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Summary

The new Ordinance of Scientific Areas enacted by the Ministry of Science of Republic of Croatia specifies Politology as a scientific discipline of social sciences: 1. Political Science, 2. Theory and History of Politics, and 3. Political Philosophy. Following the objections of the academic community, that division was revised as follows: 1. Theory, History and Doctrines of Politics, 2. Foreign and National Policy, 3. Other. The author describes a different structuring, corroborated by IPSA’s and APSA’s documents. Also, the author reviews the two centuries of the development of political science in America and in Croatia. In hundred years of the globally prevailing American development of Political Science and of the professions of political scientists, a new global standard was set. It structures include approximately a hundred fields and subfields of science and expertise in Political Science in 8 basic fields: 1. Political Institutions, 2. Political Behaviour, 3. Comparative Politics, 4. International Relations, 5. Political Theory, 6. Public Policy and Management, 7. Political Economy, and 8. Political Methodology.

The author emphasizes that any ungrounded intervention in the division of scientific fields might heavily harm the progress of this science, organisation of research, staff renewal at the University, academic education of political scientists, as well as the internationally comparable competence of Croatian experts and Croatian democratic political thought and political culture in general.

According to the Croatian Ministry of Science’s recently published Ordinance of Scientific Areas, Politology in the Republic of Croatia, as a scientific discipline (5.03) of the social sciences (5.), is now arranged into the following fields:

"5.03.01. Politology
5.03.02. Theory and History of Politics
5.03.03. Political Philosophy".

1Narodne novine, No. 29, March 14, 1997, p. 1351.
No doubt, it is a unique division, and has so far been unknown to the political science worldwide. Both historically and by contemporary standards, politics as a social science has never been similarly structured.

This paper cites the structure of political science as proposed by International Political Science Association (IPSA) as well as the one suggested by American Political Science Association (APSA), the largest national and world’s most influential association of political scientists. Furthermore, the most eminent titles, considered standard-setters within the scientific community, will be compared. Finally, development of the globally accepted structure of political science will be reviewed on the basis of the official documents.

During the XVI IPSA World Congress, held in Berlin in 1994, the issue of the “state of the discipline” was debated in terms of eight fields:

1. Political Institutions
2. Political Behaviour
3. Comparative Politics
4. International Relations
5. Political Theory
6. Public Policy/Administration Sciences
7. Political Economy, and

The contemporary, but “traditional” division differs somewhat from the list above. A year after the IPSA's Berlin Congress, the bulletin of American Political Science Association (APSA) issued the following division:

1. American Politics (i.e. national)
2. Comparative Politics
3. International Relations
4. Methodology
5. Political Theory
6. Public Administration
7. Public Law
8. Public Policy

9. *Other fields* (e.g. Political Institutions, Political Communication, Political Behavior, Political Economy, Political Psychology, Political Philosophy, etc.)

10. *Applied fields* (e.g. Political Culture, Political Education, Political History, Area Studies, etc.)

I. **American development in structuring contemporary and recent integrated Political Science/Politics. Its division into fields.**

Understanding of the structure of these fields has a rather interesting development. That development can be tracked more closely in APSA’s publications (as for setting the standards, APSA has become the dominant political science association in our century). Up to the second half of the 19th century, however, American political science was marginal and its significance far below the overpowering German influence. At that time “Science of Politics” had but four subordinate fields:

1. **American Government**

2. **Comparative (Foreign) Government**

3. **Political Theory** (or **Political Philosophy**), and

4. **Elements of Law**.

