

August 25, 1964

Dr. David Sills
International Encyclopedia of the
Social Sciences
351 Park Avenue South
New York, New York

Dear David, Heinz & Peter:

Voici the work of genius dedicated to your encyclopedia.

Go on and upward with the arts!

Sincerely,

Alfred de Grazia

P.S. Please have check made out to THE AMERICAN BEHAVIORAL
SCIENTIST.

Representation

Representation may be defined most usefully as a relation between two persons, a representative and the represented. The representative holds the authority to perform various actions that incorporate the agreement of the represented. The relation is by no means simple, since practically every type of human communication and perception can be shown to be intrinsic in representation. The relation is socio-psychological. Essentially subjective, it may however be affected by numerous objective conditions and events.

Since representation is of social interest as a concept largely in the contexts of power--whether in government, church, school, business or families--it may well be defined as a relation of higher degree, on some basic scale that moves from non-relation (or "bad" relation) to perfect or full relation. Thus an accord of "X" degree has to be achieved before representation may be said to exist, and below which A is said to be unrepresented by M.

The simplest index of the representation is a positive answer that a person may give to the query; "Do you feel represented by M?"

What this degree of accord is to be is not standardized, if only because the very parameters of the relation are unexplored. When this writer and H.F. Gosnell attempted the task in 1940 (Cf. Democracy: Threshold of Freedom (1947), it was plain that the classical utterances on representation (Cf. Edmund Burke, "Speech to the Electors of Bristol" (1774), Works, Vol. II, p.12; John S. Mill, Representative Government (1861); Karl Loewenstein, Volk and Parlament nach der Staatstheorie der francosischen Nationalversammlung von 1789 (1922); Maude V. Clark, Medieval Representation and Consent (1936); T.V. Smith, The Legislative Way of Life (1940), were woefully

perjorative, unsystematic, and superficial. Yet, as soon as the thicket of representative relations was entered, progress became slow. Obviously, representation must consist of unconscious as well as conscious relations, expressive as well as sanctioned actions, unknown as well as known actions. Else one falls into the trap of regarding/^{as}determinative of the representative relation only conscious, known, legislative behavior--parameters that are more often missing than present in the setting about which the scholar wishes to say "A is represented by M". This rationalistic fallacy has prevented generations of scholars of democracy from coming to grips with problems of representation. (Alfred de Grazia, Public and Republic (1949)).

Today, by contrast, the study goes forward. Eulan^u, Wahlke and Buchanan (John A. Wahlke, Heinz Eulan, William Buchanan, and Leroy C. Ferguson, The Legislative System (1962)), managed to perform the difficult task of fitting standardized inquiries of several sets of U. S. State legislators into the real-life environment of representation and attaching to the representative's and perceptive structures and functions a set of postures toward representation: the expert role defines the ability and reputation of a member to the work of the horse; the purposive role includes the ritualist, tribune who defends the people, and the broker who coordinates views and people; in the representarive role some legislators take up a trustee posture toward their constituents, others a delegate one, and some "politicos" are disposed to both in various ways; finally, the areal role denotes the tendency towards identifying with the elective district on the one hand, and the whole-state on the other.

At the same time, Warren Miller and ?
undertook to question samples of the electorate various
districts concerning these Congressmen [Fn to come].

As they have exposed the facts of representation, recent studies have also disclosed the materials upon which the long-argued ethics of representation must rest. The question "Whom should a representative represent?" can be answered in a more precise way, granted always that one knows what he wishes to come out of the representative system and action, expression, and

Despite the improvement in research the connection of representation in any settings or in society as a whole must continue to be referred to (unprecisely) in absolute terms ("is" or "is not" represented), or unprecise terms ("more representative than") What would be required to improve the scientific situation? First of all, a clear, scientific approach to the myth-shrouded concept is required.

Believers in one set of democratic doctrines would be considered to be deeply desirous of penetrating as rapidly as possible into the representative relation. It is, after all, par excellence. The democrat who subscribes to one or another factual theory that abundant representative behavior occurs or can be made to exist between an official and a considerable body of the constituency. Should the relation not be explored?

Perhaps a taboo arises as the source of myth is approached. At any rate, considering the wealth of empirical investigation in human relations, it is odd and regrettable that so little work has borne directly upon the foremost structural problem of democracy.

