

The American Political Science Review

VOL. XLV

MARCH, 1951

NO. 1

THE PRIMACY OF POLITICS*

JAMES K. POLLOCK

University of Michigan

In presenting my valedictory to this distinguished Association which has honored me by selecting me as its President, I should like to point out by way of introduction what has happened to this office, and therefore to me, during the past year. I have heard of one of my distinguished predecessors some twenty-five years ago who had little else to do as President of this Association than work all year on his presidential address. This was important work and I have no word of criticism of it. But the Association has changed, and today it leaves to the harried wearer of its presidential toga little time to reflect about the status of political science and his own impact, if any, upon it. An active Association life, now happily centered in our new Washington office, is enough to occupy the full time of your President, and universities as well as this Association might well take note. Therefore, in presenting my own reflections to you this evening in accordance with the custom of our Association, I do so without the benefit of the generous time and scholarly leisure which were the privileges of some of my distinguished predecessors.

Nevertheless I do base my presidential address today upon my own active participation in the problems of government, as well as upon my scholarly experience. I have extracted it in part from the dynamics of pulsating political life. It has whatever authority I may possess after having been exposed these twenty-five years to the cross-fire of politics, domestic and foreign, as well as to the benign and corrective influences of eager students and charitable colleagues. This change in the nature of presidential addresses reflects, I believe, the new role of the political scientist and the development of our profession.

* Presidential address delivered before the American Political Science Association at its forty-sixth annual meeting in Washington, D. C., December 28, 1950.

I

As our Association moves into a second half-century of activity, I am impressed with the seriousness of our responsibility. As I see it, our responsibility is primary because politics is primary and central to every great problem facing us today. There is nothing new about the central importance of politics, for Aristotle long ago referred to politics as the most sovereign of the sciences and as the master science. In his *Ethics*, he pointed out that it is "politics that determines what other sciences should be studied in states; which of them should be learned by each group of citizens; and to what extent they should be learned." ". . . observation," he continued, "shows that even the forms of capacity which are most highly esteemed—the art of war; the art of household management; the art of oratory—come under the control of politics." Considering the complexity of modern civilized existence, it is even more true today than ever before that political action is of primary importance. Little can be accomplished any more without reference to political processes.

Unfortunately, however, political scientists in their study of politics have not quite kept pace with the complex responsibilities which have been placed upon them. In the Greek city-state, responsibilities were few and of rather limited scope. In the modern world, our responsibilities are very broad and very compelling.

In the present state of national and international politics, a special responsibility also attaches to Americans. Particularly in the last decade new duties all over the world have been thrust upon us. As a result of the war, the United States, in various parts of the globe, is now performing services which a generation ago would have been thought impossible. Our role in the creation and in the operation of the United Nations is likewise of great importance. Our leadership in the programs of military occupation both in Europe and in the Far East have been a drain upon our resources and continue to pose serious problems for the United States. The unprecedented American economic aid and technical assistance under the program of Economic Cooperation have not only been a boon to world economic recovery, but have demonstrated to us the possibility of constructive action in raising the welfare level of human beings everywhere. More recently the Point Four program and our leadership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, not to mention our fathering of programs intended to facilitate European integration and Philippine rehabilitation, illustrate the extent and complexity of our international activity, and the measure of responsibility placed upon us. Our country, in a word, has been doing

something new and distinctive and has assumed a role heretofore unknown to us.

We have not always sought the leadership of these programs. This leadership has been thrust upon us and as a consequence we have not always done our best, although it is clear to me that our contribution has been very great indeed. In some cases it has been almost providential that we have had a Clay, a Hoffman, a McCloy or a MacArthur to handle programs of great magnitude, complexity and importance. Lacking the experience and the trained personnel to undertake great programs, we have often had to improvise and we have sometimes found that our intentions and our programs have been misunderstood and misinterpreted. Any one familiar with our efforts to staff overseas agencies knows only too well how few Americans are really familiar with the other cultures of the world, and capable of working with them in a constructive way.

