

courage maximum participation by European political and social scientists and to lessen the possibility that biopolitics will be perceived as associated almost entirely with American political science.

On this point, I am happy to report, Professor Heiner Flohr of Dusseldorf University has been extremely active in encouraging interest in biology and politics among West German political scientists. Professor Flohr organized a symposium of several days duration held in Loccum and attended by a substantial number of academics in West Germany. Papers on various aspects of biopolitics were presented both by "native" scholars and by a trio of visiting Americans, Professor Steven Peterson, Glendon Schubert, and Albert Somit.

There has been in addition an increasing interest in "biopolitics" manifest in the USSR. Professor Vladimir Denisov of the USSR Academy of Sciences played an active role at the 1979 Moscow panel sessions, has since written extensively on a Marxist approach to biopolitics, and is expected to be one of the panelists at the forthcoming Rio sessions.

As the above suggests, we are always eager to identify and involve in our efforts political scientists around the world. The IPSA Biology and Politics Research Committee would welcome the names of those with such an interest.

Albert Somit  
Southern Illinois University

### Report From The Methodology Committee

One of the distinguishing features of the Association for Politics and the Life Sciences is the exploration of methodological approaches as well as data-gathering techniques not commonly used in political science. To date, the sharing of experiences among persons engaged in such research has been mostly informal.

Although this is very valuable for the participants, it cannot reach the wider audience that might be interested in the techniques some of us are using. In part, the effort required is one of disseminating information about how these methodologies and techniques can be applied to political behavior and about what the potential pitfalls and advantages are.

For the most part, however, we have taken methods developed in other disciplines and have used them with only slight modifications. This is not uncommon in the social sciences, and it is probably unrealistic to expect any substantial methodological innovations in the near future. However, favorable conditions for such creativity will be established if those of us engaged in empirical work make more of an effort to share our experiences—especially with graduate students and new professionals. In this connection, three events should be noted.

At the 1981 meeting of the American Political Science Association, APLS sponsored a workshop on methods in nonparticipant observational research. Carol Barner-Barry (University of Maryland, Baltimore County) began the panel with a paper titled, "An Introduction to Nonparticipant Observational Research Techniques." Benson Ginsburg (University of Connecticut) then presented "The Applicability of Ethological Techniques to Research on Humans." Glendon Schubert (University of Hawaii-Manoa) followed with "Potential Applications of Observational Research in Political Science." Finally, Brian Hill (University of Connecticut) demonstrated the use of a portable, computerized event recorder.

At the 1982 meeting of the American Political Science Association there will be a panel titled, "Research Methods and the Life Sciences." Currently, two presentations are planned. Steven A. Peterson and Robert Lawson (Alfred University) will give a paper titled, "Cognitive Psychology and the Study of Politics." James N. Schubert (Alfred University) will be discussing "Ethological Methods for Analyzing Interaction Process in Small Group Legislative Decision-Making."

Finally, Meredith W. Watts has edited an issue of *New Directions for Methodology of Social and Behavioral Science* (Number 7, 1981) titled, "Biopolitics: Ethological and Physiological Approaches." Included are contributions by Glendon Schubert, Fred Strayer, Carol Barner-Barry, Roger Masters, Meredith Watts, and Leonard Hirsch and Thomas C. Wiegeler. The volume is intended to serve as an overview of both the area and some of the problems particular to this approach. It should be useful both for those who are currently working in the area and for those who would like a reasonably comprehensive methodological introduction.

Carol Barner-Barry  
University of Maryland,  
Baltimore County

### Report From The Public Policy Committee

For this first issue of *Politics and the Life Sciences*, the most useful report on the subfield concerned with the public policy aspects of biopolitics would be identification of its scope and focus. The paragraphs that follow describe one view of this biopolitical subfield, but readers may have other perspectives. Therefore this report is also an invitation to readers to add their comments, objections, or qualifications to these observations. In a subfield as dynamic as biopolitics, there can be no final word on any subject.

It is characteristic of biopolitics that its subfields are not discrete—not neatly separable. Policy, in particular, interrelates to all other aspects of the subject. Biopolitical issues may arise as philosophical or theoretical propositions and move from conjecture to empirical research. Research findings may imply commercial application, or they may suggest public action perhaps to facilitate, regulate, or even prohibit the further develop-