The Orbit of Political Science

Charles E. Martin

I should begin with a brief definition of terms. The "field" of political science has never appealed to me for I think of a cow, a carabao, or a tree. The term "area" suggests something that is a part of the whole; it offends the totality of political science. The "orbit" of political science seems a better term for this space age of shrinking boundaries, yielding sovereignties, and expanding physical power.

For our purposes today, "discipline" is a more preferred term than "department," which smacks of the mercantilism of the store or the condescension of the government bureaucrat.

Political science may be defined as the study of the state and of its role in the great society. Some will reject this definition; however, it is valid for me today. Under this meaning, political science is not contained. It is not narrow. It is not tagged. UNITY, even in diversity, and UNIVERSALITY, even in division, are its crowning qualities.

Some of my best contacts with your country have been through professors of political science. Dr. David P. Barrows, my first teacher in political science, and for some years director of education for the archipelago, led me into the discipline of politics as a life work. He taught me many things about the Philippines. And also, I believe he offered the first seminar on Philippine politics in the United States. Dr. Maximo M. Kalaw, former head of the Political Science Department here, first received me at this University as a Carnegie lecturer in 1929. I shall never forget him and his admirable qualities. I knew Dr. Ralston Hayden of the University of Michigan well, and

Dr. Martin was once a Visiting Professor of American Studies at the University of the Philippines. He was a former Professor Emeritus of International Law and Political Science at the University of Washington (Seattle) and former President of the American Society of International Law. This keynote address was delivered at the inaugural meeting of the Philippine Political Science Association, University of the Philippines, March 16, 1973.

exchanged positions with him during summer sessions. These men were effective in individual achievement; they were modest men in their personal relations, and were simple and direct in their dealings with students and colleagues.

I. Politics and the Great Society

I wish to discuss first the role of political science as it serves the great society. Over the centuries our science has achieved form, substance, and continued application in the affairs of men and nations, without formal study within institutions of learning. It was practiced long before it was taught. It was written about centuries before it was reduced to a formal academic discipline.

As regards the great society, we observe first the *science of statehood.* By this we mean politics in the Aristotelian sense. Politics is a body of knowledge which often evolves into theories finding their way into practice. Such facts are found in the record of the past and in the experience of the present. They are rooted in history. The science of politics is therefore political knowledge, the fruit of which is political wisdom. It is interested in judgments which are wise, and decisions which are just.

The modern science of politics regards decision-making as susceptible of a scientific approach. It seeks results from a wholly objective discipline, if that is possible. It utilizes creative political thinking as a guide to the political present and future.

As night follows day, there follows the *art of statecraft.* This is politics in action. It is interested mainly in success, in achievement, and in results. Justice, ethics and judgment, while important, hold a complementary position in statecraft. This is the area of the administrator, the practical politician, and the man who gets things done. He sets up institutions and processes which will achieve such results.

Statecraft is not synonymous with selfish pragmatism or crass realism. There is an artistry and a practical element in getting the finest and noblest political things effectively realized. It may be the work of the statesman, the practical politician, and sometimes unhappily, even the work of the political boss.

The terms "Machiavellianism," "pragmatism," "realism," and "national interest" have been loosely used by some political scientists as the opposite of ethics of legalism, and of justice. They do not denote a genuine positivism. Nor are they to be confused with the art of politics.

We observe finally in the great society the *ethics of the public mind.* It might also be called the public conscience, or public morality. Dr. J. P. Laurel declared that "social morality is individual morality collectivised." The public conscience is concerned with the justice or the injustice of any state or public action. It deals with the right and wrong in politics.

Dr. J. P. Laurel also said: "The foundation of good government is morality; the basis of morality is righteousness which is divine." Woodrow Wilson declared that "morality and not expediency" was to him the guiding principle in American foreign policy. In order to keep the pledged word of the United States, he asked the Congress for the repeal of the free-tolls provision of the Panama Canal Act. These gentlemen were practical statesmen as well as great thinkers and men of political conscience.

In a Democracy, and with the masses, what is right counts far more than what is scientific or practical.

II. Leading Approaches to Political Science

The four Gospels offer four different views of and approaches to the Christian life. There are many approaches to the science of politics, a few major ones and a number of minor ones. We will look briefly at five such approaches which appear to be employed simultaneously in most political science teaching.