Despite unprecedented American activity and generosity, both our country and the world are, unfortunately, still afflicted with tensions. Our period has been well characterized as "the twilight of warlike peace." We are now in the midst of great defense preparations at the same time that we are attempting to carry on life and business as usual. Everyone asks, "Will there be war? Shall we have inflation? Must we stand still in other areas while we are putting the country in a state of defense?"

II

It is in this atmosphere, in this crisis situation, that I am called upon to discuss certain critical areas of our politics and to emphasize the responsibility of political scientists with respect to them. Such a discussion, I believe, will serve to emphasize the primacy of political considerations. Let me speak first of the impact of our new world position upon our government and our whole political life. Our new role in world affairs has placed new organizational requirements not only upon the State Department in particular, but also upon the whole government. In the words of the Report of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch:

The Executive Branch today finds itself forced to develop positive foreign policies and programs involving not only the State Department, but many other departments and agencies as well and to deal cooperatively with other nations on a multilateral as well as a bilateral basis. The Congress, in addition, finds that the exercise of its traditional powers in the domestic as well as in the international field has made it a participant in the conduct of foreign affairs on an unprecedented scale.

The problems of government organization for the conduct of foreign affairs are, therefore, not confined to the State Department alone but involve the organization of the Presidency, the State Department and the Foreign Service, the departments and agencies other than the State Department, the interdepartmental relationships and the relationships between the Executive and Legislative branches.

In the "good old days," the State Department might have to handle a crisis or two every year; but now Mr. Acheson is faced with a major crisis almost every day. If the crisis does not develop overseas, it is almost certain to develop in some portion of the capitol! Adding to the complexity of the situation is the greatly increased size of the government as a whole and of the State Department in particular. Our foreign office now is almost five times larger in personnel than it was ten years ago, and in terms of appropriation nearly twelve times larger. In the interdepartmental field, there are more than thirty committees concerned with economic, social, military, and other aspects of foreign affairs. Of the fifty-four major departments and agencies in the executive branch, at least forty-six are drawn into foreign affairs to a greater or lesser extent. Statutory interdepartmental bodies, such as the National Security Council, have assumed greater importance. Certain units, such as the Department of Defense and the Economic Cooperation Administration, are deeply involved with the administration of occupied areas abroad and with financial assistance overseas. The Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Commerce Department are important in international financial and agricultural matters, and also in connection with export control.

Congressional participation in the conduct of foreign affairs has become particularly evident in the expanding role of the House of Representatives in connection with appropriations for foreign programs. Under existing constitutional arrangements and structural provisions, the State Department has to operate under strictures and limitations which do not hamper any other foreign office in the world. When there is mutual cooperation and restraint between the executive and legislative branches, progress is achieved. But past experience points to the need of several important changes if our country and our people are to play a significant role in world affairs. Here, political considerations are primary.

Some of the necessary changes are organizational in character and have been dealt with adequately in the recent report to which I have referred. When the full effect of the reorganization of the State Department recently authorized by Congress has been felt, and when time has been given to allow the Department itself to work out the funda-

mental changes in its internal organization and personnel recently recommended to the Secretary of State—assuming always the support and sympathy of Congress—we will have a staff and an organization in our foreign office adequate to the traffic and requirements of our complicated world.

In two areas, however, we shall need to make important changes. One is in the administration of overseas affairs; the other is in the position of the United States Senate. On the latter point I should like to quote from the Report of the Hoover Commission on Foreign Affairs and then add a postscript. The report said:

One serious procedural impediment to achieving satisfactory legislative-executive cooperation is the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote for the confirmation of treaties. No thoughtful student of the conduct of foreign affairs can ignore the consequences of this provision. It is a serious trouble breeder between the executive branch and the Senate in that such an inherently rigid rule encourages circumvention by the executive by resort to the procedures of executive agreements and joint resolutions. Attempts to use these procedures, in turn, involve friction between the Senate and the House of Representatives. An especially bad result is that the emphasis is directed to the question of whether the proper procedure is being employed, instead of to the substance of the issues before the Congress. The question of a change in the present requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote is deemed, however, to be outside the province of this Commission.

