
Harold Lasswell Definition Of Politics

Harold Lasswell
Definition Of Politics

Downloaded from
remodelicious.com by
Stewart & Deandre

INTRODUCTION: THE ENDURING INFLUENCE OF A SIMPLE QUESTION

In the vast and often abstract world of political science, few statements have proven as durable or as elegantly simple as the one offered by Harold Lasswell. When asked to define the essence of politics, Lasswell cut through centuries of complex theory with a single, sharp sentence: "Politics is who gets what, when, and how." This concise formula, first presented in his 1936 book *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*, has become a cornerstone of the discipline. It is a definition that strips away ideology, emotion, and institutional jargon, focusing instead on the raw mechanics of power and distribution. The **Harold Lasswell definition of politics** remains a vital tool for students, scholars, and citizens alike, offering a clear lens through which to examine everything from local school board decisions to international diplomacy. This article will explore the genesis of this famous definition, break down its core components, examine its broader implications for political science, and consider its enduring relevance in the 21st century.

WHO WAS HAROLD D.

LASSWELL?

To fully appreciate the **Harold Lasswell definition of politics**, it is helpful to understand the man behind the words. Harold Dwight Lasswell (1902–1978) was a pioneering American political scientist and communications theorist. A professor at the University of Chicago, Yale University, and the City University of New York, Lasswell was a key figure in the behavioral revolution in political science. This movement sought to make the study of politics more empirical, scientific, and focused on observable human behavior, rather than just formal institutions or legal texts. Lasswell's work spanned numerous fields, including propaganda analysis, political psychology, policy sciences, and communications. His interest in power, influence, and the psychological dimensions of leadership informed his immensely practical and human-centered definition of politics.

DECONSTRUCTING THE FAMOUS DEFINITION: "WHO GETS WHAT, WHEN, HOW"

The power of the **Harold Lasswell definition of politics** lies in its analytical clarity. It is not just a catchy phrase; it is a framework for investigation. By focusing on four key interrogatives—who, what, when, and how—Lasswell provided a systematic method for understanding any political event.

“Who”: The Actors in the Political Arena

The first element of the definition forces us to identify the key participants. Who are the actors struggling for influence and resources? This is not limited to elected officials. The “who” in Lasswell’s equation includes:

- **Individuals:** Voters, citizens, activists, lobbyists, and leaders.
- **Groups:** Political parties, interest groups, corporations, labor unions, and non-governmental organizations.
- **Institutions:** Government agencies, legislatures, courts, the military, and the media.
- **Nations and International Bodies:** States, the United Nations, the European Union, and multinational corporations.

A key insight here is that Lasswell’s framework is inherently **pluralistic**. It acknowledges that power is not a monolith held by a single entity but is instead contested among a wide variety of groups and individuals.

“What”: The Stakes of the Political Game

What exactly are these actors competing for? Lasswell argued that the ultimate “what” is **values** and **resources**. These are the things people want and need. He

categorized these into several key areas:

- **Power:** The ability to influence the behavior of others, to make decisions, and to control agendas. This is often the primary currency of politics.
- **Wealth:** Economic resources, income, property, and control over production.
- **Respect:** Prestige, status, honor, and recognition in society.
- **Well-being:** Safety, health, comfort, and physical security.
- **Affection:** Love, friendship, loyalty, and a sense of belonging.
- **Enlightenment:** Knowledge, information, education, and access to truth.
- **Skill:** Competence, expertise, and proficiency in various fields.
- **Rectitude:** Moral standing, virtue, and ethical behavior.

Political conflict erupts when there is a scarcity of these values or disagreement over how they should be distributed. A debate over tax policy is a conflict over who gets wealth. A debate over healthcare is a conflict over who gets well-being. A debate over voting rights is a conflict over who gets power.

“When”: The Timing and Circumstances of Distribution

The “when” in the definition highlights the crucial element of **timing**. It reminds us that political outcomes are not static; they are products of specific historical

moments, social contexts, and institutional procedures. The “when” can refer to:

- **Procedural Timing:** When elections are held, when a bill is debated, when a court rules, or when a budget is approved.
- **Historical Context:** Why does a particular issue become politically salient at a specific time (e.g., a crisis, a scandal, an economic downturn)?
- **Strategic Timing:** When is the optimal time for an actor to press for a demand? A union might strike during peak season. A president might announce a major policy after a landslide election victory.

“How”: The Methods and Mechanisms of Politics

The final element, “how,” is arguably the most complex. It refers to the entire arsenal of tactics, strategies, and institutional processes that actors use to achieve their desired outcomes. The “how” of politics includes:

- **Persuasion and Propaganda:** Using communication to shape public opinion and build support.
- **Bargaining and Negotiation:** Trading favors, forming coalitions, and reaching compromises.
- **Voting and Elections:** The formal mechanism for aggregating preferences and selecting leaders.
- **Lobbying and Advocacy:**

Directly influencing policy-makers.