First, we ask *what is the purpose or end of the state, and how may it be realized?*

The end of the state is the field of *political philosophy.* It explores ideas, principles, fundamental doctrines, concepts and theories of right and wrong, of justice and injustice, of what is needed and desired, and what is not needed and not desired. These manifestations of philosophy are aimed at the ultimate in political ends, and at long-range goals, such as the greatest good, the highest obligation, and the supreme wisdom. Mankind hopes for these things. He aspires to them.

The ways and means of achieving these political ends make up the function of the *political institution.* Institutions are merely men acting together in sustained accord to achieve planned and considered goals. Organization or establishment, tied to end or purpose is the institution. "Inventive thought and effective action" result where philosophy and institution are effectively intertwined.

Second, we ask *how do we determine, direct, and utilize the social will?*

It is done, first, by the *process of politics*. This means the development of the social will so that desires are translated into accepted law or custom. This sometimes requires inconvenience and sacrifice. It is essentially a reservoir of the social will, plus power, awaiting use. It is the area of policy determination, and its translation into a rule of law or an executive order binding on the body politic.

It is done, second, by the *process of administration.* This is the use of the social will to render specific government services to all entitled to enjoy them. Where voluntary means will not have this result, it must be compelled. Administration is concerned with the agency and the method of action.

It is fashionable to debate over the primacy of politics as against administration, and *vice versa.* In a democarcy, neither has much value without the other.

Our third question, and therefore our third approach is *what is the function of power? How and why do we separate and divide it?* The separation of powers in law is mainly a matter of restraint. It protects one area of power against another. In practical politics, it denotes a power struggle for supremacy between rival government bodies. In politics as a science, the aim is a division of power based on function, or the assignment of that role of power which can best be performed by a specific official, functionary, agency, or institution.

The leading allocation of power is that of the *executive authority.* This is the permanent, stable element in government. It is the source of authority for all derivative governmental action. The executive power is the authority to act. The executive function is stability and continuity in government. The executive institution, to take a familiar form, is, for example, the presidency of the Philippines, or the presidency of the United States.

Following World War I, the new constitutions paid little attention to presidential government. Everywhere parliamentary institutions were regarded as the key to political success and governmental effectiveness. Following World War II new governments have steadily strengthened the executive power with a distinctive position and an independence of other departments of government. The executive may be considered as the policy head of the government, as chief magistrate of the state, and as head of the national administration. Each of these functions gives him a unique status and a sustained authority. The strong executive will utilize all

three in the pursuit of his political goals. It is the most impressive commitment of power in the modern state.

A complementary allocation of power is that of the *legislative authority.* It is the deliberative, policy-determining element in government which discovers and enacts the social will on a representative basis. It has the character of assembly, of consultation, of discussion, of debate, and of decision by voting.

Despite its dilatory tactics and its frequent indecisiveness, the legislative authority more than any other has secured the liberties and rights of the people, and rule by the people. It may represent the transitory in government because of its function, character, and scheme of organization. If often responds to the political winds and tides of the day. However, in the modern state where there is no legislature, or where it is only a "chamber of echos," the people are not free.

The function of investigation and the conduct of legislative hearings raise new and vital questions as to the genuine role of legislative authority. We do not have the time to tarry over them here.

The *judicial authority* is the element in government most removed from politics which protects the individual and his rights and requires him to perform his duties. It guards against the anarchism of the individual and the arbitrary action of the state. It helps the individual to set the legal machinery of the state in motion in his own behalf, and even against the state itself. In some instances, it interprets the Constitution and laws of the state. As against policy, initiative, administration and action, it operates as an element of restraint in government. It is the "red light" in government, against the too frequent tendency of the legislative and executive authorities to see only a "green light" for their guidance and action.

A fourth question is *how do we organize our hierarchies of jurisdiction or levels of authority?*

Naturally and logically, the *national government* comes first. This area of government is the basis of sovereignty and power. It is sole authority in foreign relations. It alone posseses international personality in unlimited degree. It is supreme over all lesser units, whether they be of a unitary or a federal state. It is the political unit with absolute sovereignty; it exercises exclusive jurisdiction within its borders. It forms the basis, assuming sovereign equality, of the family of nations. Its constitution, whether written or unwritten, is the

highest instrument in authority and legal obligation which exists today.