The state of knowledge of representation would be improved if translation of concept and findings of other scientific fields were made. Since representation is a psychological condition, there

Secondly, an ~~approximation~~ ~~of~~

~~The determinants of ~~group~~ representation~~

Since ~~it is~~ ^{representation} a psychological condition, there are obviously numerous relevant concepts, such as perception (awareness), cognition (information), communication, ~~and~~ ^{and} stereotype, ~~that~~ ^{that} are to be regularly taken into account. In addition, there occur ~~many~~ group behavior concepts, many of which pertain to representation. If representation is a relation between "A" and "M", it is also a relation between "B" ~~and~~ "C", "D", ... N.

^{on the other hand} The boundary of the members being determined by the definition of the group, and that ~~is~~ being in the parlance of political science, the electoral district, which ~~has~~ in turn can take numerous forms of a territorial or functional type ~~and~~ ^{and} exclude few or most of the ~~population~~ ^{population} given formal title to participate in choosing a representative.

What determines the representation of a group's members and ~~their~~ ^{their} formal leader? Again, numerous variables, constructed naturally occurring, such as the ~~formal~~ social composition of the group, its attitudes towards personalities type and public issues, etc. To all of which must be appended the warning that every change brought to bear upon "A" will perhaps affect "B", "C", et al differently. ^{force} simple ^{ly} ^{complic}

~~the~~ ^{perhaps} effect "B", "C", et al differently. ^{force} simple ^{ly} ^{complic}

yet that whole ^{set of} problems is germane to
the study of representation. For ~~what~~ a major
source of change in representation may be the
propagandistic ~~strategy~~ operations of parties
contending for the right to be representatives.
If propaganda be regarded as stimulus,
intended to cause response favorable to the
propagandees on ~~the~~ the part of the
propagandized (and the represented ~~are~~ are
continuously ~~subjected~~ being propagandized),
the ~~best~~ chances of success of the stimulus
rest basically upon its ^{penetration} ~~development~~ ^{the} more
basic norms of the population. If, for
example, the ~~demands~~ expectations and demands
of a group are heightened by the win
of an ~~new~~ ideology according to non-traditional
principles, ^{increased} ~~re-education~~ ^{pressures} will ~~be exerted~~ ^{be exerted}
~~upon~~ ^{upon} those who offer
themselves as representatives. The latter
will be obliged to ~~to~~ respond by ^{natural}
confirming, or more likely, ~~shouting~~ ^{shouting}
In sum, the ^{study of the} representation of a group
results from the special algebra of apparatus
of individuals; ~~no barrier~~ need exist betw.
~~the~~ ~~between~~ two theories of representation
individual and ^{the other} group, are unnecessary
admittedly, if it is difficult to assess the ^{condition} ~~condition~~
representation ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ ^{same} ~~case~~ ^{case} ~~of~~ ^{of} the

Still, counterbalancing and averaging errors of individual estimate permit the logically astonishing result (rarely recognized but ~~now~~ widely present in social science literature) that a statement made about the representation of a group is likely to be no less precise or valid than one made about an individual. Predicting the vote of an individual and predicting the vote of a group; stating the effects of propaganda on an individual and ~~on~~ a group; declaring that a new institution will or will not ~~produce~~ increase the representation of an individual and of the group in these cases and many more scientific success is no more likely in working with an individual than with a group. Therefore one need not fear to study either or both, granted that one cannot understand, ~~and~~ much less predict, either kind of behavior very well.

Thus far, we have spoken of individual and group psychology in representation as being affected by subjective and symbolic determinants. There exist as determinants a great number of institutional devices to produce (or restrict) representation of a group of institutional devices intended to produce a high level of representation among the constituents of a population may be called "representative government." ~~Actually~~ Historically, many governments have been "representative" without being "representative governments," since the conditions of representation may be "ideal" without the emphasis

~~It is for ~~such~~ that reason that a number of~~
~~Statements~~

INSERT

→ These devices, which may sometimes ^{be} called institutional but often are of a relatively minute nature (such as a term of office), are ~~not~~ to be construed as ^{recurring sets of} ~~similar~~ ^{relevant to the relationship of representation} ~~actions~~ - habitual, routine, predictable and enforced by ~~specialized~~ specialized personnel. There is no need, therefore, to separate the study of representative government from the study of representation.

It a,

~~secret~~ ballots, campaigns, etc. -- that is called representative government.

Theoretically they have to be regarded as procedural constructions intended to form representation in a desired way. Thus an apportionment that follows local cultural boundaries is expected to produce representatives colored by local ideas, and one that cuts across boundaries established in a nearly random way is supposed to ~~not~~ suppress localism.

