative Studies Project at Hawaii. The first of those projects is my own dissertation research on the role of the national parliament (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, hereafter DPR) with particular emphasis on the period 1966-1977. Preliminary results of that research indicate that throughout the 30+ year existence of the DPR it has demonstrated a high degree of discontinuity with respect to internal structural characteristics, behavior and the role which it plays in the larger political system. Membership changes have been both frequent and drastic in response to the infrequent elections which have been held as well as to the more common irregular methods resulting from external pressures. Over that 30 year history the DPR has declined steadily from its position as a powerful legislative body at the center of governmental decision-making activity to its present low level of legislative output and location at the periphery of decision-making power. Attempts to explain this decline lead to an examination of the interactions between the DPR--and the political party system which is inseparable from it--and the larger political and social system within which it exists. Here one is forced to the conclusion that even the position of power once enjoyed by that body is more apparent than real and carried within it the seeds of the DPR's decline. We are reminded of the theme of the Hawaii conference several years ago on Legislative Origins and the fact that constitutional provisions adopted by the "new states" at the time of independence and their desire to prove their democratic credentials frequently create the illusion of parliamentary strength in the absence of those conditions necessary to the healthy and effective exercise of that strength. The consequence of such deviation from reality is the exacerbation and escalation of conflict at elite levels, the obstruction of policy-making in critical areas by political deadlock and, finally, the launching of punitive actions against the legislature and political parties by a variety of opposing forces with either the support of substantial elements of the attentive public who have become disillusioned by local democratic practice or in the face of widespread public indifference. Such was the case in Indonesia in 1949 when President Soekarno moved to alter the existing political constellation by introducing "Guided Democracy" and again in 1966 when General Soeharto acted to replace both Soekarno and "Guided Democracy" with his "New Order" regime.

Both of the above cases are of interest to us because of the prominence with which the DPR figures in them. In the first instance it is the political parties and the DPR as their base which were the targets of Soekarno's efforts to streamline the political system and gather the reins of power in his own hands. In pursuit of this goal he acted to reduce the number of political parties to ten, disbanded the DPR which had been elected in 1955 and replaced it with an appointed body in which a large number of the members represented functional

social categories rather than political parties. Under the new constitution the DPR was also removed from its former position at the center of the policy process, although it did continue to function as a forum for heated ideological debate among the various contending elite groups. However, the prominence of the charismatic Soekarno in these changes tends to mask the similarity between what was happening in Indonesia and a model which we might identify with military regimes in Pakistan, Burma and Thailand, to name but a few. In Indonesia also it was the military bureaucracy which lent the support necessary for the curtailment of parties and parliament, but in this case the existence of a charismatic leader who sought to maintain a balance between the two adversaries managed to delay the full development of this model until 1966. When the military and their anti-"Guided Democracy" supporters finally moved against Soekarno they determined that control of the DPR and other representative bodies which had formerly been the source of political party strength was both expedient and essential to their plan to carry out a peaceful change of regime. Expediency suggested that control of those constitutional bodies would lend their plans an aura of legality, while their distrust of both parties and politicians dictated that only their neutralization would minimize opposition to their efforts. In the years 1966-1968 DPR membership underwent wholesale change in what was termed a "redressing and refreshing" of that membership. Taking advantage of President Soekarno's earlier provision for representation of functional groups those seats were filled by members whose only commitment was to the espoused principles of the "New Order" and who were openly hostile to the existing political parties.

The alterations of the Indonesian political system briefly sketched above culminated in the establishment of a military regime which bears a close resemblance to the Pakistani, Burmese and Thai cases alluded to above. The literature on both the military and political parties in developing countries abounds with explanations for the strength of the former and the weakness of the latter. What is of interest for our purposes is the relatively long time span over which the contest between those two adversaries was conducted in Indonesia in comparison with the other cases mentioned. If one were to speculate that this contrast might indicate that Indonesian parties are, at least, less weak--relatively--than their counterparts in other developing nations, this would seem to have important implications for the future of the "New Order" and for the role of the DPR. But this as well as most of the foregoing lie within the realm of legislative boundary conditions; matters of how legislatures react to or are shaped by factors existing in their external environments. The Indonesian case also suggests a rather different type of consideration. The utilization of the DPR as a vehicle for changes which came to characterize the "New Order" as well as object of those reforms, the fact that it has continued to enjoy an uninterrupted existence throughout the past eleven years, has twice experienced an orderly partial change of membership as a result of national elections and continues to be the object of considerable public attention--a good bit of it critical--suggests that this body must fulfill some felt need. While those earlier considerations call for a type of analysis which treats legislative structure and role as object or dependent variable, this latter proposition requires that those dependent and independent variables be reversed. Now it is the structure and role of the legislature which are to be viewed as the causal agents in producing or enhancing some set of conditions in the surrounding

political and social environment. While both of those perspectives are given consideration in this research, it is the latter perspective of legislature as agent of political and social change which is emphasized.

