

The American Political Science Review

VOL. XLVIII

DECEMBER, 1954

NO. 4

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

RALPH J. BUNCHE

United Nations

This, the fiftieth annual meeting of our Association, has more than ordinary significance. Certainly it can be said that the Association has attained middle-age and the intellectual as well as the physical maturity to do proper credit to our years. We may, on this special occasion at least, regard with pardonable pride our record of growth, the recognition and development of our discipline in both teaching and research, the public service it has rendered, and its contribution to the forward progress of American political democracy. American political scientists, practitioners of what Aristotle rightly or wrongly described as the "master science," have recognized, as did Plato and Aristotle, the surpassing importance of political problems in society and have experienced the difficulties which they foresaw in the effort to employ scientific methods and procedures in the solution of such problems. Beyond doubt, however, we move steadily forward. Our scientific and professional standards show constant improvement. Our store of knowledge is immense. Our almost feverish search for new data is incessant. We know almost all there is to know about the political infirmities of our patients except how to cure them. The state of domestic and world affairs keeps us humble.

All of the fifty annual meetings of this Association have been held in the twentieth century, which may claim as its most tragic distinction its almost constant addiction to warfare. Even a superficial glimpse at the past half-century leads to the conclusion that but few of these meetings have been held at a time when people somewhere in the world were not at war. Indeed, it is an unflattering commentary on the condition of our times merely to point out that this fiftieth meeting of the Association is the first in well-nigh a quarter of a century which can look upon a world

* Delivered before the American Political Science Association at its fiftieth annual meeting in Chicago, Illinois, September 9, 1954.

free, even if most insecurely, of organized warfare anywhere on the globe.

This, I make bold to say, can be counted as a blessing even if one must hasten to add that while there is at this moment no war, neither is there peace, for the cold war waxes hot, tensions continue severe, provocative incidents constantly test our nerves and our forbearance, armaments pyramid, and the dark threat of atomic war ever lurks on the horizon.

Still, with the cessation of fighting in Indo-China, there is no instant war and, therefore, an opportunity is presented, slight though it may be, for governments and statesmen and peoples the world over to pursue with renewed vigor the ends of peace and bring thereby some measure of relief and hope to harassed and war-weary mankind. But, in truth, the precariousness of the times is such, the aggressive forces loose in the world are so unpredictable, and uncertainty so dominates one's thought and psychology, that even as I write these words on September 7th I grimly realize that they may not hold true at all on September 9th.

In this regard, it may be recalled that our Association came into being during an earlier lull in warfare throughout the world. The Sino-Japanese, Spanish-American, and South African wars were over and the Russo-Japanese war had not begun when the first meeting of this Association convened in New Orleans a half-century ago. There has not been much let-up in warfare since. No cause and effect relationship is implied, of course.

Only twenty-five were present at that initial meeting. At the end of the Association's first year there were two hundred and fourteen members, and of these most found their primary interest not directly in political problems but in history, economics, and other social studies having political implications. As former President John A. Fairlie pointed out in his presidential address at the 1929 meeting, "When this Association was organized, the systematic study and teaching of political problems was but slightly developed. Only a few courses in public law and government were given in some of the larger universities."

Since those early, lean days, the lustiness of the growth and the proliferation of our discipline is amply attested by the bulging program of this fiftieth annual meeting.

In many directions our Association and our discipline have made striking progress. Our membership today stands at well over 6,000, of which less than half consists of those actively engaged in the teaching of political science. This has been a development realized largely in the last quarter-century of our existence, for in 1929 President Fairlie noted that

of some 1900 members at that time only a "small portion" were outside the teaching profession.

Political science is now firmly anchored in the curricula of American colleges and universities. There are today more than 300 departments of political science in American colleges and universities with many thousands teaching the subject, exclusive of the large number of those who teach civics and social studies in the secondary schools. The students of political science number in the tens of thousands and each year over three hundred colleges and universities grant degrees in the field. No doubt our most distinguished past president, Woodrow Wilson, were he with us, would be highly gratified by the increasing extent to which members of the profession, particularly in the past two decades, have emerged from the academic realm to render invaluable assistance to governments local, state, and national—and to international organizations and agencies.