Speaking now as a responsible political scientist and not as a member of a government commission, I should like to recommend that the power of the Senate over treaties be modified in the light of present world and domestic requirements. Many of my distinguished colleagues have previously recommended an amendment to the Constitution by which treaties should be confirmed by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress instead of by a two-thirds vote of the Senate alone. Such a change, in my view, is eminently fitting and necessary. It arises not from any desire to lessen the effectiveness of the United States Senate, but rather from the necessity of bringing the present constitutional provision into accord with the requirements of present international life, both at home and abroad. When one considers the speed with which international developments are moving today, not to mention the procedures of other countries with which we are now having close and friendly relations, it would seem reasonable to press at this time for a constitutional change. It is possible, of course, that difficulties between the Senate and the Executive in foreign affairs can be eliminated by other means, but I think it is doubtful.

With respect to the administration of overseas affairs, I feel a special

urge to press for some prompt re-tooling of this part of our organization for the conduct of foreign relations. The Korean War and the Bell report on the Philippines have recently been added to the new problems of the E.C.A., the North Atlantic Treaty organization, and Point Four, to emphasize how the American government has developed vast overseas operating agencies to alleviate suffering and to ameliorate economic conditions all over the world. Among other things, these new activities require a new type of public servant. Without disparaging our military or diplomatic personnel, it is, I believe, quite correct to say that specialized administrative and technical qualifications are necessary for the successful operation of these huge overseas ventures. We have done, in my opinion, amazingly well under very trying circumstances. But I should be less than frank if I did not also say that the development of a corps of career men, trained for overseas operations, as distinguished from the training now provided for the foreign diplomatic and military services, is urgently required. The magnitude and importance of the problem is grasped when one recalls that there are now almost as many federal civilian employees outside the United States as in the city of Washington.

Furthermore, it is no longer possible to have a unified foreign policy, if we do not have a unified administrative center in Washington under the policy direction of the State Department. The recent Gray report on foreign economic policies has shown very admirably how all aspects of American foreign policy, political, economic and military, must be interlinked, and a proper organizational home provided. It might be well to add that coordination and unification of all overseas administrative activities in Washington will be without full effect unless we achieve the same degree of unification under each of our foreign missions abroad. It is just as bad to have several spokesmen for America in a foreign capital as it is to have several of them in Washington.

We also should not forget that the appropriations for providing participation by the United States in international organizations and conferences exceed the combined appropriations of the State Department and the Foreign Service. In the active international arena in which we are now very well supplied—not to say almost overwhelmed—with all kinds of functional organizations and international conferences, it becomes increasingly important that our government should promote efficient arrangements and procedures for our activities in these international organizations. Otherwise, we will not get value received for our expenditures, and our foreign commitments will become confused.

Another factor of supreme importance is the close collaboration between the State Department and the Department of Defense. Similar

close coordination between foreign and military policy now, I trust, happily on the way to realization, will avoid the bickering, the delays, and the fatal mistakes which characterized clashes between these two arms of our government toward the end of the war and immediately thereafter.

Finally, if in addition to this improvement in the structure and operation of our foreign policy, we could at the same time achieve a more responsible and cooperative relationship between Congress and the State Department, we should then have the basis for a popular understanding and support of foreign policy which now seems to be lacking.

In a well functioning democracy, the people must also be associated with policy-formulation. As long, however, as the responsible agencies of the government continue to pull and haul and to confuse the public about the great issues confronting the world, there is little chance for the citizen to participate with any degree of satisfaction or confidence in helping to decide great international questions. All of these problems are of primary importance and all are political.

III

The reorganization of our conduct of foreign affairs is only part and parcel, however, of the much larger problem of adapting our whole democratic structure to the increased needs of the time. "We need," as John Gaus puts it effectively, "a theory of government functions and one of the classification, recruitment and education of the personnel to administer them that are reflective of the conditions of *big democracy*." I have not yet recovered, in fact I am not sure that I ever will, from the shock I received when I recently observed and scrutinized from an unequalled vantage point the whole vast, sprawling edifice of the federal government. It takes a man of great hardihood to look at, let alone understand, the budget of the United States with its thousand-odd pages. But the experience of being regaled for two years with all of the facts and figures relating to the organization and functioning of the huge federal structure which spreads over all of this country and over all of the world, has naturally left on me some lasting impressions which I still find difficult to express.