Local government units, under our two governments, are either creatures of the United States state governments or of the Philippine national government. They are, naturally, units of administration. They may be and often are units of autonomy as well. In the American federal system there are three levels of government, with the original ruling power of the member states as a unique feature. In the unitary system of the Philippines, there are two levels of government.

In both countries, despite these differences, the traditions of local government are deep and strong. The *town house* is regarded and revered as much as the *state house.*

How far should local self-government be encouraged? Should autonomy be preferred to administration? Or sacrificed to it? Local self-rule is an effective safeguard against an undue concentration of power and extreme centralization of function.

A final question, and final approach, is *the division of authority between the external and the internal jurisdiction of the state.* There is no greater fallacy than the frequently made declaration that domestic and foreign functions of the state have become merged, and that no questions of internal and external jurisdiction arise.

In its *internal affairs,* the state is supreme within its own dominions. This is where municipal law prevails as against international law. It is where the basis of legal obligation is the subordination of a legal subject to a superior political authority. It is where sovereignty is absolute and where jurisdiction is exclusive.

In its *external affairs,* a state is equal with other states but not sovereign over them. The state is not supreme, but it is free from external control. International law prevails as against municipal law. Legal obligation is based on coordination, or the mutual consent of equals. It is where negotiation and agreement rather than legislation and voting are the processes of settlement and decision. Such is the basis of the international authority of the state. The status of a treaty as contrasted with that of a national constitution explains much of the difficulty in resolving the recurring difficulties between the nation-state and the family of nations.

Each of us, I take it, finds one of these approaches more to his liking than any of the others. And within each approach, each of us prefers one of its divisions over the remaining ones. For example, if one prefers state purpose or end and its realization to any other

approach, he will also prefer philosophy over institutions, or *vice versa.* How we align ourselves within these categories reveals much of our stake in political science, and the direction of our interest.

III. The "Division" or "Fields" of Political Science

In most large universities political science has become divided into "fields" of study for the alleged purpose of specialization. Where institutions are too small for such narrow divisions of the subject, courses dealing with them are offered. As the college has its "undergraduate major," so each department has its "area of concentration." A brief summary of these fields will give some idea of the "reach" and diversity of political science today:

1. *Political theory.* Ideas and events, and men and movements are compared and contrasted. Attention is given to questions of morality, of political obedience, of collectivism versus individualism, of the pursuit of happines, and of democracy.
2. *Public law.* We deal here with justice and law, legal institutions, constitutionalism, the separation and division or powers, private rights, and judicial review.
3. *Politics.* Under this caption we consider the struggle for power, personality in politics, unwritten constitutions, party systems, pressure groups, public opinion, and extra-legal factors in politics. Elections are studied. Policy-determination as against administration is stressed.
4. *Administration.* This includes bureaucracy in government, administrative areas, centralization and decentralization, the civil service, decision-making, and intergovernmental relations. It is essentially the "business of the government."
5. The *national government.* This has been outlined under another heading. Teachers generally emphasize either organization and structure, or principles and institutions. It is the unit of the greatest power in government.
6. *Local government.* We have considered this as one channel of approach, either under a federal or a unitary system. Despite being the lowest level of government, it is always a field or course in political science.
7. *Comparative government.* Foreign rather than comparative governments were taught in the past. Today a truly comparative approach is attempted. Moreover, institutions rather than machinery and structure are stressed. The comparative method is being extended to the more specialized aspects of government, not merely the obvious and major ones.
8. *International relations.* Diplomacy, foreign policy, international law, international organization, international administration, geopolitics,

and national power in international relations are standard courses in this area in the large university. There is also the problem of whether international relations is a separate discipline, or a "field" under political science.

9. *Political behavior.* This area illustrates the impact of psychology, sociology, and even mathematics on the science of politics. It seeks to study the political animal as he is. Individual and group conduct are examined "in the raw," with little regard for the ends and institutions of the state, or for the forms and functions of government. The field is too new for either definitive results or for reasonable prediction.

This breakdown of fields into subdivisions may resemble the traditional course descriptions in a college bulletin. However there is a distinction with a difference. I have set forth this fragmentation both of "field" and subject categories for a dual purpose. It will reveal much of what is right with our discipline. By the same token, much of what is wrong with it will be revealed. Much can be said as to the length, breadth and depth of the "spread" of our subject. I leave the problem with you without further comment.

