

The Political Science Educational Philosophy of Ralph Bunche: Theory and Practice

Hanes Walton, Jr.

This article is based upon a textual analysis of Ralph Bunche's writings since 1940 to determine the nature, scope, and significance of his educational philosophy of the discipline of political science. From this textual analysis of his writings, the article finds that five major intellectual categories emerged from his writings and notes; whether those categories were original ones and/or whether they were modifications of categories already in existence. After having evaluated the original and secondary nature of these categories, this article indicates that Bunche's educational philosophy created a different perspective and vision for the discipline. Herein lays his great contribution.

Embedded in Ralph Bunche's writings and organizational practices is a unique and exceptional conceptualization of political science as a discipline. This conceptualization and vision, which we shall call an educational philosophy, is not to be found in a single coherent and comprehensive publication, document, and/or volume. Yet, it does exist in his wide and diverse and scattered writings and leadership roles and practices in the Howard University Department of Political Science, the presidency of the American Political Science Association, positions at the U.S. Department of State, and in leadership positions at the United Nations. It is also to be found in his four research memoranda for the Gunnar Myrdal report, *An American Dilemma*, and in his field research in South Africa (Edgar, 1992; Grantham, 1973). Here, in these sundry works, Bunche left an intellectual record, and it is possible to delineate from that record of scholarship and field studies his conceptualization of Political Science as a discipline that challenges, contrasts, and diverges sharply with the dominant and consensus one now describing the discipline.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Bunche delivered his presidential address to the American Political Science Association (APSA) in Chicago, Illinois on September 9, 1954 which just happened to be the 50th anniversary of the organization (Bunche, 1954). Using this unique moment in time, as well as this historic occasion (of being the first African American to serve as President of the APSA), this President told the membership that the nation state and the international community had certain problem areas, which merited greater attention from the discipline of political science (Bunche, 1954).

Among the problems that Bunche noted were "the problem of colonialism, particularly of colonial Africa"; the fear, intolerance, suspicion, and confusion emanating from racial demagogues; and the second-class citizenship emerging from racial segregation, White supremacy, and disenfranchisement (Bunche, 1954, p. 969). In Bunche's view, these grave problems had been ignored by the discipline. These pressing problem areas facing the profession and society threatened both freedom and democracy (Bunche, 1954). But perhaps most

importantly is not Bunche's identification of these problems, but what they offer in terms of insights into the mind of a public intellectual who happens to be an African American political scientist. Undergirding these poignant remarks and suggestions is a vision and perspective of the discipline of political science that, while borne of the past and present, offers a course correction and reform for the future.

To see this vision and perspective with its proposed reforms for an academic discipline and professional organization, this study will begin with a textual analysis of Bunche's post-1940 writings and delineate from those works and the appropriate secondary sources the seminal intellectual categories of his educational philosophy. Moreover, the study will reconstruct, from these categories of ideas and reflections, a systematic and holistic portrait of Bunche's desired political science education.

1940 was chosen as the point of departure for this study because in this Special Issue there is an article by Jonathan Scott Holloway which offers an excellent exposition of Bunche's intellectual ideas from the early 1930s until the 1940s. Not only does the article show the evolution and focus of Bunche's ideas, but their nature and significance as well. This article reveals that these ideas and philosophy were much different from the ones used in the 1940s forward. Therefore, this study starts where Professor Holloway's article stops.

The discipline from its inception to Bunche's presidential address has been exceptional in undertaking textual analyses of a wide variety of political thinkers and philosophers and reconstructing the pertinent concepts, ideas, and thoughts in the original texts so that they provide the readers with a comprehensive and systematic portrait of one's political philosophy and/or political theory. It has been done with Greek thinkers like Plato and Aristotle, with Roman thinkers like Machiavelli and Cicero, English thinkers like Hobbes and Locke, and French thinkers like Rousseau (Sabine, 1973). It has been done for African American political thinkers like Martin Luther King, Jr., W.E.B. Dubois, and Huey Newton (Jeffries, 2002; Reed, 2001; Walton, 1971). Hence, this study of Bunche's educational philosophy about the nature, scope, and significance of political science as a discipline will model itself on those enduring and continuing studies in political thought and theory by taking their well tested and logically developed procedures and techniques as the guidelines and frames-of-reference to organize and structure Bunche's ideas, visions, and perspectives. Thus, the methodology for this study is one of performing a textual analysis of Bunche's writings post-1940 to his last ones in the 1960s.