This research is now in its final stages and the resulting Ph.D. dissertation is hoped to be completed and presented for defense at the University of Hawaii some time early next year (1978).

The second piece of research is a joint project between the Comparative Legislative Studies Project at Hawaii and the Centre for Strategic and International Studies in Jakarta. My involvement in this project has been largely advisory. The purpose of CLSP support for this project was to aid the Centre for Strategic and International Studies in the development of its research capabilities on the role and behavior of local (Indonesian) legislative institutions.

While in other Asian countries one of the activities which legislatures and legislators seem to be most actively engaged in is that of providing a wide range of constituency services in direct response to complaints or requests from individuals or groups, there is little evidence of this direct link between representative and constituency in Indonesia. At the level of the national parliament this absence is probably accounted for by the highly centralized organization of the two existing political parties and by the emphasis on the representation of functionally defined interests over geographically defined groups on the part of the quasi-governmental non-party, Golkar, but at the level of provincial and sub-provincial assemblies the smaller size of the areas concerned makes this argument less convincing. However, the fact that local assemblies enjoy much less autonomy from local executives would tend to make intervention in administrative matters by an assembly or its members even more problematic. For these reasons the case of a group of transmigrants who appealed to a member of the Yogyakarta provincial parliament for aid in a dispute with the local office of a central government department which was not only taken up by that body but also received considerable coverage by the local press seemed to provide material for an interesting case study. (The case study approach also seemed to offer certain additional benefits in view of the fact that this was--at least in part--a training project for a junior staff member.)

Essentially the results of the research show that the local assembly was unsuccessful in gaining the cooperation of the central government department concerned beyond a few formal letters of explanation which can be summarized as stating that the transmigrants not only lied about conditions, but were a lazy, unreliable lot to begin with. Some of the more interesting aspects of this case deal with the process by which the protest came to be accepted on the agenda of the local assembly and the members' reaction to the lack of cooperation on the part of that government department. Several drafts of a paper (in Indonesian) have already been written and it is in the process of further revision for publication as an occasional paper by the Centre for Strategic and International Studies.

The third piece of research represents the combination of my own interests concerning the role of the present DPR with the interests of several staff members at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies in improving the

oversight activities of that body with respect to the annual state budget. Preliminary indications here are that throughout the period of the "New Order" (1966-Present) the time elapsing between the submission of the draft budget to the DPR and the DPR's approval of the budget has decreased from just under three months to less than two months, while even the former figure represents a substantial decline from the four and one-half months previously allocated for that purpose. Given that one of the main contentions of "New Order" supporters is that by freeing the DPR from an atmosphere of ideological conflict its time could now be devoted to the pursuit of national development policies, one would expect that the review and oversight of government activities and policies would be given high priority. However, this does not seem to be the case with respect to the budget.

This project has already produced one publication by Rufinus Lahur: "Catatan Mengenai 'Waktu Pengajuan' Rancangan Undang-Undang Tentang Anggaran Pendapatan Dan Belanja Negara (RUU-APBN)," ("A Note Concerning The Time of Submission of The Draft Law On The State Budget") and at least one more publication by Mr. Lahur is planned. My own work on this subject will be included in a chapter on the oversight activities of the contemporary DPR to be included in my forthcoming Ph.D. dissertation on the Indonesian parliament.

Direction and Context of Current  
Legislative Research

Richard Sisson

Los Angeles  
1977

### The Direction of Research

My present study for a number of reasons has spent more time than was initially anticipated in its gestation. It commenced as an effort to inquire into the role of legislatures in the making of law and in monitoring its administration. In what ways, to what extent, and with what effect have legislators participated in shaping law in the Indian states? How has this changed over time, under what range of conditions? Which legislators have been most influential in this regard with respect to what policy areas? How have legislators made their interventions in the decision process -- through the party caucus, select committees, standing committees, through the system of party and legislative factions, or through the legislative forum itself?