IV. Our Academic Brethren

How wonderful it is for us to dwell in peace with our academic brethren! And how seldom that desirable goal is attained! Woodrow Wilson remarked once that he needed no instruction in practical politics, having been first a university professor and then a university president.

Are our academic brethren allies or enemies? Are we, in relation to them, in a condition of equality or of satellitism? Are we a "core" subject or a "collateral" one? Are we a substantive or a procedural discipline? As Buckle once said, no matter how strong we are at our center, our genuine character is revealed by the way in which we impinge on our brother disciplines at the circumference.

Political scientists have had a special relationship with historians, economists, and lawyers. Political science in the past has been allied with each of these disciplines, and has been at times a part of each. In fact, our discipline until recent years has been regarded as subordinate to them. They form a distinctive group of the substantive social sciences with which political science is closely allied. Political science has declared its independence and has established its own indentity. The relationship with these sciences, however, should remain firm and close.

The sociologists, the psychologists, the anthropologists, and, to some extent, the geographers, belong to the methodological social sciences. Their influence on political science teaching, and especially on political science writing and research has been both rewarding and devastating. The record of association is neither wholly black nor white. It is that area of political science contact which today needs the most careful scrutiny, guidance, and perhaps even some control.

The comments of our academic brethren are not always music to our ears. A look at some of their traditional criticism will do us no harm. If it is true, we should change our ways. If it is mistaken it will do us no harm. We hear these charges made repeatedly:

1. That we are too tied up with politics.
2. That we are too tied to the state and power.
3. That we are too proliferated; we are too divided, with no unity.
4. That we are too pragmatic, too utilitarian. We are not sufficiently academic. We have no basic philosophy.
5. Our materials are too current and too contemporary.

We are doubtless guilty of some of these things, as are also our academic brethren who make the charges. Self-examination rather than refutation seems our better course.

The association of the science of politics with the sovereign state subjects our discipline both to the values and the liabilities, the advantages, and the limitations of that most powerful of social institutions. The state is not always a valid political instrument, just as the church has not always been a constructive instrument of religion. Such an association we cannot and should not try to escape, short of shirking our social and moral responsibility. The possession of power and its use by the state is the central problem of political responsibility today. It is the office of the political scientist to establish criteria governing the conduct of those entrusted with the use of power. Our guilt is the greater when we surrender to the phenomenon of power, and when we esteem it for its own sake alone.

V. The Role of the Political Scientist

What is the function of the political scientist in the modern world? It cannot be precisely the same as his function at the beginning of the present century. Our role is greatly influenced by the problems which arise during different periods of time. Since our political problems have undergone a certain form of revolution, the

role of the political scientist has undergone a substantial alteration as well. The character and significance of this change is a favorite subject for educational discussions, articles, books, and symposia. The educational journals are filled with articles on the "new" role of the educator. "Revolutions" are described as having taken place in almost every discipline. We need not specify these changes, actual and fancied, at this point. The world is interested, not in our too frequent use of such terms as "new," "modern" and "revolutionary" but rather in our understanding of the nature of the change and our effective performance of our particular functions under it. We have too often answered these inquiries with the usual academic clichés occasionally handed out to the graduating senior on Commencement Day. Neither the senior nor society is deluded by such academic nonsense. Unless we, along with our fellow educators, bring forth valid answers and solutions to our own problems, the direction of education, as now widely threatened, may be taken from us.

I prefer to discuss the role of the political scientists in keeping with his professional character — as *teacher, researcher,* and *public servant.*

1. *The teacher.* Out teaching role is our highest and noblest function. St. Paul, in his spiritual division of gifts addressed to his Christian students, included apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and *teachers* (Acts 4:11). It is later said in the Acts of the Apostles (6:42) that the apostles "ceased not to *teach* and preach." And earlier in the Holy Writ "the teacher" is referred to "as the scholar." (I. Cor. 28:8). Clearly nothing is more vital or significant than stimulating and dynamic contact with human beings, especially with the youth of the land. Mere research is cold and lifeless without continuing relations with making on a qualitative and selective basis. Constitutions of government and statutes of conduct are the skeletons of our political society. The flesh and lifeblood are elsewhere. So also the research institution in political science without the student is a dull and dreary place.