In all directions—political parties; national, state, and local government; political theory; constitutional law; public administration; public opinion; political behavior; legislation; international law and relations; comparative government—there has been significant advance in the definition and development of subject-matter, in both teaching and research.

In quite recent years the Association has afforded organized public services through the assistance of the profession in response to requests from the White House and various departments of the government. Organized research efforts, involving collaboration of substantial numbers of political scientists, have been undertaken as a new and recent development; of these the study of delegations to the party conventions in 1952 is an outstandingly successful example.

It may be mentioned, in passing, that political science gains increasing stature as an international discipline. The International Political Science Association, under the initiative of UNESCO, is now well established, with active participation by American political scientists led by Professor James K. Pollock as Senior Vice President. But it remains a fact that political science, as we conceive of it, is unknown in most of the world beyond our borders—in much of Europe, the Orient, and elsewhere. At the time of the organization of the International Political Science Association in 1950, there were political science organizations in but eight countries. However, there is undoubtedly in this development an excellent opportunity to promote the interests of the profession, to widen greatly its horizon of service, and, more important, to reinforce the international bonds of democracy. Since it is estimated that more

than eighty per cent of the world's political scientists are in this country, both our opportunity and our responsibility in this international venture are great.

Our collaboration in this international effort is motivated neither by intellectual imperialism nor by a missionary impulse to bring political wisdom to the "heathen." Rather, the International Association affords the opportunity for an exchange of thinking and a cross-fertilization of ideas among intellectual equals of all nationalities, colors, and creeds who have discovered, quite as we discovered, the need for a distinct discipline in the field of political phenomena.

Despite the rapid development of American political science as an independent discipline—and it could be said not altogether facetiously that in some respects there might appear to be more of independence than of discipline—and while we have made substantial contributions to the intellectual and public life of the nation, disagreement, frustration, and failure are not unknown to us.

Passing mention only need be made of such matters as the tendencies toward excessive intellectual diffusion, over-specialization, "splintering" of the discipline, and the lack of what might be called unifying roots. Nor shall I dwell upon the absence of agreement among us on methodology, techniques, and classification, or on the comparability of political science and the natural sciences. These undoubtedly are matters of vital concern to the profession and on any one of them there could be—and there has often been—discussion without end.

Partly because this is our fiftieth meeting, partly because of the extreme discretion in public expression incumbent upon an international civil servant, and in no small measure because of an acute awareness of my own limitations in the preparation of this paper, I have burrowed in the addresses of previous presidents of the Association.

It seems to me that this meeting at the half-century mark is a particularly appropriate occasion on which to reflect upon the wisdom, the hopes, and the cautions of those who may rightly be called the founding fathers of American political science, especially where they may offer wise counsel for our future course and for the challenges with which the present and the future confront us.

A review of the presidential addresses delivered before this Association in the course of the fifty years since that small band of pioneers came together in New Orleans, provides a graphic picture of the development of political science in America, its function and method, its achievements and shortcomings, as seen by some of its most distinguished disciples. In these addresses there may also be found no slight reflection of

much of the nation's political history and thought of the past half-century.

Bearing in mind the virtue of brevity, note is taken here of only some of the salient points in a selected few of the addresses of the first half of the Association's existence. Rather arbitrarily, I have decided that the ex-Presidents since 1930 are still too young to be classified as "elder statesmen."

At the third annual meeting, Albert Shaw emphasized that the Association "is not partisan, or sectional or propagandist in its nature;" it "is not a body of reformers," and therefore, it "can help to bring to a hundred questions now under discussion in the affairs of the nation, of the States, or of the municipalities the spirit of calmness, of inquiry, of reasonable discussion—in short, the scientific spirit."

Without straining any point, it may be urged that it would be difficult to think of a greater service that could be rendered to our nation today as regards both national and international affairs.