THE EMPIRICAL BASES OF BUNCHE'S FIVE INTELLECTUAL CATEGORIES

Bunche's vision and perspective for a different type of political science arose from his empirical-based field studies as well as from his experiential efforts. Such a vision like his did not arrive from armchair speculation. By way of comparison, we can turn to another political scientist, who, like Bunche, rose to the top of the discipline by studying the same area of Southern Politics—a problem area that was outside of the realm of the discipline. V.O. Key, Jr. (1958) in his presidential address to the discipline entitled, "The State of the Discipline," suggested that political science had rarely come to grips with the fundamental questions of how scholars go about pushing the limits of knowledge:

Method without substance may be sterile, but substance without methods is only fortuitously substantial. Technique and method in themselves perhaps may not generate many new ideas, but they are most handy for verification or, as occurs with melancholy frequency, disproof. And new techniques and methods often make it possible to raise new kinds of substantive questions. (Key, 1958, p. 967)

Bunche's works, which we organize here into several basic categories (African American Politics, Southern Politics, Political Parties, African Politics and Colonialism, and International Organization and World Politics), were born with empirical methods and techniques that allowed him to raise incisive and insightful questions about "the particular and the unique" as well as the very nature of the discipline. He conducted field studies on African American and Southern politics for the Carnegie Foundation study of America's race problem along with the Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdal. Bunche was contracted to prepare four memoranda for the study, which contributed to Myrdal's massive volume, *An America Dilemma*. One of the studies

analyzed leadership, another Negro pressure groups; one looked at the political status of Negro politics in the North and South, while the fourth and final one probed the different ways that the Negro problem had been addressed and reflected upon the racial ideologies behind these conceptualizations. All of them were empirically based works that created the groundwork for both African American and Southern politics.

Next, Bunche conducted similar field studies on African politics, African colonialism, and South Africa. These African studies covered the differences in British and French colonialism on the continent, the White Supremacy regime in South Africa, and the politics and liberation efforts of native Africans in these different systems of oppression and subjugation.

Then he conducted participant observations as part of his work in International Organizations and World Politics. Here his publications analyzed the role and function of this world organization in the post-World War II world. Therefore, when taken collectively, these ingeniously based intellectual categories sharpened Bunche's disciplinary imagination that spurred creative analyses and provided for bold new interpretations. In Table 1 one can see the four major categories and their subareas.

TABLE 1

*The Five Political Science Intellectual Categories as Developed by
Ralph Bunche: Origins and Sources*

CATEGORIES	NEW OR MODIFIED	ORIGIN/SOURCE
African American Politics	New	Field Studies
Southern Politics	New	Field Studies
Political Parties	Modified	Field Studies
Subcategory: African American Partisanship		
African Politics and Colonialism	New	Field Studies
Subcategory: South African Politics		Field Studies
World Politics and International Organization	Modified	Experiential

Source: Adapted from a textual analysis of his writings

First and foremost among Bunche's intellectual categories is the one derived from his fieldwork for his doctoral dissertation in 1934. This work on African politics and colonialism focused on Togoland and Dahomey, but this category was broadened, enriched, and enhanced with his field study of South Africa on September 29, 1937 (Edgar, 1992). Both of these studies led to several articles on African politics and colonialism and the problems that he encountered in these political systems and processes. His findings and observations appeared as remarks in his presidential address of 1954 and shaped the suggestions he made to and about the discipline. In fact, this body of work which appeared in articles, book chapters, and monographs made him immediately aware that the discipline of political science had evaded, dismissed, and/or overlooked this colonialism in general, and African colonialism in particular, as a subject of concern and importance.

Prior to his dissertation field studies and the resultant dissertation in 1934, Bunche published two articles on African American politics in 1928. These were studies of Negro politics in Chicago, a Northern urban area. However, he did not return to this particular genre until 1935-1936 and 1939-1940, that is, after he completed his dissertation. Bunche established his second intellectual category of African American Politics and the field studies that he undertook for the Myrdal study that were financed and backed by the Carnegie Foundation. Bunche produced 4 of the 44 monographs that were commissioned for the study. Of these 4, "The Political Status of the Negro" consisted of 1,600 pages, 19 chapters, and 3 appendixes. It thoroughly enriched and

enlarged this new and budding intellectual category. Nothing of this scope and size and significance on the topic had surfaced in the discipline before. Bunche's work covered all of the major regions of the United States—southern, northern, and western (Urquhart, 1993). Perhaps, *Negro Politician* the study of Chicago politics by political scientist Harold Gosnell is the closest comparison to the depth and range of Bunche's work.