Despite unprecedented achievements in reorganizing the federal government, much remains to be done. One trouble, of course, is that so much more than government in the formal sense is involved in government reorganization. If someone, more statesmanlike than the average, is seminal and vital and penetrating in his proposals, he immediately encounters the entrenched and the selfish interests which consider themselves to be adversely affected by these recommendations. The great

extravaganza which is staged every year in Congress, an extravaganza which the late Will Rogers one time referred to as "Rivers and Harbors" or "I'll Get Mine," is a case in point. Here again it is the politics of the problem, and not merely its administration, which must be solved.

Even when it is essentially a bureaucratic responsibility and opportunity, much pushing by citizens is necessary. I still catch my breath when I reflect on how the President, not merely President Truman, but any President, must decide great questions. Even the very smart Budget Bureau does not know, or finds it politic not to enquire, who is doing what and when and how in the President's office. The idea of a career staff secretary, such as was recently recommended by our Commission after a careful, and if I may say so, highly realistic consideration of the problem under our constitutional system, apparently does not appeal to those immediately around the President. Like staff reductions, such proposals must often be pressed from outside the bureaucracy.

The importance of pressure group opposition and bureaucratic neglect should not be minimized, as I will presently indicate. But it is very important to realize that the federal government has become so big and awkward that it is, in effect, out of control. So difficult is it to secure the cooperation of numerous officials and agencies involved in any program, and in all programs, that at any given time no one is on top of the heap. Bureau or departmental autonomy, statutory restrictions, overlapping jurisdiction, absence of coordination, poor staff services, and just plain bigness add up to a condition of lack of control—one might say "free-wheeling"—which is the opposite of that responsible democracy we seek. No political scientist has developed hydramatic control for government machines, or if he has, it has not yet been adopted.

It is still a source of amazement to me that otherwise sensitive and intelligent men should continue to pile billion upon billion and bureau upon bureau without much thought of the administrative and political consequences. It is hard for me to believe that any thoughtful person could still think that it was possible for any one agency to attempt to write, or even approve, the position classifications in the entire federal service. Or that the Congress of the United States should be so perverse and unlearned in the principles of financial administration as to continue to insist upon a system which runs counter to the almost unanimous views of those who have studied the question. It is disheartening and discouraging to find that even hospitals are bandied about with the same kind of financial and public abandon that characterizes the construction of a dam on Tombigbee Creek or the dredging of the Clatskankie! Even when the political scientist considers himself to be a sort of political

pathologist and tries to view the whole scene with that scientific reserve and calm judgment which befits anyone whose appellation is scientist, he still feels like remarking with Ostrogorski that "God takes care of drunkards, of little children, and of the United States."

Perhaps, as Herbert Emmerich has remarked, "Our governmental institutions are better than we tend to think." But we must not forget that they are now assailed by new enemies and by reinforced old ones. At a time of national crisis we should not be tolerant of inefficiency, nor neglectful of popular control. A new compulsion is now present which should drive the Congress and the President to move with all speed in the direction of implementing the recommendations of the last few years which were designed to put our house in order for any emergency.

I cannot hope in a few brief moments to summarize all of my deep reflections about executive organization and about the relation of Congress to it. But I do want to demonstrate how political considerations are of primary importance and to say that we have only started along the road of integrating our economy, our defense, and our resources. Despite the reorganization of Congress and the progress which has been made toward executive reorganization, there still remains a vast area of inefficiency, duplication and lack of control which continues to be a menace to our free institutions. The great problem of executive-legislative relationships cannot be effectively tackled until both the executive and legislative branches are in such reasonable state of organization that one can think of having them work together successfully. As long as Congress fails to equip itself with adequate, unpartisan staffs and continues to rely almost entirely upon seniority to select its leadership; and as long as the executive branch continues to consist of a congeries of unrelated services, dependent upon and limited by a nineteenth century set of personnel regulations, just so long will the pattern of our federal politics be one of oscillation between executive bureaucracy and congressional oligarchy.