Two years later, at the fifth annual meeting, Lord Bryce, after offering political scientists what he described as a "maxim of universal validity," i.e., "keep close to the facts," raised the question: "What is the use of Political Science? Can it be made to serve the practical needs of the time?" In partial answer to his questions, which are just as pertinent and timely today as when he posed them early in the century, he expressed the view that since in free countries "the chief problem of democracy is to make the citizens intellectually and morally fit to conduct their government"—this being especially so in the United States, where "the ultimate control of public affairs belongs to the mass of the people"—political scientists ought to try, through their influence on citizens in the universities and their publications, to improve civic intelligence.

There has been improvement certainly, but there are few, I imagine, who would not agree that the need in this direction continues to be great and urgent.

The next year, at the sixth annual meeting, A. Lawrence Lowell, pointing out that "politics is an observational, not an experimental science; and hence the greater need of careful observation of those phenomena which we can use," queried: "But how much do statesmen turn to professors of political science for guidance? Surely students of politics do not lead public thought as much as they ought to do . . ."

Would it not be true to say that we still do not; that in the main the impact of the political scientist on thought and leadership is by no means comparable to his knowledge and potentiality?

At the seventh annual meeting, Woodrow Wilson expressed his dislike of the term "political science," since in his view, "human relationships, whether in the family or in the state, in the counting house or in the factory, are not in any proper sense the subject-matter of science. They are stuff of insight and sympathy and spiritual comprehension." He preferred the term "politics," which in his view included both the "statesmanship of thinking" and the "statesmanship of action."

President Wilson adjured that "the statesmanship of thought" as against "the statesmanship of action" must be furnished by the political scientist

out of his full store of truth, discovered by patient inquiry, dispassionate exposition, fearless analysis and frank inference. He must spread a dragnet for all the facts, and must then look upon them steadily and look upon them whole. It is only thus that he can enrich the thinking and clarify the vision of the statesman of action, who has no time for patient inquiry, who must be found in his facts before he can apply them in law and policy, who must have stuff of truth for his conscience and his resolution to rely on.

Wilson went on to say:

the statesman and the student of political science have not hitherto often been partners. The statesman has looked askance upon the student,—at any rate in America, and has too often been justified because the student did not perceive the real scope and importance of what he was set to do and overlooked much of the great field from which he should have drawn his facts,—was not a student of thought and of affairs but merely a reader of books and documents.

The weaknesses and deficiencies which Wilson saw in the equipment of the student of politics of his time have been, I would think, largely corrected by now. But despite the considerable and encouraging traffic between campus and bureaucracy, especially during war years, the gap between the realms of study and action continues more than wide enough. In my experience off the campus during almost fifteen years now, I have discovered that when I am referred to as an "academician," this is not always meant as flattery, that the habit of trying to marshal all the facts, weigh them, and think things through thoroughly as the basis for action is sometimes regarded as droll and at other times incites no little impatience.

In 1925, at the twenty-first annual meeting, Charles E. Merriam prophesied:

we are likely to see a closer integration of the social sciences themselves, which in the necessary process of differentiation have in many cases become much too isolated. In dealing with basic problems . . . it becomes evident that neither the

facts and the technique of economics alone, nor of politics alone, nor of history alone, are adequate to their analysis and interpretation.

Merriam, no doubt, would be pleased with the extent to which, in quite recent years, inter-disciplinary seminars, composite courses, and inter-disciplinary research programs have developed. There is, certainly, much less exclusiveness among the social scientists than in earlier years.

Merriam concluded:

At any rate, it becomes increasingly evident that the basic problems of political organization and conduct must be resurveyed in the light of new discoveries and tendencies; that the nature of mass rule must be reexamined; that the character and range of popular interest in government and the methods of utilizing it must be reexplored; that we must call in science to help end war as well as to make war; that the mechanisms and processes of politics must be subjected to much more minute analysis than they have hitherto received at the hands of students of government, from a much broader view, and from different angles.