However, Bunche's field studies for Myrdal created not just one new intellectual category but two—African American Politics and Southern Politics (Walton, 1994). His pioneering work on African American politics was done so well and with such great contextual analysis that it laid the groundwork and foundations for Southern politics, a third category. Long before V.O. Key, Jr.'s, classic, *Southern Politics*, which appeared in 1949, many of the concepts, themes, political institutions, and interpretative frames-of-reference were formulated, defined, and operationalized in Bunche's landmark political status memorandum for the Myrdal study. Key's book not only referenced Bunche but was in the final analysis significantly influenced by Bunche (Walton, 1994).

His fourth intellectual category is that of political parties. It emerged during the field studies for the Myrdal study. After the 1936 presidential election, the results revealed that the African American electorate, a staple and strong supporter of the Republican Party since the 1856 presidential race, realigned with the Democratic Party. Although in several Southern states after Reconstruction a number of African American Democratic state legislators appeared; the vast majority of officeholders in this period were Republicans. But what shook the Republican Party leaders was the vast realignment of the African American voters with the Democratic Party in President Franklin Roosevelt's 1936 election. Such a critical realignment of the African American voter spurred the Republican National Committee (RNC) to commission Bunche to undertake a study of why the dealignment occurred and how they might regain this loyal segment of their partisan base (Walton, 1990).

This commissioned study of the Republican Party electoral base in the African American community allowed Bunche to probe the nature of African American, Republican partisanship and the factors and variables that eroded, undermined, disrupted, and severed that long-term relationship. Dominant among the litany of variables and factors as Bunche's study determined was party policies and the leadership around those policies. Since Republican Party public policies such as the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments and the 1875 Civil Rights Act had originally caused the alignment in the first place, the abandonment of those policies had led to party detachment and weak partisan ties. Simply put, the Republican Party did not strongly support the African American community in the 1936 presidential election as it had done from 1856 until 1932.

Moreover, in doing this study of the Republican Party, Bunche had the unprecedented opportunity to see the formation of the African American alignment with the Democratic Party at the mass base. Partisan alignment with the party had taken place at least at the elite level and then at a limited mass base level prior to the Civil War; however, large-scale mass alignment at the presidential level came during the New Deal period with the election of President F.D. Roosevelt. Thus, in the end, this study wrought for Bunche insights into political party behavior at both the dealignment and alignment levels.

Although Bunche derived much of this intellectual category from a single study, he added a bit more to this category indirectly through his article on "Disenfranchisement of the Negro" (Bunche, 1941a), because the movement to deprive African Americans of their right to vote was a public policy sponsored by the Southern Democratic Party. Nevertheless, other factions of the Democratic Party opposed this policy and assisted African American Democrats in overcoming this problem. African Americans dealignment from the Southern Democratic Party was not nearly as detrimental in the long run as the Republican Party dropping of its support for civil rights policies. This category like the others had a lot to offer in terms of intellectual insights about the American Party system and process.

Then, came World War II and Bunche moved from academia to the Office of Strategic Services. Later he joined the State Department and served as an advisor to the U.S. delegation to the San Francisco Conference that drafted the United Nations Charter (Walton, 1995). In 1946, he

joined the UN Secretariat as head of the Trusteeship Department. Bunche's writings that emanated from this time until his death, with the exception of his American Political Science Association presidential address, create his last major intellectual category—International Organizations and World Politics.

Several publications in this timeframe created and expanded this category, and they essentialized his concerns with world peace and how the United Nations might serve and function so as to make world peace attainable. Seemingly, domestic concerns in these years were superseded by foreign affairs. His last major publication on African Americans, in 1942, deals with the legal status of this group in America up until that moment in time. Then, when his intellectual focus shifts to world politics, his works on African politics and colonialism do not cease until 1965, when a book chapter analyzing the problems in the Congo appears. This is his last publication.

However, it must be noted that Bunche did make several major speeches after 1965, that are currently in his unpublished papers; some of which have been reprinted recently in an anthology of his writings edited by African American political scientist Charles Henry (Henry, 1995). Combining these unpublished speeches with some of his pre-1940 writings, one could argue that these works constitute another intellectual category called the Civil Rights Movement. While potentially interesting, this analysis does not so organize and structure this body of work into such a category. A major reason for this is that most of the published and unpublished work for this possible category deals with intra-group politics and only indirectly with the larger political system and political science. Furthermore, his last unpublished speech is a reaction to not only the Black Power Movement phase of the civil rights movement but specifically to some of his critics within that movement. The speeches are clearly personal unlike the scholarly stance of his earlier works.