The political science teacher must be a "man of parts." He must, from the nature of his subject, seek some of the arts and skills of the related professions. He must be part journalist. He must give a faithful account of events; he must editorialize in the finest sense of that word. He must analyze political situations. It is something of a combination of reporter, editor, and commentator. He must be part historian. The record of the past must be respected. Accuracy in chronicling political facts, figures, and events is of professional ethics.

Moreover, history gives perspective, which no political scientist should neglect. He is part lawyer and logician. The processes of logic must be constantly employed. Controversial points must be argued. Political evidence must be evaluated. Accuracy of discrimination is called for. And justice must be done. The political scientists is also something of a philosopher. Philosophy gives unity, ultimate goals, and universality. It also provides valid grounds for mental and moral appraisal. Then he must have some of the qualities of the minister or priest. He must seek the distinction between the right and wrong in politics. He must have an individual conscience, and must partake of the public conscience of his community.

There are a number of things the teacher of politics should not do. Let me specify a few of them. He should not preach. A political science class is not a church. He should not pontificate. Such is effective when done by the right person at the right time and in the right place. He should not exhort. Our function is not that of individual, personal, and general discipline outside our distinctive role. He should not merely survey or record. There must be meaning to his teaching and significance to his conclusions. He should not merely amuse or entertain. These devices, generally pleasant and frequently effective, are only a part of the means of instruction. He should not "grind" any axe. Partisanship should be avoided at all hazards. He should advocate nothing save the truth. He should not orate or disclaim. The teacher and the orator or elocutionist are miles apart. He should revere the past and respect the *status quo*, but not to the neglect of the present and future. He must think ahead of his students, and ahead of the events of his immediate teaching decade. His students will not come into their social and political responsibility for at least a score of years. In a real sense he is teaching both for and against the future.

My greatest teacher was Dr. Charles A. Beard. No teacher of my knowledge or experience equaled his influence on students. One cannot reduce the qualities of so great a teacher to mere categories or to a diagram. However, for the sake of revealing the sources of his teaching power, an attempt must be made to do so. How did he make political science live? How did he inspire students? How did he hold their interest? Charles Austin Beard did or possessed these things:

1. A dynamic personality.
2. Sympathy and love for his students.

3. Discipline through friendliness and example.
4. Emphasized major principles of statecraft and of government in the concrete.
5. Classroom holding power as a lecturer.
6. A trenchant pen as an author and, as a researcher, a keen sense for the significant and the thing that mattered.

How may we, as political science teachers, keep in constant touch with the sources of inspiration and light? Teaching is an intensely personal thing. It cannot be regimented, scheduled, planned, zoned, or formalized. Nor can it be a popularity contest. We must work out our own teaching salvation with fear and trembling.

2. *The researcher in politics.* There must be two kinds of research: (*a*) research for effective teaching; and (*b*) research through which the professor instructs his colleagues rather than his students in the area of his specialization. The first is essential to retain the respect of his students. Credit for this is deserved and seldom given. The second is essential to retain the respect of his colleagues. Aims and methods differ in each of these levels of research.

I am certain that we approach shelves of political science publications with some trepidation, and with increasing frustration. The shelves are lined with books which will have seen their effective use within two to five years. A few may last a decade. One or two may survive a score of years. A legal scholar once remarked that he had examined many political science books which would have an uncertain span of current use. But he seldom found a volume which, through its character and merit, would be worth consulting in years to come. Our present quantitative output offers little encouragement for the future. Perhaps this tendency may in time run its course. Perhaps we can then retrace our steps and insist on the fundamental, the significant, and the permanent in our writing and publications.

I offer no "canons" of political science research. Like teaching, it is intensely personal and cannot be nailed down. However, a few guidelines may be suggested:

1. Facts, figures, and events, sometimes called "library" research, while a means, are far from being an end in themselves. They should be kept in perspective.
2. The assigned task, the project, or "field study" should be encouraged in appropriate areas of political science research, especially on the graduate and the professional levels.
3. Textbook writing should not be regarded as genuine dis-

covery where the demand is for research for the instruction of one's colleagues.

4. The pattern of the manual, yearbook or pamphlet of the bureau or institute type, generally along procedural or occupational lines, should be avoided as genuine research.
5. From one to three standard works which will last from a decade to a generation or more are worth a hundred "pot-boilers" offered in the name of discovery. We should avoid, as academicians, and especially as political scientists, writing merely for the "dateline" and the "deadline."
6. Political science belongs to society and to mankind. We should not write so that he who runs may read. However, we should write so that he who reads may reasonably understand.