Merriam's suggestion that science be employed to help end as well as to help make war has not materialized, but science has certainly made the prospect of another war a tremendously frightening thought. But to view the hydrogen bomb as signalling the end of the world, as some are inclined to do, serves only to induce panic and to nourish the ambitions of reckless ones who would seek power through exploitation of fear. In the calm view, the new weapons in all their fearful destructive potential are merely the logical end of the concept of total war in this scientific age. If a minimum of reason can be brought to prevail, the atomic-hydrogen-cobalt bombs may yet prove to be the decisive deterrent to war as governments and peoples the world over increasingly realize that another world war and the survival of civilization are altogether incompatible.

Now and then, over the years, stern warnings and criticisms have been directed to the political scientists, as for example, by Charles A. Beard and my highly respected former teacher, William B. Munro.

Beard inveighed against a good many things, including our "academic sterilities" and "the peril of narrowing the vision while accumulating information."

Munro, with an eye on the changes which had occurred in the exact sciences in response to new knowledge, urged:

It is time for political science to step up into line with the new physics by turning some of its attention to the sub-atomic possibilities. We should seek to discover the true reasons for that vast differentiation between good, bad, and indifferent citizenship which is perhaps the most obvious of all the phenomena of

politics. We should enquire diligently into the nature and scope of the forces which make each civic atom what he is. And we should discard our allegiance to the absolute, for nothing would seem to be more truly self-evident than the proposition that all civic rights and duties, all forms and methods of government, are relative to one another, as well as to time and place circumstance. They cannot be translated into unvarying formulas.

You will pardon me, I trust, if I say that to my untheoretical mind, the real measure of our success or failure as political scientists is to be found in the manner in which opportunity is served and responsibility discharged, in other words, in our total impact for good or ill upon the society. In this regard one may well question whether the Association and its members have met as well as we might the test of that leadership which could and should be afforded, in both research and teaching, toward the betterment of American public life, the strengthening of democracy, and the achievement of more stable international relations.

I do not know to what extent it may be true that the discipline of political science is at once a function and an expression of democratic ideology and practice, but there can be no doubt of the rich contribution which political science can make to the strength and growth of democracy, where, as among us, it is directed to the systematic teaching, analysis, and practice of democracy in government and administration.

The severest challenge to the political scientist and to the social scientist generally, it seems to me, is in the notable failure of political and social institutions and policies to keep pace with material and technical change. If in the past fifty years there has been progress in the development of institutions, in the art of governing people, in the understanding of political processes and events, domestic and international—and some are quick to deny it—there has been no progress in any way comparable to that which has accompanied the application of science and technology to industry, communication, and transportation. In this age of the weapons of fission and fusion which science has made available to war, may not the very future of civilization depend to a considerable extent upon the ability of the political scientists, who are indeed the true experts in political relationships, to find remedies for these potentially fatal defects in political conduct? If they do not, who is to do so? Are political scientists still too much attached to abstract formalism, to metaphysical and juristic concepts, to established patterns and a traditionally narrow scope, and too exclusive to be fully realistic about the political needs, motivations, and forces which stimulate and control the thoughts and actions of citizens and governments, and therefore to be of maximum usefulness to a world in dire distress?

There will nowhere be such a promised land of politics as Plato, the practical reformer, sought. But there can be societies better governed and international affairs better ordered than is now the case. There can be, certainly, a better world, and I have confidence that political scientists can help to make it so. To do so, it is not essential, to paraphrase Plato, that either philosophers or political scientists be kings, or vice versa. But it is essential that the acts of men which are, in the words of Lord Bryce, the "data of politics," in the broadest sense, be studied, analyzed, and well understood by political scientists. There is, it seems to me, very much truth in the observation recorded by Boswell in his journal for July 28, 1763, to the effect that "human experience, which was constantly contradicting theory, was the great test of truth. . . ." And, as Woodrow Wilson put it, "nothing that forms or affects human life seems to me to be properly foreign to the student of politics." The fields in which the political scientist must plow, if the yield is to be worthy of the effort, are indeed vast.