A ~~single-member~~ district system with a majority or plurality ~~to~~ vote determining the winning candidate is expected to accentuate the majority sentiment of each district, if such ~~is~~ ~~is~~ whereas a ~~limited~~ multi-member district ~~where~~ ~~no~~ ~~one~~ with a limited vote, by which ~~is~~ a considerable minority sentiment is bound to elect ^{one} candidate at least is a device intended to enrich legislative discussion by presenting opposing views from among the same constituencies.

~~Thousands of~~ such variant electoral systems ~~might~~ ^{exist} ~~even~~ ^{throughout} the world, because of imitation.

Only the fool ~~or~~ ^{or} ideologue insists that one system is the only system of representative government. Indeed, as we have indicated, it is impossible to show that representative government produces a strikingly larger ~~number~~ ^{number} of representatives than other

forms of government. ~~The~~ However, whatever the difference in history and today, the ~~feeling~~ as of representative government can be safely regarded as productive of more representation ~~as time goes~~ become more understood, and more controllable, ~~with the passage of time~~ its devices may be arranged to produce ^{with fair accuracy} the representation of ~~whichever~~ the system is set up to ~~not~~ represent.

It is important to stress that the devices of representative government are not ~~at all~~ ^{help} all things to all people. They help certain people to get ^{more} representation and this is performed almost always at the expense of someone else's of representation. Hence the path from ^{non-representation} representation is never straightforward and ~~it has to be strongly~~ for everyone. Each successive change in history (and in the great many short-term cycles of history that occur from year to year in contemporary ~~of~~ society) has been a redefinition of who is "worth" representing in a people. At every turn of the road, then and now, attitude, ~~and device~~ procedure and device go ~~hand~~ together, the one often cancelling out the effect of the other. For

^{instance} ~~the kind of representation available to state citizens from state legislatures was changed by court order in Baker v. Carr (1963) and Reynolds v. Sims~~ ^{to provide districts of equal population} but ~~simultaneously~~ the

9 In a more permanent way, perhaps, the political power of rural and small city areas was cut down

total representativeness of the legislators was perhaps reduced by ~~that~~ temporarily by the coming of many strange candidates before the people. ~~that~~ Distributing a set of relations that are premised upon awareness and acquaintance can easily reduce representation in ^{the very} setting where new devices are intended to promote it.

(There were, of course, many other effects on the conditions of representation as a result of these cases) fn

~~In the end~~, one must conclude that the burden of plotting and mapping the effects of disturbances and changes in ~~one or more~~ most devices of representation ~~are~~ ^{too} heavy for contemporary political science to bear and far too heavy for the much more limited rationality of ~~the~~ ^{its} politicians' practical politics. Though ~~each~~ each institutional device ~~is~~ can be perceived to carry certain effects, such effects are not well-known, scientifically or in ~~applied~~ ^{applied} ~~policy~~ ^{policy} applied politics; if ~~the~~ ^{its} individual effects can be predicted, ~~its~~ its indirect effects when taken as part of a system of devices, cannot be predicted; the coming of other changes cannot be foreseen either, and these may be of a character so gross as to overwhelm the effects of the initial changes.

Thus the ~~character~~ ^{device} of Italian and German representation were modified after World War I to permit more accurate manifestations of public opinion in the legislatures. The ~~very~~ ^{proportional representation was employed, for example} effects were



Alfred de Grazia, Appointment and Representative
Government.

as foreseen, but the largest effect of ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{contrary} ~~was~~ ^{to} promote a form of representation ~~based upon~~ ^{based upon} the ~~uncontrolled~~ Duce and Fubree principles, that is, direct controlled representation of the mass of people, ~~strongly~~ ^{emphasizing} ~~uncontrolled~~ ^{uncontrolled} activity that is, in the old sense, "unrepresentative" activity on behalf of the mass. In quite another way, far from "strengthening the state legislature" as the Supreme Court and ~~the~~ associated opinions asserted, the aforementioned 1963 and 1964 American cases would perhaps hasten the decline of federalism and, within the states, diminish the role of the legislature in relation to the governor.