A second aspect of the study was to focus upon the role of the legislative incumbent as a communication and change agent linking province and locality. To what extent do legislators define their roles in terms of facilitating change at the local level -- what kinds of change, on whose behalf, in what manner? We also proposed to inquire into the actual activities of legislators in this regard. An additional focus of attention was to be the impact of the creation and maintenance of bases of electoral support on the distribution of spoils and economic benefit.

A rather elaborate questionnaire was developed as the major instrument in the conduct of this inquiry. A copy of the interview instrument is attached. This questionnaire is based upon an interview schedule employed by the author in his study of the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly from 1962-67 and which Professor L. L. Shrader used in a modified version in his survey of legislators in the state of Maharashtra during the same period. The current edition, however, was revised and expanded substantially in order to allow a fuller range of questions concerning legislative development and performance to be pursued and in order to incorporate

appropriate items included in the omnibus interview schedule employed by the Comparative Legislative Research Center at the University of Iowa in their studies of Kenya, South Korea, and Turkey. Although preparations had been made for the conduct of the study in two Indian states, political conditions in India have proved inhospitable to the conduct of studies such as this relying as it does upon extensive interviewing of public figures concerning what could be construed as sensitive constitutional and social issues.

Our inquiry, therefore, must rely upon other data than that which was to have been acquired through interviews. Indeed it has proved possible to address most of the questions raised above in alternate ways. First, data about the backgrounds, social and economic activities, and political careers of legislative elites have been acquired for the period extending from 1920 through 1977. This time period is extremely important in the development of viable legislative institutions in India. The creation of the Reformed Councils under the Government of India Act 1919, for example, constituted the first major commitment of the colonial administration to the ultimate creation of self-governing institutions in India. Legislatures were provided expanded measures of power, elected Indian representatives were selected as Cabinet Ministers, the Provinces were for the first time granted constitutional authority to enact legislation over a range of important policy areas thus commencing the era of federalism in India. Under the provisions of this Act, elections to the Legislative Council were held in 1920, 1923, 1926 and 1930. The Government of India Act 1935 provided for the transfer of executive power to elected Indian representatives at the provincial level and for Cabinet responsibility to the elected assembly. This Act provided the constitutional framework for India until the Republic was created in 1950. Elections were first held under this Act in 1937, but were interrupted by the exigencies of WW II. Elections were again held in 1946, and those then elected

served as the members of the legislative councils and assemblies until the first general elections were held in 1952. Five state-level general elections have been held during the three decades since independence.

Information concerning the social origins and political careers of legislators has been acquired for all preindependence legislative councils and assemblies in Bombay Presidency with the exception of 1920 and 1923 where a 40 percent sample exists. Information also has been obtained for approximately 60 percent of the membership of the assemblies and councils elected since independence. While these data enable substantial analysis, it is hoped that complete data can ultimately be acquired.

Additionally, records of the proceedings and debates of relevant legislative bodies in both pre and post independence India have been or are being acquired by the Graduate Research Library at UCLA. The proceedings of the Central Legislative Council have been acquired for the period from 1862 through independence. Post-independence records are also available. More directly related to our immediate concerns are the Proceedings and Records of the Bombay Legislative Council from 1920 through 1939, when the incumbent Congress government stepped down in protest against Indian involvement in the war effort, and those of the Legislative Assembly for the two exciting years after the Assembly was first created in 1937. These two years in Bombay as well as other "Congress Provinces" witnessed a spate of reform legislation. Similar records have been acquired for the Province of the Punjab, for Burma, and currently we are in the process of acquiring the proceedings and records for the province of Sindh, since independence an important province of Pakistan. These records constitute an important part of a long-range acquisition effort of the GRL to create a complete inventory of legislative records, party documents and minutes, and viceregal papers for preindependence India.

Finally, while the author was in India this past summer, he made arrangements for the Graduate Research Library to acquire microfilm copies of the personal

papers of several Chief Ministers and Members of the Cabinet in Bombay and neighboring provinces during the pre and early postindependence period. These data, as yet unused in scholarship, will be immensely helpful in determining the developing role of legislatures in policy making and in determining the character of legislative-executive relationships.