Lastly, this potential category is excluded because it does not rest upon any systematic empirical bases like the other categories. While some of these published and unpublished speeches are logical and solidly reasoned discussions, Bunche did not collect any data nor perform any systematic data analyses. Even though this category is not formally developed, it is taken into consideration, as the reader can see, and considered in the overall formulation of this study's effort to craft a holistic vision and perspective of Bunche's educational philosophy.

Collectively, Bunche developed out of his scholarly studies five distinct intellectual categories. The first three are from his empirical studies of the American political system and process: (a) African American Politics, (b) Southern Politics, and (c) Political Parties. Then, he developed two from his field studies in Africa and his experiential efforts at the United Nations: (d) African Politics and Colonialism and (e) International Organization and World Politics. Overall, Bunche drew from these five separate and distinct areas, as well as from his civil rights movement participation, that the academic discipline of political science was deficient and weak in these subfields. Only the area of political parties was heavily studied and analyzed. The other areas were either marginal to the discipline if not omitted altogether. This meant to Bunche that the discipline was grossly incomplete both in its study of the American system and of the international system.

These five distinct intellectual categories allowed Bunche to craft a critique and reconstitute the discipline upon a different paradigm and intellectual axis than was currently being attempted by individuals in political science who relied on evaluations and assessment of history and evolution (Farr, Dryzek, & Leonard, 1995; Somit & Tanenhaus, 1967). With the five subfields of study outlined, Bunche was seeing the discipline from intellectual ramparts that were not even in the realm of vision or understanding of political scientists of the time. Simply put, these categories ultimately gave him a different vision and perspective. And this vision and perspective did not just rest upon these new intellectual ramparts (Walton, Miller, & McCormick, 1995).

THE EXPERIENTIAL FACTOR

Bunche's vision of a discipline of political science did not rest and rely solely upon empirical based field studies and research. Nor should we peg our analyses entirely upon his scholarly publication track record. That would be shortsighted. Bunche fashioned his vision and perspective also from his job experiences, and these experiences involved him in different problem-solving capacities. In the working-day world, he faced real world problems in a variety of areas, which forced him to confront the strengths and limitations of his own discipline.

In his presidential address to the APSA, Bunche argued that political science needed not to be an abstract and isolated discipline, but one concerned with addressing real world problems. On this matter, he stated, "The severest challenge to the political scientist, it seems to me, is...to find remedies for these potential fatal defects in political conduct" (Bunche, 1954, p. 968). He further asked: "Are political scientists still too much attached to abstract formalism, to metaphysical and juristic concepts...to be of maximum usefulness to a world in dire distress?" (p. 968).

Inherent in these remarks is a man concerned with his discipline playing a problem-solving role in both domestic and world affairs. Yet this was not typical of presidential addresses to the APSA. Contrasting Bunche's presidential address with that of V.O. Key, Jr. (1958), a notable and exemplary scholar in his own right, one immediately is struck by Key's emphasis and focus on the need to generate knowledge from inside the discipline with better methodological tools and techniques. Key is concerned with how to expand the boundaries of the discipline and push back the knowledge frontiers. He is less concerned with the problem-solving ability of the discipline in real-life situations. Problem solving for Key is simply one of solving knowledge problems inside the discipline. To this end, he proffers a *unidimensional* vision and perspective of the discipline:

The burden of my argument may be stated briefly and bluntly. It is that the demands upon our profession has grown more rapidly than has the content of our discipline....We must devote greater resources in manpower and ingenuity to the systematic analysis of the phenomena of politics. (p. 970)

Elsewhere in the address, Key amplifies this *unidimensional* vision and perspective by recommending that "...a critical need of our discipline is for more, and far more rigorous, research training...A second area...is that of recruitment of...genuinely creative scholars to push back the frontiers of knowledge" (p. 970).

Clearly, Key's vision is quite different from that of Bunche. This analysis of Key's vision is not to say that he did not have job experiences in the real world, because he did. He worked under his former Chicago mentor, Professor Harold Gosnell, at the Bureau of the Budget, during World War II (Heard, 1977; Lucker & Key, 2001). From that experience he wrote an academic treatise (Key, 1940, 1942). Beyond this job experience, he also served in a political commentary role by writing for popular magazines and newspapers. He even served on President John F. Kennedy's presidential commission to study campaign financing (Lucker & Key, 2001). Yet, even with these real world experiences, Key's main role and function was as a "scholar advancing political knowledge." This meant that in the end, Key's vision of the discipline, like so many of his predecessors, crafted a unidimensional perspective of the discipline. Bunche, any way you perceive him, had an absolutely different perspective; that difference derives in part from his experiential knowledge.

