IN MEMORIAM

LOUIS J. CANTORI

Louis J. Cantori, emeritus professor of political science at the University of Maryland Baltimore County, died on May 12, 2008, of heart failure resulting from amyloidosis, a rare condition in which proteins abnormally accumulate in vital organs. Lou had been a member of the UMBC political science department for 33 of the 42 years it has been in existence, and his retirement three years ago left a big gap in our department's life—we have sorely missed his enthusiasm, energy, good cheer, and hearty laugh.

While Lou's area of expertise was Middle Eastern politics and Islamic thought, he was broadly trained in the general field of comparative politics, and over his career he became increasingly interested in the discipline of political science as a whole and in its philosophical and historical foundations. His wide-ranging intellectual and scholarly interests gave a distinctive unity to his research, teaching, and service to the department, UMBC, profession, and community.

Lou was born and raised in Haverhill, Massachusetts. He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1951 and rose to the rank of sergeant. In 1954, he married Barbara Joan Nye and together they raised three children, Greg, Eric, and Nadia. Lou earned his bachelors degree in international relations from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in 1961 and then went on to graduate work at of the University of Chicago, where he earned a masters degree in political science in 1962 and his doctorate in political science in 1966. In 1963–64, Lou traveled to Egypt for the first time where he studies Islamic philosophy at Al-Azhar University in Cairo and did extensive field research for his dissertation on political parties in Egypt and Morocco. Having become fluent in Arabic, he returned to the Middle East many dozens of times over the next 45 years. Lou began his professorial career in 1966 when he joined the political science department at the University of California at Los Angeles, where he published his first book, *The International Politics of Regions: A Comparative Approach*, coauthored with his UCLA colleague Steven Spiegal. Lou joined the UMBC political science department as an associate professor in 1972, served as department chair from 1979 to 1985, was promoted to full professor in 1987, and retired with emeritus status in 2005.

Both the department and UMBC as a whole were undergoing rapid change at the time Lou arrived at UMBC. A new campus leadership had just replaced UMBC's founding leaders (the campus opened in 1966) and its mission became more focused on research and graduate education. A new graduate program in public policy was established separate from the political science department, which to this day remains a strictly undergraduate department. The department's faculty complement increased from four to 12 in just two years, and for the first time included members with rank higher than assistant professor. These changes engendered a fair amount of conflict, and both the department and the campus as a whole experienced some troubled times during the 1970s.

When Lou was elected department chair in 1979, the department was somewhat factionalized. It had suffered from instability in leadership for several years, the number of majors was modest and not increasing, the size of the faculty was significantly smaller than in the mid-1970s, and the curriculum had not been revised for many years. But by the time Lou stepped down as chair 1985, the department was characterized by a remarkable spirit of cooperation and collegiality that it retains to this day, the number of majors had nearly doubled, the faculty complement had increased from 10 to 13, and there had been major innovations in our program. We all greatly appreciated the change for the better—and no one more than me as the incoming chair.

This progress reflected not only Lou's consultative, consensus-building style of leadership but also the fact that this leadership style was put at the service of a clear vision as to where the department should be going, coupled with great energy in assembling the resources and personnel to bring this vision into effect. Under Lou's leadership, we developed (and still offer) a number of professionally oriented minor and certificate programs open to both majors and non-majors, which offer a significant array of career and/or graduate school oriented curriculum options to UMBC students, but only as a supplement to a (political science or other) liberal arts major. Harold Levy, another of our emeritus professors, recalls that, "ever the true scholar, Lou intensively studied the department very closely, in order to develop his clear vision. I personally recall his several in-depth discussions with me about the pre-law program, as part of his much broader effort to re-conceptualize the department, and to define his practical agenda, in order to nourish the most promising directions in which the department should move. I can see him as I write this, clenching his eyebrows as he earnestly asked me: 'what support do you need, Hal, for the pre-law program?' "

Lou also contributed in important ways to broader campus governance. Before becoming department chair, Lou was elected to, and subsequently became chair of, the Faculty Affairs Committee. Under his leadership, the committee designed a new set of campus promotion and tenure procedures necessitated by a change in academic organization in the late 1970s. With relatively minor revisions, these procedures remain in effect today. Second, Lou was elected to a newly formed Academic Planning and Budget Committee, which quickly became the most important and hardest working faculty committee on campus. He was an especially active member of the committee and in due course became its chair. Third, throughout this period, Lou was one of a relative handful of senior faculty members to assume an active and sustained role in advancing the interests of UMBC within the larger political system, particularly in the dark days of the mid-to-late 1970s, when there was talk of merging UMBC with another institution or even shutting it down and turning the campus into an industrial park.