With considerable diffidence, in view of my lack of adequate knowledge of work underway in our field, I venture to suggest that there are certain problem areas which would seem to merit greater attention than is now accorded them by our profession.

There is, for example, the problem of colonialism, and more particularly of colonial Africa. This, certainly, is at once one of the most critical and the most difficult of international problems. In one form or another, colonialism commands a highly prominent position on the agenda of the forthcoming ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Postwar experience alone has painfully demonstrated how much of the trouble and conflict in the contemporary world flows directly or indirectly from this faucet. Our colleges and universities, however, and political scientists with few exceptions, have been regrettably slow in grasping fully the world significance of this problem. American political science, I fear, has not yet come to grips with it.

In scanning the presidential addresses of the past, for example, I noted that in only one or two of them was there any reference at all to the problem of colonialism. This subject, surely, is quite within the scope and the horizon of interest of the political scientist. If I stress this lacuna in our knowledge and effort, it is not alone because colonialism has been my major pre-occupation. It is also because the field provides such great challenge; there is in it for the diligent student so much of rich opportunity for constructive contribution; and as a present and potential source of vast trouble and danger it is today one of the world's leading problems.

Secondly, in view of the new position and responsibilities assumed by our nation in world affairs, which in our democratic system necessarily involves a new responsibility of judgment and decision for the American citizen, it may well be questioned whether our educational system has adjusted to the changed situation and demands in such manner as properly to equip the citizen for the political discharge of this still unfamiliar role and responsibility.

With respect to international affairs, for instance, there would appear to be much to be learned about the historical and entirely respectable role of negotiation, conciliation, and honorable compromise in the settlement of disputes. Expectations from policies and actions are often unrealistic to the point of being fanciful, while patience is correspondingly short. There is much to be learned about how to bear up under sustained uncertainty and danger. There is surely to be found in knowledge and understanding some measure of safeguard against frustration and cynicism.

Thirdly, the striking evidence of fear, suspicion, intolerance, and confusion in the society, providing fertile soil for demagoguery, imperil our traditional freedom, and pose a stern challenge to the political scientist. These are phenomena which surely demand our most urgent concern, on behalf of the nation at large as well as our own professional and personal interest.

In the ultimate sense, it is clear, our future professional effectiveness must depend upon the preservation of that traditional freedom of inquiry which is fundamental to the American way of life and to the very concept of self-government.

If you will permit me to make one further reference to my personal experience, I would say that in our analyses, calculations, and conclusions concerning political phenomena we should never lose sight of the human, the personal factor. I am constantly impressed with the extent to which purely individual characteristics, such as personality, temperament, disposition, integrity, humility, candor, and patience, often exert substantial influence on important matters. This I have found to be the case in administrative affairs, in negotiations, and in mediation. I suspect that it must be taken into account in other areas as well.

These are simple things but they often cause political situations and efforts to be far more complex than they would otherwise be. They may not lend themselves readily to scientific approach but they have to be reckoned with most seriously.

With no apology, I should like to conclude on the quite unscientific note of faith.

Civilization is in the grip of a moral crisis. While this, in itself, is no new experience in human history, the clear and present danger derives from the fact that our scientific knowledge far exceeds our knowledge of man; to such an extent, indeed, that man now has at his disposition a power of self-destruction never before approached. That same scientific knowledge also affords to man a greater possibility for improvement than he has ever known.

It is my conviction that it is toward the fundamental unity of man that we must look for the only means whereby civilization and mankind may survive on this earth. Our knowledge of man must begin to catch up with our mastery of science. It is only in this direction that we may usefully seek to disperse the poisonous fears and suspicions which actuate that irrational behavior of man which in turn keeps him in mortal danger, each to the other. This is a matter fundamentally and decisively of simple faith in man and in his future. Despite all manifestations of evil—and these are in abundant supply—I find in that faith all that is needed to sustain me and my hopefulness in these times of grave peril.