Bunche's first experiential task was to found and then organize the Department of Political Science at Howard University in 1929. In this role, Bunche had to construct a political science curriculum for primarily African American students who found themselves disenfranchised in an entire region of the country and in limited areas in other parts of the nation (Bunche, 1941b). Bunche's challenge was to provide a professional education along with knowledge of how to solve this problem of a lack of suffrage rights (Prestage, 1969; Walton, 1968). Establishing a department which met the special needs of this unique population was no meager task.

Next, Bunche worked on the Myrdal study and the RNC commissioned study. In these job experiences, he had to bring a variety of disciplinary research techniques and procedures to bear upon the problems of race relations in the nation and those confronting African American Republican and Democratic partisans. These job experiences offered Bunche a participant-

observer status in the nation at large as well as its political party system. In both areas, democratic processes simply failed to function for an entire segment of the population—and had been failing for quite some time. Bunche was faced with making the democratic process in America work for the excluded.

From 1941 to 1945, Bunche worked for various units and sections of the nation's foreign policy-making bureaucracy. In these different roles and functions, he was engaged in solving serious foreign affairs problems, especially those dealing with colonialism and burgeoning African nation states. These subjected people had to achieve self-determination, liberation, and freedom in a post-war world. In addition, these people of color had to acquire the resources with which to overcome the limiting and halting conditions under which they had endured for centuries.

Finally, Bunche ended up working for an international organization, the emerging United Nations. In this job, he saw both African and Middle Eastern problems that needed immediate solutions. Problems here surfaced in the social, political, economic, and health realms. Eventually, conflict and civil wars in these areas forced Bunche into a peacekeeping role. A testament to his effectiveness in the latter area can be seen in his winning the Nobel Peace Prize in 1950 for problem solving. Once again disciplinary knowledge of people, of conflict, and international paths to conflict resolution enabled him to work out acceptable, practical solutions. Using the United Nations to achieve peace, however, was a totally new learning reality.

Therefore, with these types of job experiences under his belt and in his mental makeup, Bunche had to, on each occasion, take theory and merge it with a practice that was as unique and likewise acceptable to the troubled societies, communities, and fledgling nation states in which Bunche found himself involved. In each and every experiential circumstance, he had to fashion out of his political science education—largely self-fashioned—an answer to a crippling anti-democratic reality and assist democracy to emerge and prevail.

Such an experiential career is vastly different from a pure academic one that provides an occasional foray into domestic and foreign matters. Bunche's path is first into an academic career and then into a career that is bureaucratic and organizational. Truly, each of these careers depends upon a political science education and experience. Political Science, unlike the disciplines of history, sociology, and anthropology, trained its students about politics, political behavior, political organization, law, political conflict, and constitutions. This is the main focus of the discipline and not cognate and/or adjacent areas. However, it was these experiential career roles that granted Bunche another dimensional view of his discipline of political science.

Therefore, in 1953 when Bunche was elected President of the APSA and by the time of his presidential address in 1954, he had crafted a *multidimensional* vision and perspective of the discipline. This type of vision enabled him to link the two areas of theory and practice and place the discipline into both an intellectual and problem-solving mode. He asserted this in his presidential address, and this separates him from his predecessors. He had by now a different political science discipline in mind. It was a discipline with programmatic features.

RALPH BUNCHE AND HIS AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION LEGACY: THE CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM

Unique to Bunche's presidency was that he created the APSA's Congressional Fellows Program that selected scholars from the academic and journalistic world and assigned them to different members of Congress, both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. Yet, assignments to members of Congress were not the only possibility. The selected individuals could also be assigned to work with standing congressional committees.

Additionally, Congressional Fellows were asked to rotate their assignments during the second semester of the legislative year. This meant that one could participate and observe members in the House of Representatives for one half of the year and then observe and participate in the Senate or with a standing committee for the other half of the year. Hence, a fellow could learn about both houses of Congress and some of its permanent standing committees. Such rotating assignments would provide both budding academicians and future journalists with a

comprehensive portrait of Congress—a portrait not based on theory, modeling, memoirs, and secondary data alone but in conjunction with actual experiences. This aspect of the program closely parallels the field studies of Bunche.

