

---

**POLITICS & GOVERNMENT**


---

est office in the land, says Ladd, a political scientist at the University of Connecticut, is that there are not one but two types of liberalism in America today, and the Democrats, "to their joy and sorrow," embody both of them.

New Deal "bread and butter" liberalism, Ladd believes, is by now so ingrained that it wins votes from conservatives and liberals alike in congressional and state elections. But a "New Liberalism" has emerged in the past 20 years among a small but influential group of well-to-do, college-educated professionals who question the old economic and moral values. They reject equality of opportunity in favor of equality of result, writes Ladd, and take a libertarian stand on abortion, drugs, sexuality, and race.

New Liberals have a greater impact on the presidential race than on local contests. Because of their access to money and media, they help choose the Democratic nominee and shape his campaign. But because they are detached from the mainstream liberalism of the middle and lower classes, they taint the nominee's positions with unwanted controversy. New Liberalism, argues Ladd, was responsible for McGovern's nomination and defeat in 1972; it increased Carter's vulnerability in 1976. (Carter received 37 percent of the votes of self-styled conservatives; Democrats running for state legislatures in the same year received 54 percent of those votes.)

The Democratic Party will be torn by an ever widening breach between Old and New Liberals, Ladd predicts. Dissenting "policy intellectuals" see no place to go outside the Democratic camp; neither do the Old Democrats, under pressure from blue-collar workers who no longer see themselves as the principal beneficiaries of Democratic domestic spending programs.

### *The King's English*

"Chancery and the Emergence of Standard Written English in the Fifteenth Century" by John H. Fisher, in *Speculum* (Oct. 1977), 1430 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Students of politics are careful to note the influence of cultural change on government; but the operations of government may have an equally important impact on language and culture. A case in point, says Fisher, a professor of English at the University of Tennessee, is the re-emergence of Standard Written English as an official language in the 15th century.

Despite the upper-class preference for French after the 1066 Norman invasion, "English" was still spoken by ordinary folk in Britain. Until 1400, however, all official correspondence was written in French or Latin; schools did not abandon these languages as vehicles for classroom instruction until the 16th century; and Parliament's business was conducted in French until about 1360. In short, a spoken, colloquial English, with pronunciation and spelling varying by locale, existed alongside two highly structured administrative languages.

**POLITICS & GOVERNMENT**

Then gradually, between 1420 and 1440, the royal Chancery began to write more of its documents in English, because citizens could no longer understand anything else; by 1460 local officials followed suit.

Like other medieval English institutions, the Chancery had evolved from an arm of the royal household into an administrative secretariat led by a powerful Chancellor. All correspondence from King and Parliament, all petitions, proclamations, records, indentures, summonses, and writs, were written by the Chancery. And just as all Chancery clerks came to write in a distinctive "Chancery script," so too their words acquired linguistic uniformity when they began to write in English.

Thus, while a simplified, phonetic spelling was coming into vogue elsewhere in 15th-century England, the Chancery persisted in the archaic forms we retain to this day (such as *though* for *tho* and *right* for *rite*). But it replaced the old adverb construction *lich* (as in *openlich*) with a modern one (*openly*); changed the plural from *z* to *s*; dropped the *e* in words like *oure* and *whiche*; and adopted a past tense ending in *d* instead of *t* (as in *asket*).

Written English, concludes Fisher, grew up outside church and school, and in the absence of any other national model for writing the vernacular, the king's prolific chancery clerks set the style.

## *Democratic Republicans*

"Partisan Patterns of House Leadership Change, 1789-1977" by Garrison Nelson, in *American Political Science Review* (Sept. 1977), 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

According to many political scientists, leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives has been determined more by custom than by the clash of interests and ideologies. In this view, a representative, whether Republican or Democrat, reaches the top of the party hierarchy largely because he has come up the ladder: Service as majority whip leads to the majority leadership, which in turn is the springboard to the speakership.

Nelson, a political scientist at the University of Vermont, challenges this notion of an "institutionalized" House. In an analysis of House leadership contests from 1789 to the present, he concludes that Democrats and Republicans exhibit distinctly different selection patterns that reflect the two parties' contrasting political philosophies and social composition.

The Democrats have had a higher proportion than Republicans of appointed leaders (such as deputy whips and committee chairmen), as well as of elected leaders who moved from post to post in an "ordered succession." Appointed Democratic leaders have often been "removed from above" by the elected leaders (for example, by the speaker or majority leader). Elected leaders themselves, however, are subject only to infrequent, usually unsuccessful challenges from the party caucus. In short, House Democrats exhibit a hierarchically arranged, tightly con-