With the pedagogues now rushing to Washington for federal aid to education, I suppose it will not be too long until Washington, not content with generous grants to farmers and veterans, will be filled with strange new ideas of educational organization and expenditure, and one of the last fields left to the states and the localities will be dumped willy-nilly upon the overloaded shoulders of the federal government. Decentralization and deconcentration, which seem to be our only salvation, will then become nothing but empty words. This would be fatal indeed to our democracy. As Charles Beard one time pointed out, "Unless our administrative system is so constructed and operated as to keep alive

local and individual responsibilities, it is likely to destroy the basic well-springs of activity, hope, and enthusiasm necessary to popular government and to the following of a democratic civilization."

There is not much use worrying about intergovernmental relations unless some effective limit is placed upon the power and activity of the federal government. No one can say with any assurance what the optimum load of the federal government can be. But it is my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that we are now attempting in Washington and through the federal government much more than can be efficiently administered or popularly controlled.

I might suggest that we already have in the federal government unsolved problems of sufficient seriousness that we do not need to take on any more. For instance, in the very critical period ahead when national security will demand a large military budget, our time-honored devices for subordinating the military to civilian control are, to say the least, likely to prove to be inadequate. This whole field of civil-military relationships deserves the closest study and scrutiny. To involve the federal government in further new problems at a time when a question like this, so fraught with grave consequences for the future of our republic, is pending and unsolved, would seem to be utterly foolhardy and irresponsible. Progress in coordinating diplomatic and military planning, at least at the top, could easily be shattered if Congress attempts to rely merely upon its control of the purse-strings without insisting simultaneously upon what is necessary to develop firm lines of authority and accountability within the executive branch.

I cannot conclude my discussion of the labyrinth which is the executive branch, or the confusion in the Congress, without referring to the real menace of pressure group politics as it operates in the capital city. Harold Lasswell has not exaggerated when he wrote:

National policy increasingly becomes a matter of deals made between national pressure group officials and the bureaucracy of executive departments and agencies. What the pressure organization is able to "deliver," more than ever depends upon what the officials of a centralizing government find it expedient to give.

It is deeply discouraging to the average citizen, as it is depressing to the trained observer, to find the public so frequently pushed around in favor of combinations of interest groups. "Aggression of groups and agencies against the people as a whole," as Mr. Hoover puts it, "is not a process of free men. Special privilege either to business or groups is not liberty." The unusual and plutocratic and extravagant atmosphere of Washington is in no small measure due to the unlimited resources of

lobbies and special interests which find their outlet in some portion of the District of Columbia. This problem, although seriously affecting the whole functioning of the federal structure of government, must be remedied elsewhere than in Washington. Thus I come to the next point of my discourse.

IV

One of the major problems of our democracy, after all, is how to strengthen and improve our political parties. We cannot exalt and enthroned the citizen without at the same time utilizing the politician. Under our form of government the politician operates within the framework of the two-party system, which, over the generations, has acquired a peculiar form and certain peculiar habits. The special form and spirit of our party system has determined the whole character of our government. Party politics is therefore of central importance. Sooner or later in every discussion of government and politics in this country, one must come back to the organization and functioning of our political parties. Party organization by itself is of crucial importance; and although American political scientists are probably in advance of those in all other countries of the world in their understanding and analysis of party processes, nevertheless in the last decade we have tended to emphasize—some might say overemphasize—other aspects of our discipline. We now have it on the best authority that “in democracy all social classes, all economic interests, all expertise, planning and power are subordinated to politics.” Until recently some enthusiasts had almost convinced us that there was nothing outside the administrative framework.