The fellows left the program with a real-life view and an insider's account of congressional behavior and representative government. From this group of participants have emerged vast publications in the form of books, book chapters, and journal articles and essays, as well as journalistic works and commentary. All the participants have a first-hand account of citizen legislators and the functioning of one of the three different branches of American government. Over the years, the APSA Congressional Fellows Program has expanded academic knowledge and led, in some circles, to some of the problem-solving in this branch of government. With this program, Bunche gave the APSA a different view of the discipline, combining theory and practice. Unfortunately, the discipline has paid little attention to it (Utter & Lockhart, 2002).

Currently, the APSA in cooperation with Duke University sponsors the Ralph Bunche Institute under the direction of Professor Paula McClain, which takes top minority college juniors from all over the country and trains them during a summer in the nature, scope, and significance of the discipline so as to encourage them to join the profession. This summer training is also provided to help them gain entrance into some of the top graduate schools in the country. This program is essentially a manpower program designed to increase the number of minority scholars in the profession. It has been immensely successful in getting more minority scholars in the leading departments in the discipline. Hopefully, as these young minority scholars emerge into the profession, some of them will address some of the problem areas that Bunche explored and directed the profession's attention toward.

In the final analysis, Bunche's major legacy lies in the rich benefit inherent in and flowing from the Congressional Fellows Program. Such a program readily exemplifies his innovative/creative/progressive vision and perspective on political science. The program connects the academic scholar to real world issues and problems and the attempts at problem solving that the legislative branch of government undertakes to make democracy a reality in the American political system. With this program the profession and the real world can effectively interact and engage with each other. It is through the Congressional Fellows Program, the APSA is performing its civic duty, thus achieving Bunche's multidimensional vision and perspective of the discipline.

RALPH BUNCHE'S CONCEPTUALIZATION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Drawing upon his bold, new, and imaginative intellectual categories and his experiential tasks, Bunche was able to see his profession from different angles and see that the discipline needed far more than empirical research and a set of new research guidelines. Grooming new scholars were vital to Bunche's educational philosophy and important to the future development of the discipline, but it was not sufficient. American Democracy was beset and plagued by a host of domestic and foreign problems that had to be solved. There was a need and role for the profession beyond the academy—the multidimensional facet of Bunche's vision.

But multidimensionality is just one of the cornerstones of Bunche's political science vision. Unlike Key who spent a career trying to reorient political scientists toward the adoption and effective use of methodological techniques, Bunche's programmatic approach sought to reorient political scientists toward a real world approach that combined theory and practice. Surprisingly, both approaches seek to retrain political scientists. And both approaches are still in existence today. Nevertheless, the methods and techniques approach posited by Key is the dominant one. The Congressional Fellows approach of Bunche's legacy is small and confined to those who have an interest or specialty in Congress. Because the larger potential of the program gets subsumed under the task of observing Congress, the discipline fails to see the program beyond the congressional task. However, the participant-observer component is only one aspect of Bunche's conceptualization.

Bunche's intellectual categories and experiential tasks formed for him a very strong belief and support of Democracy. Initially, Bunche was a Marxist with a belief in the communistic

system as a possible solution to the plight of the masses in America (Bunche, 1936a; Henry, 1995; Holloway, 2002; Kirby, 1980). Even the budding New Deal program of the early Roosevelt years did not shake or convince Bunche to give up his Marxist ideology. When World War II came with its Nazi and Italian dictatorships, along with the Stalin dictatorship in Russia, the human rights and economic problems under these systems served as a personal eye-opener that these systems left a great deal to be desired. Bunche came to the realization that the problems facing African Americans might not get a fair hearing and resolution after all given the racists orientations of these fascist and dictatorial systems. The communist system would be infinitely harder to change.

By the early 1940s, Bunche moved to embrace a Democratic system. Democratic institutions at the international level also became supportive and sponsored. The promise and prospect for positive and progressive change in this democratic system, as Bunche saw it, was rooted in the system's formative legal documents that respected human rights and offered a chance for self-determination, freedom, inclusion, and liberation. Democratic theory also held out for just such possibilities. Born from this set of concerns was a theoretical framework for Bunche's vision of the discipline.

For this political scientist, Bunche's work shifted theoretical perspectives. Democratic theory replaced Marxism and explained the relationship between the variables of humankind and its government better than the former. Theory had always underpinned Bunche's scholarship, but now Democratic theory became the strategic framework. Thus, in the midst of the behavioral revolution that placed quantitative analysis over theory and value neutrality over a systemic commitment (even when the system was democratic), Bunche made a commitment to the values and beliefs in democratic theory.