New York postgraduate *School of Political Sciences*, founded at Columbia University in 1880 by Professor John W. Burgess, had set a new model for political science. After an intervention into that tradition, the base of the study of Political Sciences became a combination of Political Philosophy, History, Geography, Political Economy, Diplomacy, Science of the State, and Theory of Law with Public law — with historical, comparative, administrative and statistical approaches. In 1891 Sociology was added, too. The idea for the altered structure was taken from European

---

3 Cf. APSA: *Personnel Service Newsletter*, vol. 38, No 6, Feb. 1994. That is, simultaneously with the Congress of IPSA.


political science, largely from the newly established École libre des sciences politiques in Paris.7

In USA, the first intervention in the above mentioned constitutive structure was a new view of global and American politics after World War one. The second wave in this development took place in mid century (1925—1975). Slowly at first, then gaining momentum in the forties and fifties, the so called behavioral revolution penetrated; about a decade later, it was the system analysis. The combined processes of historical “return to the state”, bringing back political institutions, public policy, and political economy as well as the rise of rational choice theories and new political philosophy8 in the seventies and eighties, contributed to today’s, matured synthesis of the nineties. This synthesis took the europeization of American political science into a new stage of development, while the European became americanized to a great extent. This is indeed, structurally and conceptually, the fundament of today’s integration, after a long period of convergence.

It is only after World War one that the number of officially accepted fields of enquiry and teaching began to grow. The fifties brought about an enlarged list of the fields of “specialization” in American political science which had meanwhile become the leading national political science, partly because of this. Here follows the new structure of the fifties:

1. Political theory or Philosophy
2. Political Parties, Public Opinion, Pressure Groups, Political Communication (Propaganda, Semantics)
3. Public Law (often separated into Constitutional Law and Administrative Law)
4. Public Management
5. International Relations, Diplomacy, International Politics, International Law, International Organizations
6. American Government (Federal, State, and Local)
7. Comparative (Foreign) government (often with American Government)
8. Legislative bodies and legislation
9. Government and Business.9

---

At the American universities, the usual articulation of fields at the departments of political science was somehow narrower, but a broader structure of courses covering the fields as well as optional subjects on other departments fully compensated for the possible gaps. The general structure, however, included the following:

1. Public Administration
2. International Relations
3. Comparative Government
4. American Government and Politics
5. Political Theory\(^\text{10}\)

The inter-departmental list of optional courses regularly contained Law, Journalism, Economy, and History. In terms of the number of credits, some of these courses were compulsory.

It is important not to overlook that this structure of disciplines matches the structure of professions in political science. The reason is twofold: first, because of the American culture of professions and its pragmatic orientation towards the constant and efficient solving of developmental and business problems in achieving a high performance of government offices and private corporations; and secondly, there was a strong initial push of the French influence on development of American political science. The key features of the French education in political science are the fundamental theoretical education with the expert practical education in both public and private organisations.

From the thirties — shortly after Merriam’s *New Aspects of Politics* — up to the sixties, APSA adhered to the following division:

1. American National Government
2. Comparative Government
3. International Law and Relations
4. Political Parties
5. Political Theory
6. Public Administration
7. Public Law
8. State and Local Government\(^\text{11}\)

---

\(^{10}\)Roseman & co. (1966), pp. 18—19.

\(^{11}\)Cf. APSA (1961).
The structure is similar in Europe at that time, but Political Economy, Political History and at places Political Sociology as well had greater importance than in USA (where Political Economy and Political History were considered sub-fields). If we take into account only the structuring of Political Science by fields, and set aside the initial fourfold structure — we can summarise the list of changes in the USA in the last seventy years (APSA 1923, 1960, 1994) as follows:

(4) Methodology replaced Political Parties (4) of the thirties, the latter restructured as a sub-field (1) of American Politics and (2) Comparative Politics. State and local Government (8) also becomes a sub-field (1) of American Politics, (2) Comparative Politics and (6) Public Administration, while its place is filled with (8) Public Policy.

(4) International Relations is established and reformulated as an independent field, with International Law being only its sub-field.