   We must, of course, defer in part to the new methodology and terminology. Yet, they are not understood by the men who make policy. Political scientists cannot write for the self alone. We must provide materials that statesmen can use. There is not enough time to engage in political pedantry.
7. We must look for facts and for the truth "beyond the ranges." "The obvious," a good rule for the politician, is a poor one for the political scientist.

Political Science is a social science. It must deal with man in his individual and group environments and relationships. Its research cannot be that of the mathematician or the physicist. In our research, let us dare to be ourselves.

3. *The political scientist, the community, and the public service.* Political science is a public discipline. The state is a social institution. The political scientist should have membership in political communities on different levels; participate in their activities; serve their communities as members or leaders; and possibly serve as appointive, and, under certain circumstances, as elective officials.

The community is to the political scientist as the soil is to the tree, the air to the bird, and the sea to the fish. Separate him from it and you eject him from his environment and dry up his source of intercourse with society.

It is one profession where participation in some form in the body politic is a condition precedent to effectiveness, viability, and growth.

Partisan elective office raises discretionary questions of the highest importance to the political scientists and his institution. Once involved, he seldom retains his academic objectivity. He often becomes of declining value to his university. "Potomac fever" is a heady wine. It is better let alone.

However, participation on the citizenship level and the rendering of expert services through appointive office of a temporary character are wildly followed by political scientists and should, in balance, be encouraged. Public service, it should be remembered, is secondary to teaching and research as one of the teacher's functions. Recent efforts to equate elective office-holding with political science teaching and research have not succeeded. Where pursued unduly, such attempts have led to devastating results.

VI. What Should be the Measure of the Political Scientist's Social Responsibility?

The political scientist's social responsibility is greater than that of most academic men. If he is demagogic, subjective, partisan, or indiscreet in his teaching and writing, it becomes news. He will be quoted. He will be criticized. He will be tried, at least, in the public mind. He must seek to avoid these things. If a professor of English or of physics "sounds off" along the above-mentioned lines, he is regarded as merely "commenting," or as exercising the privileges of a citizen. The political scientist is regarded as expressing the views of a professional. It is one of the hazards of his calling. He must say something that matters and counts, with all the caution and restraint of the scholar.

Dr. Henry Suzzallo, in inviting me to become a member of his faculty at the University of Washington to organize a new faculty of politics, declared: "The sky is the limit so long as you stick to facts."

So long as facts are our means and the truth is our goal, we should be left free in mind and action to discover the truth and to follow where it leads.

VII. The Unfinished Task

The task of the political scientist is never completed. Current solutions are always followed by even greater problems. Never were the words of Thomas Jefferson so applicable as today when he declared that each generation must find its own political solutions, and that the past must yield to the demands of the present and future.

What are the tasks that are ahead? I shall suggest a few. The resolution of the following problems will demand the maximum resources of political study and research, and would be of permanent benefit to the great society:

1. The development of a more balanced discipline in all its phases, especially in the science of politics and in the art of government.
2. The holy marriage of idealism and realism.
3. The problem of power in the state and in its external affairs.
4. The bipolarity of the world today, with its current effects and its future potential.
5. Sovereignty and world peace through the rule of law.
6. The liberty of the individual and the authority of the state.
7. The public and private sectors in the national economies.
8. Democracy in the world today: what it is; the different types of democracy; democracy of the East and West.
9. Nationalism, regionalism, and universality.

I end as I began. The dynamics of our discipline are the political dynamics of the great society. These dynamics are:

1. *Creative political thought.* Said Dr. Hans Morgenthau: "Creative political thought illumines the political experience of the day — and of all days — by discovering within it the perennial forces, problems and patterns of interaction, of which political life consists."
2. *Purposeful political action.* This is the organized use of authorized power for determined and agreed political ends, both within and without the state.
3. *A working public conscience.* Lord Acton once observed that no prescription of the state was valid against the conscience of mankind.

This great trinity of dynamics, if wisely directed and actively employed, would mean that political science, operating in the great society, could master any problem, no matter how difficult, both now and in the future. The first half of our century, dominated by fear, force, war, poverty and oppression, could be made to yield to a second-half devoted to the pursuit of security, peace, happiness and prosperity.