The first aspect of the present research effort is composed of an analysis of the changing character of legislative elites in several important provinces/states in pre and postindependence India. Currently, information for preindependence legislators is being coded for data processing, data for the 1920-36 period having already been keypunched and partially cleaned. In our analysis of this rather extensive information, we shall address a wide variety of specific questions that concern the extent to which the provincial legislatures constituted a vehicle for changing the character and composition of the political elite at the local level in India, in what manner it was instrumental in changing power relationships between major groups in provincial society, and, when set against the public record of legislative debate and performance, the impact of increasingly representative legislative institutions on rural development.

#### The Context of the Research

It should be noted that the study is conceived in terms of a larger interest with the way that institutions become established, persist, and assume power and take social effect. One of the general concerns here as in the broader literature has to do with the transformation of legislatures from "Councils of Convenience" to "Councils of Consent". In many instances this transformation never takes place. Legislatures as councils of convenience are the appendage and instrument of a powerful and privileged class which has its roots sunk in other more permanent institutions. But in the case of preindependent India, the transformation did take place over a period of decades and this pattern has continued after independence enduring thus far the imposition of fairly severe authoritarian emergency powers

by the executive. This transformation in preindependence India involved an historic change from appointive bodies nominated by the colonial executive to assist in the administration of things to a reluctant acceptance of the idea of translocal elected institutions which were part of the structure of public authority and which applied to all subjects and citizens in given territories who met, at least initially, stipulated property or educational qualifications.

In analyzing the development of legislatures and the way they do or do not assume power, it is necessary to address the question of origination, an issue which has been usefully thought out and conceptualized in a monograph by Fred Riggs. In this monograph, Riggs notes the importance of context and condition at some specified time. Context refers to the time that serious demands for the creation of a translocal elected assembly with authority to check executive power is made. The condition concerns the structure of executive authority at the time that these demands are made. For purposes of the present inquiry, it shall be necessary to extend the conception of the structure of the executive somewhat. We first note that in order for legislative institutions to have a chance, there must be some order of centralized executive authority existent at the time of the rise of legislative demands. Where executive authority does not exist, there are better ways of organizing power and taming unruly citizens than through representative institutions. There is a necessity of a more coercive format. For legislative institutions to gain a foothold, there must be an established structure of authority to transfer and share -- where authority does not have to be created and molded anew.

Demands for legislative power are initially demands to participate in the exercise of executive power, and they rise where a new class does not feel that its interests are attended by or through the executive power. The possible outcomes of this confrontation are a function of several additional factors, and have to do with the cohesion and predilection of elites at the time of origination. Where incumbent elites are characterized by an open structure, that is pluralist power

and pyramidal authority, mobility of new groups has been existent if not encouraged, shifting coalitions have not been uncommon within the elite, and a tradition of accommodation, however grudgingly arranged and sometimes violated, has developed. Where they are closed, that is concentrated power and hierarchical authority, there has been limited mobility and a tradition of directive and stipulative as opposed to deliberative and accommodative decision patterns has been maintained. With respect to the rise of a class of counter-elites, the more closed the governing elite and pervasive the structure of authority, the more protracted the process of class formation will be. The more open the governing elite and segmentary the structure of authority, the greater the possibility of class formation and expression.

The different kinds of outcomes are suggested in the following typology.

		<u>Class Salience</u>	
		<u>Cohesive</u>	<u>Uncohesive</u>
Elite Predilection	TYPE I	TYPE II	
	Participative Legislatures	Consultative Legislatures	
	TYPE IV	TYPE III	
	Secession or Civil War	Repression or Cooptation	

The consequences of the confrontation at the time of origination can be outlined as follows. In the case of Type I confrontations, we find successful efforts on the part of counter-elites to use the legislature as an agent for constraining executive authority. This we refer to as supportive societal abridgement. That is to say, a cohesive counter-elite, excluded from power, usually of a different traditional status group than the ruling elite, is able to influence the activities of the government through the legislature. In short, it uses the legislature as an agent of class interest. In the case of Type II we find the use