A period of rapid change in USA concerning the understanding of the field structure of our science began in late sixties (i.e. about ten years after — and in part parallel to — major works by Easton, Dahl, Lindblom, and Almond, and under Strauss’, Rawls’, Lasswell’s, Parsons’ and Lazarfeld’s influences). Only three “general fields” were distinguished at first (in 1968):

1. Contemporary Political Systems
2. International Law, Organization and Politics

At the same time 27 specialized fields or sub-fields were listed in alphabetical order, without explicit structuring. A compromise between the so called traditionalists and behaviourists/system analysts is obvious. That solution was abandoned soon and in 1973 the eight-field structure was restored. Apparently, the new structure was new solely by the names of the fields, while structurally it remained the old pre-sixties list (“containing the antique dichotomy of Foreign and American Politics”):

1. Foreign and Cross-National Political Institutions and Behavior
2. International Law, Organizations and Politics
3. Methodology
4. Political Stability, Instability and Change

5. Political Theory
6. Public Policy
7. Public Administration
8. Political Institutions, Processes and Behavior in USA

Sixty sub-fields of those fields were determined at the same time.\textsuperscript{15} The methodology stabilisation, the end of the financial expansion of behavioral research as well as the influence of Deutsch, Lowi and Moore, which all happened about that time, probably initiated the development of several fields. Methodology, Political Behavior, Institutions and Public Policy emerged among the disciplines. System Analysis was linked to Methodology, Public Policy and Political Change. Political Philosophy, Theory of Law, Administrative and Public Law were integrated into the sub-fields. An interesting thing about that structure — in itself innovative in many ways, but at places not particularly logical — is its origin. It appeared after the \textit{National Science Foundation Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel}\textsuperscript{16} had been published in 1970 and the application of the Register was attempted. It was not very successful, except for the cited elements which followed the natural logic of political science instead of the logic of administration. That structure was soon abandoned.

If we are to compare it with the contemporary structure, introduced at the beginning of the article (IPSA 1993 and APSA 1994) as well as with the one that APSA was defending at its conventions in the nineties\textsuperscript{17}, several points need to be made. First, the differences between the actual structure and the structure in the years from 1968 to 1973 should be clear. Also, a partial return to some ideas of the structure from 1930—1961 is noteworthy. Secondly, we should note that several fundamental ideas of American political science from the late 19th century and the early 20th were borrowed from French, German and British current theories. And thirdly, the new, (but also the modern classical, now integrated) status of Public Policy, Political Economy, Political Institutions, Political Processes/Behaviour, Theory of State, Theory of Law, Public Law, Political Communication, Political Culture, Political Philosophy and Political Education is acknowledged.

Today’s standard began its establishment in the contemporary referral scientific literature in 1975\textsuperscript{18}, the year when \textit{Handbook of Political Science} was published. Eight volumes of the \textit{Handbook} were structured as follows:

\textsuperscript{15}Cf. APSA (1973), Greenstein & Polsby (1975).
\textsuperscript{16}Greenstein & Polsby (1975), loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{17}Cf. APSA (1995, 1996).
\textsuperscript{18}Greenstein & Polsby (1975), op. cit.
1. Political Science: the Scope and the Theory
2. Micropolitical Theory
3. Macropolitical Theory
4. Nongovernmental Politics
5. Governmental Institutions and Processes
6. Policies and Policymaking
7. Strategies of Inquiry
8. International Politics.

Ada W. Finifter from Michigan State University edited two reviews of the “state of the discipline” in political science in 1983 and 1993, both published by APSA\textsuperscript{19}. Her reviews apply the following division:

1. History of Political Theory, Thought, and Ideas (emphasising the “great books”)
2. Political Theory and Methodology
3. Political Processes and Political Behavior (with Political Parties, Elections, Parliamentarism, Policy Analysis, Political Communication, Federalism, etc.)
4. Political Institutions and State (Legislatures, Public Law and Judicial Politics, Political Executive, Public Administration)

Of complementary importance are the conclusions of an APSA expertise from 1985, done by Bluhm, Hermann, Murphy, Nelson and Pye\textsuperscript{20}. According to that analysis, which has become very influential — especially for the structure and the approaches to the sub-fields of political science in the USA and elsewhere — the emphasis is put on the increasing importance of (neglected for a long time) humanistic scientific profiling of the following basic fields and sub-fields in the integrated Political Science — Political Science “in singular”:

1. Public Administration and Policy Analysis
2. Formal Theory and Empirical Application
3. National Politics

II. After Political Sciences: Integral Political Science

The new global standard in the recent “integrated” political science — though increasingly clearly outlined in the literature — was not formulated before the latest representative encyclopedic work, *A New Handbook of Political Science* in 1996. The book was prepared in collaboration with IPSA and was preliminary discussed on IPSA’s Congress in 1994 with the explicit intention of continuing and replacing the *Handbook of Political Science* of 1975. In this book, a global representative team of political scientists has worked explicitly on the basis of contemporary and recent leading American, British, German, French, and Italian traditions in political science, and on the innovations in not only political science, but in the related social sciences. According to this, in today’s more or less united global tradition, the actual division of the integrated political science goes as follows:

1. **Political Institutions** (especially legal analysis and Rational Choice analysis, complementarily)
2. **Political Behaviour** (esp. institutional and experiential approaches, voting and parties)
3. **Comparative Politics** (esp. micro-behavioral research and analysis of democracy)
4. **International Relations** (esp. neo-realist, neo-mercantilist, post-positivist and feminist approaches)

---


5. Political Theory (explicitly including the “traditions in political philosophy”, especially after Rawls (i.e. fifties)

6. Public Policy and Administration (esp. analysis of comparative policies, ideas, interests and institutions)

7. Political Economy (esp. perspectives of politico-economic social analysis and economic analysis of politics)

8. Political Methodology (esp. qualitative methods, research projects and experimental methods)

Political sciences, founded in the tradition of last century’s “science of the state” and an even older tradition of politico-cameral sciences\(^2\), are quite changed today. Inside that tradition, political sciences were actually a replacement of the entire social sciences, a replacement that emphasised its interest for community and politics; roughly they were structured accordingly:

1. National, Comparative, and Global — Political, Economic and Social History. History of Diplomacy
2. History of Political Doctrines
3. Philosophy of Politics, with Philosophy of State and Law, and History of Philosophy
4. Political Institutions and History of Political Institutions. Public Law with Constitutional and Administrative Law, and Jurisprudence
5. State Administration and State Policies
6. Political Economy with Finance, and (later) Pure Political Economy, Social Economy, and Economic Policy
7. Social Psychology
8. Sociology of Politics
9. Publicity, Publishing, and Journalism
10. National and Comparative Government, State and Politics
11. International Law, Diplomacy, Political Geography and Demography

During the modern era, i.e. the last three to four centuries at least (say, from Machiavelli, Bodin, Althusius and Hobbes), political sciences’ basic content has never been much less segmented. But some of the contents were narrower, some broader — and they have been developing in

different structures. Some of those disciplines were developed together, and only afterwards they branched into special fields. The others were developing by themselves (sometimes merely as skills), and were only later on integrated into the new and various scientific compositions. However, most typically they have undergone multiple paths of development on the one hand they have developed into special sciences (Political Science, Economy, Law, Administrative Science, Psychology, Sociology, History), and on the other, they have simultaneously become fields and sub-fields of other science or sciences (Political Psychology, Political Sociology, Political Geography and Geopolitics, Political History, several politico-legal fields, Management, Economic Policy). Or, they used to be special disciplines but have become integrated fields and/or sub-fields occasionally even in several diverse sciences (Finance, Political Economy, Political Philosophy). Meanwhile, structural attitudes and approaches to the structuring have been changing, so the same disciplines have not remained quite the same as fields in different sciences.