Many in his discipline during the Cold War committed themselves to a democratic system that was racially exclusive. They supported the American political system in the forties, fifties, sixties, and seventies despite its horrendous practice of segregation. Some supported the system because they believed in racial inferiority. Other claimed states rights and the fiscal burden that minorities placed upon the system. Bunche did not waver. His democratic theory and beliefs were clearly inclusive in both the domestic and foreign spheres. Specifically, he committed himself to the American system with all of its imperfections because of its promise and future possibilities. This meant that Bunche had to criticize weaknesses and limitations of African American leadership and some of their ideologies and programs, which ranged from African American nationalism to African American cultural approaches and programs.

Such criticisms, which he raised both before and after the onset of the sixties, came back in the late sixties to haunt him in the midst of the widespread Black Cultural Revolution. Sadly, many scholars have seized upon this conflict between Bunche and the African American leaders of the Cultural Revolution; focusing upon the verbal struggle and fireworks between the contending parties as if it meant something. Therefore, they missed the larger issue of his democratic theory. Here was a democratic theory that was inclusive and not one defined by the reactionary radicalism of the Cultural Revolution. As he had done in developing his democratic theory, Bunche worked against the reactionary White right and left to shape and structure his theory. As a result, in the sixties and early seventies, he was opposing and fending off those reactionaries on both the right and left.

Few members of his discipline had or faced this same ordeal. Surely, this type of reality did not haunt Key, but this haunting reality for Bunche ultimately enriched his theoretical perspective. This racial reality helped him to become a force in shaping and structuring his vision and perspective of political science. In the end, his disciplinary vision has (a) a democratic theoretical base, (b) a multidimensional focus, and (c) an intellectual categorical foundation. When these components of his educational philosophy are linked, one sees a different view of political science in striking contrast to the consensus-based unidimensional one. Yet, this difference comes at a great cost to Bunche in terms of the history and legacy of the discipline (Wilson, 1985).

RALPH BUNCHE AND POLITICAL SCIENCE: THE COST OF IMAGINATION, VISION, AND RACE

It is not that scholars and students of political science have not promoted the unidimensional vision over the multidimensional version that Bunche developed (Dawson, 2000; Farr, Dryzek, & Leonard, 1995; Somit & Tanenhaus, 1967). Rather, they have promoted the behavioral approach over the applied approach that Bunche stood for and which the Congressional Fellows Program implies. In general, scholars have accepted low-level and middle-level theory over an inclusive democratic theory. Bunche's contributions and pioneering vision are all but omitted from the books that analyze and evaluate the history and evolution of the discipline. Bunche is not seen as one of the preeminent and quintessential political science scholars of the discipline, despite the fact that his work was in the mainstream of the behavioral revolution even before it got underway, which set the criteria for laudatory assessments. Instead, Bunche has been relegated, if he is acknowledged at all, to little more than a competent political scientist who worked as Myrdal's assistant (Utter & Lockhart, 2002). The writers of the histories, biographies, and evaluations of the discipline might mention that Bunche is among a very few of the profession (i.e., President Woodrow Wilson and Henry Kissinger) to win a Nobel Peace Prize. By and large, Bunche's legacy has been reduced to passing comments or extemporaneous footnotes (Baer & Jewell, 1991, p. 83).

Numerous excuses will be offered for this limited appraisal of the man and his educational philosophy. Few have taken the time to measure his contributions or probe his works for the fresh, original, brilliant, and creative ideas and thoughts he has advanced. His concepts, frameworks, and theoretical and empirical models are all there. Most have stood the test of time (Walton, 1994).

The textual analysis of this study has finally generated the first composite portrait of his theory and drawn from it a new vision of the discipline of political science, another possible political science education. Then, there is the matter of peacemaking and peacekeeping that the Bunche educational philosophy makes clear for the profession. However, the Bunche example and achievement model is little known and understood. It remains in an unclear intellectual limbo. Thus, the crisis continues to rage.

In closing, there is one avenue of influence still in the offing. Today, many political science departments, along with the APSA, are helping to launch the subfield of African American Politics and/or Race and Politics. Bunche was clearly a founder of this intellectual genre and generated many of its intellectual concepts and theoretical foundations. It is just possible that Bunche's contributions will continue to emerge and build a legacy in the discipline equal to his vision and perspective. Bunche just might yet prevail.