of legislative institutions by existing governing elites as a means of assisting executive authority, a phenomenon which we shall term constraintive executive abridgement. In this case, important social groups wield power through executive institutions, a condition customarily found in modernizing traditional polities and in one-party states. With respect to its autonomy and power in situations such as this, the legislature serves at best as a "systemic monitoring apparatus", as in the case of Nepal, or as an "embryonic articulative system", such as in Tanzania. The consequence of this legislative role is that of deflecting mass demands and of inhibiting the development of a new political class. Type III confrontations describe nascent representative demands where the executive elite is so inhospitable and powerful that reformist movements are forced underground, as in the case of prerevolutionary Russia or contemporary Paraguay. Type IV confrontations describe situations such as the collapse of Pakistan and the creation of Bangladesh. In the case of India we find the legislative demand being made in a Type II confrontation ultimately becoming transformed into a Type I confrontation.

In order to plot the routes of legislative development after the originating confrontations, we must analyze those factors which encourage deflection from power and those which facilitate the route to power. In the first instance, we find that the retreat of executive elites, whether they be alien colonials or thin, culturally alienated, indigenous elites, leads to legislative atrophy by default. The counter-elites, aspiring ultimately for control of the executive power, move into executive positions leaving the legislature to atrophy. The rise of powerful legislatures seems to require the persistence of an incumbent elite and the toughening factors of time, routine, and inter-generational socialization. A second condition which deflects the legislative institution from the route to power is unmitigated and protracted conflict between the executive and the legislature. This is encouraged

particularly where executive and legislative institutions reflect fundamental primordial divisions within society or where there is a fundamental ideological fissure or gulf. A third condition is the existence of a counter-elite which constitutes a closed class that uses the legislature as its political agent but resists providing for the recruitment of new classes into the legislative institution.

Factors which facilitate the route to legislative power are in some ways the obverse of the above. First, there must be more or less open channels of recruitment to the legislature -- a condition which entails certain problems. First of all, the doors cannot be thrown open in too rapid or diffuse a fashion so as to undermine the power of the legislature with respect to the executive. Yet they cannot be so closed so as to encourage disaffection or the use of a new class or classes by the executive to curb the power of the legislature. This dilemma constitutes the problem of autonomy and reciprocity. Legislatures must have sufficient autonomy to be able to influence the course of public policy making without stifling or undermining their representative capacities.

Second there must be a transformation from routine to moral consensus -- from class agent to a public arena or forum. This is the ultimate transformation, the toughest and most perplexing test. Third, the route to power is facilitated by the existence of social formations which have served to inhibit the permeation of centralized authority in traditional regimes. Particularly powerful facilitating conditions of this sort exist where local self-governing institutions have persisted effectively.

Once on the road to power, legislatures themselves seem to become agents of change as well as reflective of social changes which have already occurred. First, they enable as they encourage the formation of new social and political groups.

We have found in the Indian case that those legislators who were reelected during the 1920s and 1930s were initially propelled into the legislature through local governmental institutions or through membership in important traditional status groups. Those who continued to be successful, however, were those who created new bases of social support whether through new voluntary associations, class associations, or proto-party organizations at the district level. Thus the organization of public power provided by a legislative format encourages the formation of new groups bent upon changing the terms of existing social relationships. Previously depressed groups at the provincial level in India found in the legislature a means to circumvent traditional Brahmanical power at the local level and in the executive services of the state. Along with this change we find that the legislatures encouraged the institutionalization of the norm of equality as well as that of consent to law.

But there are inimical consequences of legislative institutions as well. In certain social situations, legislatures, rather than mediating conflict, tend to exacerbate it, although it is still an open question as to whether or not any kind of institutional format can mediate certain conflict situations. Second, legislative institutions in a parliamentary framework place a premium upon the creation of more or less permanent coalitions for the provision of governmental stability and the steady pursuit of progressive social ends, something often absent in newly created legislative regimes.

#### Legislatures and Alternative Forms of Representation

The above considerations suggest that legislative regimes are attractive as developmental models for a number of reasons, often ignored. First of all, those who would discard this alternative frequently overlook the fact that most authoritarian regimes have generally had poor developmental records. Those which have had success in rural development have done so under the benign auspices of an alien occupation(Japan),

where a landed, ruling elite was forcefully uprooted and received immense infusions of percapita foreign economic assistance (Taiwan), or where the regime has enjoyed stability over a long period of time (Mexico and Turkey). Where societies are relatively unmobilized, experience protracted international conflict, and have abnormally high rates of economic growth by virtue of the endowments and grace of nature, authoritarian regimes have enjoyed a certain stability, although coups within elites have not been infrequent. In almost all cases, however, governments have not successfully addressed the question of land reform and the more general problems of economic redistribution.