Political science, as it developed in the second half of 20th century, especially in the last 15—20 years, is approximately structured in the following manner:

1. Political Theory

24Political Theory is — in short — arranged into the following sub-fields:

1. Foundations of Political theory
2. History of Political theories, ideas, and thought
3. Normative and qualitative Political theory, Political philosophy, and Ethics
5. Politico-economic Theory
6. Theory of Law
7. Theory of Political institutions and the State
8. Theory of Organisation and decision-making
9. Theory of Political behaviour and Political communication
10. Theory of ideologies and of Political culture
11. Theory of National politics
12. Theory of Comparative politics
13. Theory of International relations

Theoretic (and philosophic) methodology of Political Science, Theory of State and Political Institutions, Theories of Political Behaviour and Political Communication, Media, and Journalism, Political Theory of Economy and Society, Theories of Political Systems and Comparative Politics, Theories of Organisation and Management, to some extent Theory of Law and Theory of International Relations — they all traditionally belong to both the Political Theory and other special fields of political science.

One remark applies to the structuring of Political Theory and to all the following structurings of fields of Political Science in the subsequent notes: these structures are meant to indicate the content and the approaches of a discipline.
2. **Methodology of Political Science** 25
3. **Political Institutions (and State)** 26
4. **Political Economy** 27
5. **Political Behaviour and Political Processes; Political Communication, Media and Journalism** 28

This requires special explication and much more space than we can afford. We can only add that each discipline of Political Science images all others, and vice versa. They are an indispensable part of the profile of every graduated political scientist (their share in the course syllabus, of course, may vary according to the profile). Even more, it is a criterion of their status as disciplines.

25**Methodology of Political Science** is mostly arranged into the following sub-fields:
1. Theoretic (and philosophic) methodology of political analysis and research in Political Science
2. Political methodology of Rational Choice and formal analysis
3. Methodology of empirical research of political institutions and processes. Model making and simulations, review projects and political analysis
4. Data creation, collecting and processing. Statistics and political analysis
5. Developmental and strategic analysis, forecasting and managing political processes
6. Methodology of historical political analysis
7. Politico-legal analysis
8. Comparative analysis.

26**Political Institutions** are arranged into the following sub-fields:
1. History of political institutions
2. State, parliamentarism, governmental institutions, presidentialism, judiciary
3. Political organisations, political parties, and elections
4. Public media
5. Theory of state and political institutions.

27**Political Economy** is arranged into the following sub-fields:
1. Politico-economic theory. Macro and micro analysis. Economic analysis of politics
2. Global/International political economy
3. National political economies
4. Comparative political economy, regional political economies, and political economies of international integrations
5. Special political economies
6. Politico-economical order, development, and change. Institutions and processes. Politico-economical cycles
8. Strategies and policies of politico-economic development and change

28**Political Behaviour, Political processes, political communication, media and journalism** — as a joined field — would have to be arranged into the following sub-fields:
6. **Public Administration Management**

7. **Public Policy**

1. Political behaviour and processes
   - electoral behaviour and processes
   - legislative behaviour and processes
   - executive and administrative behaviour and processes
   - judicial behaviour and processes
   - politico-economical behaviour and processes
2. Interests, political culture and behaviour
   - interest groups
   - political violence
   - political culture, socialisation and participation
   - stability, development and change
3. Political communication and public opinion
   - political information
   - representation, public relations, and lobbying
   - public opinion
4. Public Media and journalism
   - Press
   - Radio
   - TV
   - Other networks
   - Political communication market
5. Theories of political behaviour and political communication
   - Politico-psychological aspects
   - Politico-sociological aspects
   - Politico-economical aspects
   - Politico-legal aspects
   - Strategic aspects.

**Public Management** is arranged into the following sub-fields:
1. Foundations of public management
2. Theory of organisation and decision making
3. Theory of management
4. State/public administration
5. Administerial behaviour
6. Administration law
7. Fiscal and budget management
8. Human resources management
9. Comparative administration systems.