REFERENCES

- Baer, M., Jewell, M., & Sigelman, L. (Eds.). (1991). *Political science in America: Oral histories of a discipline*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Bunche, R. (1928). The Negro in Chicago politics. *National Municipal Review*, 5, 20-23.
- Bunche, R. (1928). *The American city as a Negro political laboratory*. Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting, National Municipal League, Washington, DC.
- Bunche, R. (1936a). *A world view of race*. Washington, DC: Associates in Negro Folk Education.
- Bunche, R. (1936b). A critique of New Deal social planning as it affects Negroes. *Journal of Negro History*, 4, 308-320.
- Bunche, R. (1940). The role of the university in the political orientation of Negro youth. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 9, 571-579.
- Bunche, R. (1941a). The Negro in the political life of the United States. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 10, 567-584.
- Bunche, R. (1941b). Disfranchisement of the Negro. In S. Brown, A. Davis, & U. Lee (Eds.), *The Negro caravan* (pp. 48-59). New York: Dryden Press.
- Bunche, R. (1954). Presidential address. *American Political Science Review*, 48, 961-971.

- Dawson, M. (2000). Slowly coming to grips with the effects of the American racial order on American policy preferences. In D. Sears, J. Sidanius, & L. Bobo (Eds.), *Racialized politics: The debate about racism in America* (pp. 344-357). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dawson, M., & Wilson, E., III. (1991). Paradigms and paradoxes: Political science and the study of African American politics. In W. Crotty (Ed.), *Political science: Looking to the future, Vol. 1* (pp. 189-234). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Edgar, R. (Ed.). (1992). *An African American in South Africa: The travel notes of Ralph J. Bunche 28 September 1937-1 January 1938*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Farr, J., Dryzek, J., & Leonard, S. (Eds.). (1995). *Political science in history: Research programs and political traditions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grantham, D. (Ed.). (1973). *The political statuses of the Negro in the age of FDR*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heard, A. (1977). Introduction to the New Edition. In V. O. Key, Jr. (Ed.), *Southern politics in state and nation: A new edition* (pp. xxi-xxv). Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Henry, C. (Ed.). (1995). *Ralph J. Bunche: Selected speeches & writings*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Holloway, J. (2002). *Confronting the veil: Abram Harris, Jr., E. Franklin Frazier, and Ralph Bunche, 1919-1941*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Jeffries, J. (2002). *Huey P. Newton: The radical theorist*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.
- Key, Jr., V. O. (1940). The lack of budgetary theory. *American Political Science Review*, 34, 1137-1144.
- Key, Jr., V. O. (1942). *Politics, parties and pressure groups*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Key, Jr., V. O. (1958). The state of the discipline. *American Political Science Review*, 52, 961-971.
- Kirby, J. (1980). *Black Americans in the Roosevelt era: Liberalism and race*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Lucker, A., & Key, Jr., V. O. (2001). *The quintessential political scientist*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Prestage, J. (1969). Report of the conference on political science curriculum at predominantly Black institutions. *P.S.: Political Science and Politics*, 322-336.
- Reed, Jr., A. (2001). *W.E.B. DuBois and American political: Thought fabianism and the color line*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sabine, G. (1973). *A history of political theory* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Somit, A., & Tanenhaus, J. (1964). *American political science: A profile of the discipline*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Somit, A., & Tanenhaus, J. (1967). *The development of political science*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Urquhart, B. (1993). *Ralph Bunche: An American life*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Utter, G., & Lockhart, C. (2002). *American political scientists: A dictionary*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Walton, Jr., H. (1968). African and Afro-American courses in Negro colleges. *Quarterly Review of Higher Education Among Negroes*, 36, 185-193.
- Walton, Jr., H. (1971). *The political philosophy of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Greenwood.
- Walton, Jr., H. (1990). Black presidential participation and the critical election theory. In L. Morris (Ed.), *The social and political implication of the 1984 Jesse Jackson presidential campaign* (pp. 49-64). New York: Praeger.
- Walton, Jr., H. (1994). Black southern politics: The influences of Bunche, Martin, and Key. In H. Walton, Jr., (Ed.), *Black politics and Black political behavior: A linkage analysis* (pp. 19-38). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Walton, Jr., H. (1994). Review of Ralph Bunche: The man and his times. *National Political Science Review*, 4, 318-319.

- Walton, Jr., H. (1995). *Black women at the United Nations: The politics, a theoretical model and documents*. California: Borgo Press.
- Walton, Jr., H., Miller, C., & McCormick II, J. P. (1995). Race and political science: The dual traditions of race relations politics and African American politics. In J. Farr, J. Dryzek, & S. Leonard (Eds.), *Political science in history: Research programs and political traditions* (pp. 145-174). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, E. J. (1985). Why political scientists don't study Black politics, but historians and sociologists do. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 600-607.

AUTHOR

HANES WALTON, JR. is professor of political science at the University of Michigan. His interests include American politics, race and politics, parties and elections, state and local government, and the presidency.