It would appear that executive elites, even in those authoritarian regimes committed to a socialist ethic of one sort or another, are constrained from accomplishing their tasks without the benefit of a tightly organized mass party and have the support of substantial coercive services which are prepared to be used systematically for the purpose of achieving the revolutionary goals of the regime. Without this kind of institutional power, executive elites have no leverage with centers of power entrenched at the local level. Without the capacity to systematically coerce, governing elites require the existence and activity of self-conscious and autonomous class groups at the local level in order to pry open the old centers of power. In the cases of India and the Philippines, for example, there appears to be a strong positive correlation between the existence of self-conscious peasant organizations and successful land reform. The formation and activity of such class groups, however, are inhibited by an executive-centered regime which is at best reluctant to risk opposition since such opposition may become unresponsive to elite direction and may induce opposition in other social sectors. Local elites also tend to be characterized by a fused pattern of power. Not only do they control land and liquid as well as credit resources, they also tend to be overrepresented in the administrative services as well as in the profession of law.

Finally, executive elites being without alternative groups at the local level upon which to base their support, must come to some kind of an accommodation with local notables. And the cost is ordinarily the suspension in some form or another of the implementation of reformist legislation. Without autonomous groups, reformist elites are not only deprived a necessary ally to promote change, they have also deprived themselves of an important means of monitoring the progress of their policies. Such a condition has recently characterized the local situation in India.

SURVEY RESULTS\*

By John Grumm, Wesleyan University

\*Sad to say, Mrs. John Grumm died of cancer during the Spring 1977 term when John Grumm planned to compile and analyze the results of our survey of the readership of the CLSP Newsletter. During the summer he has returned to Wesleyan University and awaits the arrival of materials shipped by surface mail from Hawaii, including the survey returns. As soon as he has an opportunity to compile the results of the survey, his report will be duplicated and distributed to recipients of this CLSP report.

SURVEY OF COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH

By

John Grumm

Wesleyan University

In October 1976 the 548 subscribers to Legislative Studies Quarterly were sent a letter and questionnaire asking if they were engaged in research connected with legislatures at that time. If so, they were asked to respond to five items as follows:

1. The topic and scope of my research is:
2. My approach or methodology is:
3. The anticipated completion date and publication plans are:
4. This work relates to my previous published work (or that of others) as follows:
5. My current project is related to the work of others; is supported by an institute or foundation; outside support is anticipated; as follows:

We received 114 replies, which represented a response rate of 21 percent. Of these, 110 turned out to be usable responses. These 110 people reported a total of 124 separate project. There were three people who were working on three legislative projects at the time, and eight who were working on two projects. The following summary speaks in terms of these 124 projects.

Of these projects, 46 or 37 percent were being conducted by scholars residing outside of the United States, while 78 or 63 percent were being

conducted by U.S. scholars. But with regard to the country or countries which were the topics or locations of the research, foreign legislatures were being studied in 78 of the projects, or 63 percent of the total, while American legislatures were involved in only 48 or 37 percent of the projects. Thus, a number of U.S. scholars were studying foreign legislative systems rather than their own. Of the 78 projects reported by U.S. scholars, 33 involved countries other than the U.S. Only one foreign scholar was studying U.S. legislatures.

The countries outside of the United States that showed up most frequently as topics or locations for the research were Great Britain (7 projects), Canada (5 projects), and India (5 projects). Australia, France, and Italy each was the topic country for 4 projects. A total of 24 countries were mentioned as the local or topic of the research.

Projects were classified as to whether they were comparative or not on the basis of whether two or more countries were mentioned in the topic or whether the respondent indicated clearly that his approach was comparative. On this basis 49 projects (40 percent) were classified as comparative and 70 (57 percent) were regarded essentially as single-country studies. In five cases it was unclear as to whether more than one country was involved. (In fact, in these five no specific countries were mentioned.) Of the 49 comparative projects, by far the largest number, 23, involved the American state legislatures; while 14 involved non-regional comparisons. Of the projects confined to a single region or continent, Europe accounted for 6, the Pacific Islands for 4; but Africa, Asia, and the Middle East accounted for only one each. In two of these projects it was not possible to tell what area or countries were involved, but the response to the item on method

indicated a comparative approach was being taken. The results suggested that U.S. scholars are somewhat more inclined toward comparative research than foreign scholars. Of the U.S. projects, 42 percent were classified as comparative, while only 35 percent of these conducted by foreign scholars were so classified.