**Public Policy** is arranged into the following sub-fields:
1. Foundations of public policy
2. Formation and implementation of public policy
3. Policy Analysis
4. Special public policies (multidisciplinary and multisectoral)
5. Comparative public policies.
8. National Politics, or National Government and Politics \(31\)
9. Croatian Politics, or Croatian Government and Politics \(32\)
10. Comparative Politics, or Comparative Government and Politics \(33\)

\(31\) National Politics, or National Government and Politics, are usually arranged into the following sub-fields:
1. Theory of national government, politics and political system
2. Contemporary political systems/government and politics
   - USA
   - Germany
   - France
   - Great Britain
   - Russia
   - Italy
   - Japan
   - Australia
   - Scandinavian countries
   - European union
   - Regional integrations
   - Other systems.

\(32\) Croatian Politics, or: Croatian Government and Politics is consequently arranged into the following sub-fields:
1. Croatian state and society
3. Interests, political organisations and parties
5. Elections and electoral behaviour.
6. Parliament and legislative behaviour
7. President of the Republic
8. Government and governmental institutions
9. Law, courts, and judiciary
10. Public/State policy
11. Public/State administration and local self-government
12. Croatian political economy
13. Croatia in regional and global context
14. Croatian political history.

\(33\) Comparative Politics, or: Comparative Government and Politics is usually arranged into the following sub-fields:
1. Theories of comparative government and politics
2. Models of comparative analysis
3. Comparative analysis of Croatian and other contemporary political systems/governments and national politics, and regional integrations — and their special aspects
4. Regional analysis
   - Systems in transition
   - Central Europe
   - Balkans
   - Mediterranean
   - Eastern Europe
11. **International Relations**

12. **Democratic Political Culture and Political Education**

13. **Political History.** In our opinion it is not to be left out, though in the cited divisions it is a non-integrated or related discipline/field.

- South-Eastern Europe
- Western Europe
- North America
- South America
- Asia
- Far East
- Pacific basin
- Atlantic community
- Near and Middle East
- Africa

5. Comparative analysis from the point of view of other fields of political science and their sub-fields

6. Area Studies as traditional interdisciplinary field of analysis.

---

34. **International Relations** as a field of Political Science is usually arranged into the following sub-fields:

1. Theory of international relations
2. International law
3. International political relations
4. International political economy and International economic relations
5. National foreign policy
6. Croatian foreign policy
7. International organisations and integrations
8. Diplomacy
9. Geopolitics, Political geography
10. History of international relations.

35. **Political Culture and Political Education** are applied fields of all other fields of Political Science in a special way (although this is principally valid for every field, even the constitutive ones). Basically, we can see them structured accordingly:

1. Theories of citizenship, civic culture and civic education
2. Political Culture
3. Branches of Political Science and Political Culture
4. Political Education
5. Branches of Political Science and Political Education
6. Political History, Political Culture, and Political Education.

36. By **Political History** we understand a discipline/field of Political Science within which Political Science is being restructured as a *retrospective of its subject: politico-economic community and politico-economic communities* or today, of the *world of nation-state and nation states* of Hobbes’ Common-Wealth and Hales’ Common Weal, and their worldwide synonyms, as well as all their aspects, relations, and practices in both the real national, regional and world wide area and in virtual analytical spaces area. Naturally it is the retrospective of the subjects of all its special fields; but it is also a *field where Political Science interdisciplinarily meets Political Historiography* (Gross 1996, p. 11, analogical to Schumpeter 1975, pp. 11—12), *by the criteria of either science*: (It is not likely that Godin and
Interdisciplinary Political History regularly appears in course agenda and has achieved fame via many political science bestsellers in the last quarter of our century — cf. e.g. Farr 1993, Rokkan 1995).