It requires little argument to demonstrate that effective popular government rests upon a proper functioning of the party system. In the United States, a basic prerequisite not merely to good administration, but to active citizen participation and control is a responsible two-party system. We know, however, particularly since the growth and change of the federal government in the last twenty-five years, that our parties and our politics have gradually become more and more confusing and frustrating, not merely to students of government but also to the sovereign citizens themselves. Alert to the great significance of this subject, our Association several years ago created a special Committee on Political Parties. That committee, under the chairmanship of Professor Schattschneider, has now, after the most commendable study of the problem, presented to us and to the country a keen analysis and a series of important recommendations. I commend this report to you and to the country, and express my deep gratification that it should have been completed and presented at this important turning point in our

political development. I might add that having just come through, or one might say having just survived, another national election, we should be more than ever instilled with the strong desire for raising the level and improving the quality of party action. How to relate public action and public decisions to the legislative and administrative processes must ever remain before us as subjects requiring the most thorough and complete and constant study.

In this connection it is well to remember that graft, corruption, improper influence, excessive campaign expenditures, still constitute the Achilles heel of democracy. In the political arena as well as in the legislative and executive branches, we must be ever on the alert to detect and to ferret out influences and practices which interfere with the true expression of the popular will. The present investigation of the interrelation of gambling and politics conducted by one of our distinguished members, Senator Kefauver, is an encouraging case in point. In public elections today more is at stake than ever before, and as students of politics we must be more than ever active and alert to detect, understand, and explain to our fellow citizens the true import of political developments. Yes, politics is primary; everything else is supplementary and secondary. Although American political life is at times quite disorderly and confusing, it is still unwise and ineffectual to attempt to solve legislative and executive and administrative problems as if they were separate and distinct from the party process.

V

I have now presented a series of observations about government and politics in the United States which are deemed worthy of particular attention at this time. I come next to a discussion of the place of the political scientist in our new political and governmental setting.

As I remarked earlier, our present situation has been aptly referred to as the "twilight of warlike peace." What we used to refer to as "crisis government" has become chronic. Emergency conditions have become the regular and normal thing. We, as political scientists, would be derelict indeed if we did not throw the light on ourselves and on our collective work to see if we are now doing as significant work as is required, or as we are capable of doing. "Have the scales fallen from our eyes and has the lead gone from our feet?"

I have spoken earlier of Aristotle's reference to politics as "the master science." But are we working today in relation to all the social sciences as if we were the master, the coordinating, the integrating discipline? I think not. I believe that we are not as vital and active and significant as we should be, and I want to express my own view as to the reasons

for the academic restraint and reserve which up to this time have characterized our activities. Our contributions are urgently needed; and although political scientists as individuals are now active and important in the various levels of our political and governmental life, I strongly hope for greater and wider activity by our Association.

Why are we so restrained? Perhaps our recent specialization and compartmentalization has weakened the significance of our work. Perhaps we, as a discipline, have a separation of powers doctrine which prevents us from cooperative work with brother political and social scientists. I realize, of course, the vastness of the subjects with which we deal and the natural modesty of political scientists to avoid the sweeping generalizations—and errors—which make some politicians and even some members of other disciplines, objects of pity or derision.

But after all, the political scientist is and must be a generalist. Just like the politician, who, as Paul Appleby puts it, “is the preëminent, practicing governmental generalist,” the political scientist who studies, and who we know is called upon to advise the politician, must be a person who trains himself to deal with large, complicated problems. Acquaintance with all allied disciplines is necessary, for one can hardly be a generalist unless he is able to generalize from something—namely, the facts, procedures, and processes outside as well as inside his own profession. Even more necessary is the ability to take a set of facts and recommend a sound policy out of them.

John Gaus recently referred to economic and social policies which are “gaily—or grimly—urged today with almost no reflection” of administrative experience, and recalled how Margaret Cole frankly confessed to the neglect of political factors by a group of which she was an active member. “Gaily or grimly” is good, but with what grave consequences to our welfare! Government has more and more become so complicated that policy must be formulated, not by a specialist but by a generalist, if we are not to become, even more than at present, a loose confederation of modern feudal interests. What we need is a political scientist who, in the words of Sir Edward Bridges in his Rede lecture, “will be a good adviser in any field because he or she knows how and where to go to find reliable knowledge, can assess the expertise of others at its true worth, can spot the strong and weak points in any situation at short notice, and can advise how to handle a complex situation.”