Of all the projects, whether comparative or not, only 26 involved what we regarded as "under-developed" countries. Sixteen of these projects were being conducted by U.S. scholars, and 10 by foreign scholars, 6 of whom were studying legislatures in their own countries.

The substantive topics of the reported research varied so widely, it was difficult to group them in a small number of logically coherent categories. Consequently, we wound up with a list of 28 categories. In this summary we will only deal with those mentioned most frequently. Two fairly general topical categories shared first rank in terms of the number of projects relating to them. One was "Role of the legislature in policy-making." The other was "Characteristics, attitudes, and ideologies of legislators." Each accounted for 11 projects. In second place involving 10 projects was "Executive-legislative relations, including oversight." "Organization and procedures and the effects of reforms of these" encompassed 9 projects. Next, with eight projects, was "Recruitment of legislators." Three topical categories each accounted for six projects: "Legislative services and staffing," "Representational systems and patterns of representation and legislator-constituency linkages," and "Role of political parties in the legislature." (The latter did not include one project on "The role of communist parties in the legislature.") The remaining topical categories only accounted for one, two, or three projects each.

Some noticeable differences between foreign and U.S. scholars were revealed in this survey. The most popular topic among the former was "Role of the legislature in policy-making," but this only tied for fourth place among the U.S. scholars. The modal topic for the latter was "Executive-legislative relations. . . ." This was ranked only in fourth place among the foreign conducted projects, probably because they were dealing more often with parliamentary systems. For both groups, however, the second-place topic was "Characteristics, attitudes and ideologies of legislators." Foreign scholars were more interested in the "Role of political parties in the legislature" than U.S. scholars. This ranked third among the former, but was way down the list in 13th place among the latter.

The responses to the questionnaire item on approach or methodology were almost all in terms of the sources of data that were being used. A number of respondents also mentioned the kind of analysis they were employing (i.e., path analysis, multiple regression, etc.) but such specific references to mode of analysis were largely confined to quantitative type studies. So, in view of the kinds of response we got, it was deemed more suitable to categorize them on the basis of sources or kinds of data being employed. On this basis we developed 11 categories. Ranked in order of the frequency with which they were mentioned, they are as follows:

1. Interviews with legislators or other elites (47 responses)
2. Case studies or historical studies (26 responses)
3. Government documents (24 responses)
4. Legislative roll calls (23 responses)
5. Aggregate statistical data (17 responses)
6. Survey research (10 responses)

7. Participant observation (8 responses)
8. Private files or archives (6 responses)
9. Deductive or theoretical approach (4 responses)
10. Newspaper files (3 responses)
11. Mail survey of legislators or other elites (3 responses)

There were 24 respondents (19 percent of the total) who either did not respond to this item or whose responses were too vague or ambiguous to classify. On the other hand, among the 100 with classifiable responses to this item there were 43 persons who indicated they were using more than one kind or source of data. Of these, 25 respondents were using two types or sources of data, 12 were using as many as three, and 6 were using four or more.

There were some differences shown between the foreign and U.S. scholars in their responses to this item. The modal category for both groups was "Interviews with legislators and other elites," but this accounted for a full 41 percent of the classifiable foreign responses and only 25 percent of the U.S. "Government documents" ranked second in the foreign responses (25 percent of responses), whereas this category ranked only fourth (with 11 percent) for the U.S. responses. "Case studies or historical studies" was the second most frequently mentioned (16 percent of the total) of the U.S. responses, while this category ranked third among the foreign responses. The use of aggregate statistics was considerably more important to U.S. scholars; it ranked third among their responses (14 percent of the total), but this received only one mention by any of the foreign scholars. The U.S. scholars employed a wider variety of data than the foreign scholars. Some kinds and sources of data were utilized by the former and not the latter at all. These include

newspaper files and private files or archives. Furthermore, the four respondents who indicated they were employing a deductive or theoretical approach were all from the U.S.