- **Litigation:** Using the courts to achieve political goals.
- **Protest and Civil Disobedience:** Using collective action to disrupt the status quo and force change.
- **Coercion and Force:** The ultimate tool of the state, including police and military power.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HAROLD LASSWELL DEFINITION OF POLITICS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

The **Harold Lasswell definition of politics** was revolutionary for several reasons. First, it was profoundly **behavioral**. Instead of focusing on the formal structure of government (like the three branches or the constitution), it focused on the tangible interactions of people and groups. Second, it was **value-neutral** in its analytical posture. Lasswell did not define politics as a noble pursuit of the common good or a debased struggle for power. He offered a neutral tool for observing how power is actually used, regardless of one’s ethical judgment. This made the definition incredibly versatile. It could be applied equally to a democratic debate, a corporate boardroom battle, a backroom deal, or an authoritarian regime’s allocation of resources.

Third, Lasswell’s formulation bridged the gap between the study of government and the study of **power** in all its forms. It suggested that politics is not confined to the halls of Congress but is a fundamental feature of any human group, from a family to a multinational corporation. This broadened the scope of political science to include the study of influence in families, churches, schools, and social organizations. The definition is

a foundational concept in **policy analysis**, **public administration**, and **political communication**. When analysts ask “who benefits?” from a specific policy, they are directly applying Lasswell’s framework.

BEYOND THE DEFINITION: LASSWELL’S BROADER CONTRIBUTIONS

While the “who gets what” definition is his most famous legacy, Lasswell’s contributions to understanding politics go much deeper. He is also a foundational figure in the field of **political psychology**. He explored the psychological motivations of political actors, asking why some people are driven to seek power while others are not. He developed concepts like the **political personality** and the role of **private motives** being displaced onto **public objects**. This psychodynamic approach added a crucial layer to the “who” of politics, suggesting that an actor’s internal drives and insecurities can shape their pursuit of power and resources.

Furthermore, Lasswell was a pioneer in the study of **propaganda** and mass communication. He saw propaganda as a key tool in the “how” of politics, a means of managing public opinion and manufacturing consent. His model of communication (“Who says what, in which channel, to whom, with what effect?”) is a direct parallel to his definition of politics and remains a standard framework in communication studies. By connecting psychology, communication, and political behavior, Lasswell created a sophisticated, multi-dimensional understanding of political life.

CRITICISMS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE HAROLD LASSWELL DEFINITION OF POLITICS

No definition, no matter how influential, is without its critics. Several objections have been raised against the **Harold Lasswell definition of politics**:

1. **It is overly cynical and reductive:** Critics argue that reducing politics to a crude struggle for “who gets what” misses the higher purposes of politics, such as building a just society, promoting deliberation, and achieving collective goals. It can paint all political activity as a form of selfish bargaining.
2. **It ignores power structures and ideology:** The definition focuses on observable behavior but may overlook the deeper, structural forms of power that shape which “who” are even able to compete. For example, the power of patriarchy or systemic racism can pre-determine outcomes before any visible “bargaining” takes place. The definition, by itself, does not ask why certain groups are systematically excluded from the game.
3. **It struggles with “non-decisions” and agenda-setting:** As scholars like Bachrach and Baratz pointed out, power is not just about winning a conflict. It is also about controlling the agenda so that certain issues never even become part of the “who gets what” debate. Lasswell’s framework is better at analyzing overt conflict than subtle forms of power.

4. **It is a simplification for heuristic purposes:** While useful as a starting point, the definition can be an oversimplification for complex political realities. It does not easily account for the role of symbols, identity, culture, or emotion in politics in a way that goes beyond a simple resource calculation.

THE ENDURING RELEVANCE OF LASSWELL'S FRAMEWORK IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Despite these criticisms, the **Harold Lasswell definition of politics** remains remarkably relevant. In an age of unprecedented information, political polarization, and global challenges, his simple formula provides a powerful analytical compass. Consider its application to contemporary issues:

- **Climate Change Policy:** Who (fossil fuel companies, environmental activists, developing nations, future generations) gets what (clean air, economic growth, carbon credits, adaptation funds) when (now, before the next election, before

the 2050 deadline) and how (through regulation, carbon taxes, international treaties, technological innovation)?

- **Artificial Intelligence**

Regulation: Who (Big Tech firms, small startups, workers, consumers, governments) gets what (control over data, profits, privacy, job security, algorithmic power) when (immediately, after a crisis, after a slow legislative process) and how (through self-regulation, antitrust lawsuits, congressional hearings, international agreements)?

- **Healthcare Reform:** Who (patients, doctors, insurance companies, pharmaceutical firms, taxpayers) gets what (access to treatment, lower premiums, high profits, government subsidies) when (after a diagnosis, after an election, during a budget cycle) and how (through market mechanisms, single-payer systems, employer mandates, litigation)?

In each case, Lasswell's framework cuts through the noise and forces us