Of course we must not expect the best thought and the best men in our profession to be automatically transferred to the posts in government where they could do the most good. Unfortunately in these days of impoverished research, inadequate travel, heavy teaching loads, and impecunious living, we must not expect too much. In fact, it is one of

our most urgent problems to release the abilities of our most mature scholars to work on the new and the difficult and the enormous problems which beset our world. We must not send a boy to do a man's work. Neither must we kill off the great minds we have already developed, in commuting between Washington and our seats of learning. It seems that both universities and governments have neither the heart nor any proper realization of what is necessary to assure the availability and full contribution of leading minds to the processes of government.

Herbert Emmerich has pointed out how we must recognize

that no one of the serious problems of today and tomorrow can be answered by the specialized approach. The big questions of today and tomorrow are not just matters of public administration or of international relations or of administrative law or of public opinion or of political theory. They do not belong exclusively to any of the specialists in these subdivisions of our field. All the insights of the political science disciplines must be focused on these questions with a view to getting complete, not partial, answers—and in time to have some effect on action. We must break down the jurisdictional boundaries which divide us within our own field, and the jurisdictional jealousies, and work at these problems as complete scientists.

I cannot agree with my dear friend Charles Merriam when he writes that "the weal or woe of mankind in the coming years rests very largely with administration and administrators." I think it rests with politics and politicians in the broadest sense of these terms. My belief is that any narrow specialization is inimical to the primacy of our subject and to the success of government in a free society. It is the complete political scientist "skilled in the art and science of politics"—not just in theory, in law, in administration, but in politics—whom I espouse, because it is on him that so much depends.

One of our colleagues, who is in a position to know, pointed out to me how almost everything in government might be considered an economic problem. "Yet," he added, "when economists in government get together to develop a new policy, what they really talk about and what they really think about is politics. There is nothing wrong with this," he concluded, "because they must develop policies that are possible—and politics is, above all, the art of the possible. The only trouble is the tendency to approach essentially political problems in an amateurish way because of a failure to recognize their political character."

Another of my distinguished colleagues, who will remain anonymous, has asked me why "the other social sciences with their glamorous new vocabularies are playing so vigorously in our own backyards, including those of sample polling and political theory?" The answer in part is that we have not sufficiently utilized the materials and techniques available

to us in related disciplines. We have been somewhat deterred, it is true, by the horrible gobbledegook, particularly of the social psychologist, and we have had no desire to subordinate the substance to the technique. No doubt the other social sciences can help us. But the almost overwhelming problems of the modern world can be solved only by our most mature minds, and political science is the integrating and synthesizing discipline. *The pulling together must be under our auspices.* Economic and social problems occur in their most vital form in the political-legislative-administrative processes, and we must use other social sciences and accept a definite leadership in our relationships to them.

It was, I believe, our own Charles Merriam who provided the inspiration and leadership for social science integration in this country. The first President of the Social Science Research Council, Robert Crane, was also a political scientist and his present successor, Pendleton Herring, is another of the stars in our political science firmament. It is in no narrow disciplinary way that I would insist on the primacy of politics in determining public policy. I have seen something of the mistakes which are made because too specialized minds are at times on top, and because a broad political judgment was absent. It is the task of the political scientist to synthesize everything which goes into the formulation and implementation of public policy.

I am not interested in jurisdictional conflict, and I believe in drawing more fully upon the anthropological, psychological, and sociological contributions which are available to us on a basis of interdisciplinary exchange. But I would be less than frank with you if I did not assert that foreign and military policy is hardly the task of the nuclear physicist and that power and bureaucracy and other similar concepts are being manhandled by the psychologists. Why? Partly because political scientists have not sufficiently used the other social sciences and partly because we are focusing too much attention on small problems without developing frontal attacks on large, significant ones.