III. Croatian Development and Professions in Political Science

The Government of the Republic of Croatia has made some changes in its Ordinance of Scientific Areas after the Croatian version of this article was published (Strpić 1997). The scope of Politology is now specified into three new fields:

1. Theory, History and Doctrines of Politics
2. Foreign and Internal Policy
3. Other /fields/

The idea of "Politology" as the first field of Politology as a discipline has been abandoned, as well as that of "Political Philosophy" as a special field of Politology. Fields/sub-fields "Doctrines" and "Foreign and National Policy" are introduced instead (they were supposedly meant to constitute "Politology" as a field of Politology as a discipline. The new division seems comprehensible, apart from its staleness. We might perhaps understand it as a division of Politology into the applied and the theoretic fields (with History included in the latter).

But perhaps it might be understood as an expression of the tradition. Historically, Croatian higher education is linked with Mary Therese's Royal

Academy of Political and Cameral Sciences in Varazdin (1776) and the beginnings of the study of Philosophy in Zagreb. The areas of Political Science were included within the Faculties of Philosophy, Law Schools, and Schools of Administration in Yugoslavia, too. That is where this division would fairly fit.

When the Faculty of Political Sciences in Zagreb, the first in Eastern, Central, and Southeastern Europe, was founded in 1962, the following fields in teaching of Political Science were considered basic: 1. Introduction to Political Science, 2. General Political Theory, 3. Political System of SFRY and, partly set aside, 5. Political History. But the scientific emphasis was on the “core” fields in Political Science:

1. General Political Science (Theory)
2. History of Political Thought
3. General and National Modern Political History
4. National Political System and Comparative Political Systems
5. Political Geography
6. Political Psychology
7. International Relations
8. Science of Administration
9. Political Economy

This structure was much closer to the current standards worldwide, especially in France and Italy. It was argued that the conditions had not yet been met (i.e. there were no graduated political scientists) to establish the study of Political Science similar to the American, which was considered “completely formed, both by content and organisationally”. The references of the available faculty mostly contained degrees in Philosophy, Humanities and Law, at best rooted in German or French traditions.

In the past 25 years the situation has changed significantly, and today the structure of Political Science would be normally seen as follows:

1. Political Theory
2. Political Institutions
3. Public Policy and Management
4. Political Economy
5. International Relations

6. National Politics and Comparative Politics
7. Political Culture and Political Education
8. Political Processes, Political Communication, and Political Journalism
9. Methodology

The above structure corresponds to the efforts to establish an expert undergraduate education for political scientists, which would qualify them to work as professionals in the following areas:

1. Political Analysis and Education for Democracy
2. Croatian Politics and Political Communication
3. International Relations, Comparative Politics, and Diplomacy
4. Public Policy, Management, and Development, and
5. Public Relations and Political Journalism

Naturally, an administrative division like the one proposed by the Ministry of Science of the Republic of Croatia in its Ordinance of Scientific Areas does not have to literally adhere to all the above mentioned, but it should not ignore the actual state of the discipline. Those historically developed structures of disciplines/fields imply scientific and expert structure of sub-fields, which in turn expresses the status of special fields of analysis and practical daily political problems. These are the facts which must not be overlooked. At least, we believe that they should not be neglected. For the consequences will never be merely administrative.

The structure of Political Science, as we have showed above, outlines the spheres of fundamental political science expertises and professions in political science.


4. Political regulation and economic policy, finance and strategies of development. Design and implementation of strategies and policies of development and change. Design of social and political spheres. Coordination of multidisciplinary and multisector scientific and expert teams. Restructuring and adaptation of companies and economies according to political, social, and cultural infrastructure.


6. Political theory, education, culture of democracy and civic education.

Any narrowing (perhaps uninformed) or partial condensing along with partial expanding of the above standard structure (in organisation, staff renewal, and financing of scientific research and academic education of political scientists) must have direct consequences in crippling the Croatian national political science and the Croatian political thought in general. Competence and professionalism, or rather incompetence and unprofessionalism in performing highly needed internationally comparable services in exercising public/state policies, state and local administration, vital social activities, political parties, media, civic education, public and private entrepreneurship and economy, directly or indirectly depend on the above stated. Especially when social, political, and mostly democratic development and political culture are concerned.

Translated by the author
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