Of the 124 projects reported, 13 had already been completed, and of these latter, four had been published. Consequently, the vast majority of our respondents were reporting on projects that were not yet completed. Of these projects, 54 were expected to be completed sometime in 1977, 25 expected for 1978, and 7 for 1979 or later. In 25 cases it was not possible to tell when completion was expected.

Only slightly more than half (53 percent) of the projects reported had some form of financial support. Among those supported, the sources of the funds were as follows:

1. U.S. government agency or foundation (27 projects)
2. General support from own university (25 projects)
3. Foreign foundations (19 projects)
4. U.S. private foundations (16 projects)
5. American state governments (2 projects)

Since the Comparative Legislative Studies Centers have been largely supported by a U.S. government agency (A.I.D.), this source was classified under the first category. If we break this down, however, we find that the CLSCs supported 14 projects, or slightly more than half of the total in this category; the NEH supported four; the NSF, three; Fullbright-Hays grants, three; and the U.S. Congress, three. No one reported receiving funds directly from a foreign government foundation or agency, although there may be among the 19 projects reporting support from foreign foundations, a number in which the money had come directly or indirectly from the government. It

was not possible to tell from the response whether foreign government funds were involved in any of these 19 projects. Consequently, they were all brought together under this general heading, "Foreign foundations." In any event, it does not appear from this survey that the foreign governments were anywhere nearly as deeply involved in this kind of research as was the U.S. government.

If we look at differences between U.S. and foreign scholars in terms of financial support or the lack of it, we find that the foreign scholars in this survey did a little better than the Americans in getting funds for their legislative research. The differences are not great, however; 56 percent of the projects conducted by foreign scholars were supported, while 51 percent of the U.S. scholars' projects were receiving support. Foreign researchers relied most heavily on foreign foundations (which, again, may have involved some government funds) for this support, while the U.S. scholar received support most often directly or indirectly from the federal government. Ranking in second place for both foreign and American scholars was "General support from own university."

Of the 40 projects conducted by U.S. scholars, 26 received support from only one source, seven from two sources, and six from three or more sources. So half of these projects were receiving multiple support. The foreign scholars did not do so well in this regard. Of 26 projects supported, only three had multiple support, and none had as many as three sources.

The results of this survey indicated that you do not have to be comparative to attract financial support. Of the projects so classified, 51 percent were supported, while 56 percent of the single-country studies were receiving support.

In conclusion, it appears that legislative research is thriving; but, with the heavy reliance on U.S. government financial support, the inevitable cut-back in this support could mean a diminishing of activity in this field. The private foundations in the U.S. might be called upon to play a greater role in the future. Of the 110 projects reported on in this survey, only 16 were receiving any support from U.S. foundations. Grants from one's own institution have played an important role, although they have generally been quite small compared to government or foundation grants, and there is little hope that these can be increased in size and number at most institutions. Thus, the American legislative scholar will have to look more toward the private foundations in the future, and he might take a lesson in this regard from his foreign counterpart who seems to have been more successful in securing private foundation grants.

TABLE 1: Distribution of 211 (d) Grant Funds  
Reporting Period: Aug. 15, 1975 to Feb. 11, 1977

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	<u>5th Year</u>	<u>4-Year Total</u>	<u>Final Total</u>	<u>Estimates 1972</u>	<u>Estimates** 1975</u>
1. Instruction and Academic Discourse	29,473	57,950	87,423	71,500	90,147
2. Student Assistance	10,782	26,587	37,369	38,000	37,059
3. Library and Data Collections	1,150	824	1,974	4,000	2,000
4. Research	31,999 (-2,000)	53,525 (-1,519)	85,524 (-3,519)	90,000	83,892
5. Conferences and Meetings	3,253	12,219 (-2,381)	15,472 (-2,381)	13,500	14,832
6. Foreign Linkages*	(+2,000)	(+3,900)	(+5,900)	12,000	2,170 (+7,800)
7. Service	000	000	000	000	000
8. Administration	3,260	2,330	5,590	6,000	4,900
TOTAL SPENT	79,917	153,435	233,352	235,000	235,000
9. Balance not spent	1,648	81,565	1,648	000	000
TOTAL BUDGET	81,565	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000

\*Expenses attributable to foreign linkages are shown as part of the expenses for research and conferences. Figures in parentheses indicate the magnitude of these items.

\* \*Non-211(d) Funding: see #C.6.