Nevertheless, there are more practical and mundane reasons. The mere bigness of a problem like legislative-executive relationships, for instance, is almost beyond the facilities of political scientists, unaided and unsupported, to handle. Without the generous support of the Carnegie Corporation, it would not have been possible to produce our recent report on political parties and the party process. With the federal government devoting a billion dollars a year to research, mostly in the physical and biological sciences, it is only occasionally that funds are available for those really seminal and significant investigations into our vast governmental and political structure, which present conditions require. Political scientists and social scientists generally may therefore

quite legitimately excuse themselves because of lack of adequate equipment and resources. The terrific and overweening development of science and technology has necessarily pushed us aside for the time being, but it will not be for long. An active committee in our Association headed by one of our greatly respected ex-Presidents, Arthur Holcombe, will soon make our judgment and influence felt.

Perhaps the most favorable development of our times in its effect on human welfare is the activation of the policy and program of the Ford Foundation. The work of its study committee, on which our President-elect served, has been correctly evaluated by Henry Ford II as "one of the most thorough, painstaking, and significant inquiries ever made into the whole broad question of public welfare and human needs." Its work and recommendations, which every member of this Association should read, were accepted unanimously by the trustees, and there is therefore now in existence, what never existed before in such ample form, financial support for large and significant research by political and other social sciences. No longer can we complain that resources are not available. The Ford Foundation can now redress the balance in favor of the social scientists.

I am tremendously impressed with the impact of this report upon our profession. It may well become the greatest boon to fruitful and constructive research and action in the political field we have ever had. As the President of this Association, I salute this significant development and express our deep satisfaction that now for the first time in our history we have the possibility, if we are good enough, to assume our rightful place in making "significant contributions to world peace," in "the strengthening of democracy," and in the other "areas for the advancement of human welfare."

In what I have said about the place of political scientists, and in the expression of my hopes and desires for a greater future for our profession, I would not have anyone think that we are not now playing a significant role through our leading members and in our research and teaching everywhere. Our Vice President today is Ralph Bunche, recently winner of the Nobel Prize, and there are many others who are indispensable as advisers and participants in the decision of public questions at all levels of government.

But I still think that we must step up the significance of our work. Political theory, for instance, could do much today in the development of a more adequate concept and understanding of the democratic way. We have not contributed as much as we should to the practical solution of international affairs—perhaps in the latter case because we have got-

ten away from solid foundations in comparative government and international law. I also feel that we should not shy away from proposing remedial action once we have made our analyses.

Our training of political scientists leaves much to be desired. We should re-think and recast our graduate training programs so as to develop generalists who are acquainted with the other social sciences, as well as with the emerging and pulsating political life around them. The new generation of political scientists must have a stronger sense of their important mission, they must be better equipped to understand and handle the procedures of other related disciplines, and they must be trained in the evaluation of large situations and in the solution of big problems. Perhaps I should say with Plato: "that is the pattern according to which they are to order the state and the lives of individuals . . . making philosophy their chief pursuit, but when their turn comes, toiling also at politics and ruling for the public good. . . ."

Nor have we included in our profession many who are interested and active in public affairs, those whose research contributes materially to the knowledge of political life, but who are not academicians, and those who teach citizenship to the large mass of our people who never attend a college or a university. If our research is to have the practicality which it requires, and if the results of that research are to have maximum application, it is indeed time that we associate these groups more closely with our profession.

Now that we have been able to establish an executive office here in Washington, it is up to the membership to consolidate our gains, coordinate our research, broaden our avenues of influence, enrich our teaching, and enlarge the participation of our professional membership. We have a deep responsibility, as well as a unique opportunity, in this troubled world. If we will reconsider our whole field and make such professional reorganizations as are required to bring us abreast of our new responsibilities, we can say with Henry Stimson:

Let them learn from our adventures what they can. Let them charge us with our failures and do better in their turn. But let them not turn aside from what they have to do, nor think that criticism excuses inaction. Let them have hope, and virtue, and let them believe in mankind and its future, for there is good as well as evil, and the man who tries to work for the good, believing in its eventual victory, while he may suffer setback and even disaster, will never know defeat.