These instances permit another proposition about representation: ^{Representation is broader than the devices that regulate it.} Classical ~~devices~~ ^{speculation} and debate over representation almost always looked upon representation as a linear scale relation: ~~fractured~~ ^{fractured} a device would increase or diminish representation. This is true, or can be made to be true, ~~either~~ ^{by simplifying} ^{the question} ^{for simple} ^{asking} ^{as} that operationally defines the relation, ~~and~~ ^{by asking} ^{as} above: "Do you feel more or less represented today than five years ago?" Or also, ^{representation can be} ^{confined} ^{to a} ^{scale} ~~unidimensional~~ ^{usually} ^{unconsciously} ^{to a} certain kind of issue: thus, a man ~~concerned~~ ^{concerned} with ~~a~~ ^{the} commercial, atomistic view of society may not understand why the stock question of whether representation ^{should not be} ^{asked} ^{is} "Has your representative followed your wishes with respect to voting on the budget?" ^{A great} ^{many} ^{changes} ⁱⁿ ^{representation} ^{would} ^{occur}, ^{which}, ^{so} ^{long} ^{as} ^{they} ^{were} ^{stopped} ^{by} ^{this} ^{question}, ^{would} ^{either} ^{not} ^{be} ^{measured} ^{at} ^{all} ^{or} ^{would} ^{exhibit} ^a ^{generally} ^{false} ^{effect}.

F. A. Hermans, Democracy or Anarchy? (1941)

~~What often occurs is that~~ ~~to~~

Representation is multi-faceted. It is a broad relation. To define it otherwise invites continual frustration. ^{It} has to be defined as broadly as the range of expectations that people possess in regards to the government, and hence, public officials. ^{representation within} (Pari passu, ^{some of the} all social organizations.)

Consequently, a great many facts, events, and institutional devices affect ~~the~~ the state of representation. Consequently, ~~a~~ the represented is approachable along numerous paths. ~~It~~ may, therefore, be sensed as only a small loss to him to be deprived of a ~~single~~ vaguely familiar, "trivially" occupied ~~legislative~~ district representative. When at the same time, he is receiving a new charge of ^{entire} satisfaction from ^{a physically} remote ~~but~~ ~~not~~ psychologically ~~near~~ national figure. It is as useless to berate him for shortsightedness, ^{and} ~~any other~~ ^{any other} foolishness as to berate ~~any other~~ mystic who shuns the practical. Indeed, this mysticism is more practical, for it costs ~~about~~ nothing in self-discipline. ^{about} ^{the} ^{widest} ^{conclusion} ~~to~~ This particular phenomenon may be that only a self-disciplined ^{ruling class} ~~elite~~ ^{personality} ~~and~~ ^{individuals} ~~of~~ ^{of} high status, can operate a republic over a long period of time; the mass of the population must succumb sooner or later to the seductive choice of the great over the petty, majesty over meanness, feeling over calculation. The elite ~~may~~ ^{need} not be ~~one of~~ ^{one of} birth; ~~they~~

it can emerge from the ~~past~~; it must have two traits if it is to function in the bosom of modern mass democracy: it must ~~be~~ have means of maintaining solidarity on the principle of multi-faceted and ~~representative~~ ^{representative} representation against the surge of the masses ^{of people} towards ~~the~~ single-executive leadership, and it must have the skills to ~~govern~~ ^{govern} the masses. The ~~crisis~~ ^{crisis} of representation in the twentieth century has been precisely the inability of the ~~old~~ ^{old} ~~establishment~~ ^{establishment} ruling class that created the rich fabric of ~~representation~~ ^{solidarity} and ~~governance~~ ^{governance} to maintain it.

Russia, Italy, Germany, Spain, ^{Japan, Argentina} and France, to name only ~~the~~ important catastrophic cases, the ~~excitation~~ ^{excitation} of executive representation ~~that~~ ^{overcame} the intricate and ~~various~~ ^{various} system that had developed. Today, with the ~~collapse~~ ^{collapse} of several of these ~~cases~~ ^{cases} swept beneath the ~~history~~ ^{history} of history, yet actually the United States and the Soviet Union ~~both~~ ^{both} face ~~permanent~~ ^{permanent} crises over the mode of representation to be provided their populations. The Soviet Union depends upon ~~its~~ ^{its} party to ward off Stalinism. The United States depends upon a complicated legalistic ~~set~~ ^{set} of representative devices, and localized parties and elites. ~~Neither~~ ^{Neither} is safe; ~~both~~ ^{both} are

The Public and ~~Its~~ Problems (1927) 3

of Mary P. Follett, The New State (1918).