More recently, Lou served for many years as faculty advisor for the UMBC Crew Club. Such a role could have been merely nominal, but for Lou it certainly was not. He played a major role in getting the program started and helped to foster it thereafter. He regularly attended practice sessions that began at 5 a.m. and traveled

doi:10.1017/S1049096509090349

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the team to their many (and successful) competitions to cheer them on. In the words of former crew coach Jim MacAlister: "Lou's Retriever howl at Regattas reminded all of us rowing that there was a guy on the shore who really believed in us." And in the words of the present coach (and former rower) Renee Foard: "Lou was the founder, heart, and soul of UMBC's rowing program. Lou opened a world of opportunity for many students who accepted the challenge to be on the crew. Then he challenged us again to exceed beyond what even we could realize. It is for this that Lou's legacy will always live on at 5 a.m. with UMBC's Crew Club."

Over his decades at UMBC, Lou made a special mark in mentoring students. I know that there are many more "Cantori students" out in the world today than I or, I would guess, any of my colleagues can claim. One such "Cantori student," David Lesch recalls: "There I was, sitting with some trepidation in the first Middle East course of my life when a slightly gruff-looking professor with longish hair, wearing faded blue jeans and a button-down white short-sleeve shirt walked into the room. Little did I know that this was the moment when my life would change forever." David today is professor of Middle East history at Trinity University in San Antonio. Another former student, Loren Siebert, "fondly recalls how much of a guiding light Lou was for me when I was an undergraduate at UMBC, helping me find my voice while writing my essays for the Marshall/Rhodes/Fulbright scholarships. Only now, years later and with teaching experience of my own under my belt, do I fully realize how much of his scarce time was invested into me during the summer between my junior and senior years." Loren won the Marshall Scholarship (UMBC's first), studied computer science at the University of Manchester, and has recently won recognition for developing computer software used in many universities to support instruction in the Arabic language.

For many years, Lou taught sections of Introduction of Politics, which was then one of our two introductory courses (along with American Government). Its purpose was to serve as a gateway to the discipline for prospective majors and as a general education course for non-majors. It was one of most the difficult courses in the political science program to teach, since there is no standard model to follow. Lou's approach was to introduce students not only to the recognized subfields of political science but also to the history and evolution of the discipline as whole (concerning which most professional political scientists—let alone students—remain woefully ignorant). His introductory course was also notable for the high expectations he had of his students and the high demands he put on them. As chair, I once asked him whether he might again teach an honors section of the course; he did not decline but observed that "all my sections are honors sections."

Throughout his UMBC career, Lou taught our Comparative Politics course on a regular basis. There is a clearer standard model here, and Lou's course certainly covered the standard points. At the same time (and typically), Lou put his own distinctive stamp on it. As a broad-gauged comparative political scientist, Lou was not content to remain confined within what he viewed as the established behavioral/pluralist paradigm for analyzing political systems, which was constructed primarily for analyzing politics in advanced industrial societies, and which in many ways simply ignored the concepts and insights of earlier and non-American political science. Drawing on his familiarity with and interest in the philosophical and historical foundations of political science fostered by his University of Chicago graduate education, Lou argued that conservative corporatism has a paradigmatic character similar to pluralism (and Marxism) and that, in particular, this alternative paradigm provides the theoretical key for better understanding of political processes in many developing countries, especially those in the Middle East. In his comparative politics course, Lou introduced students to the corporatist, pluralist, and Marxist modes of analysis. Lou substantially elaborated these ideas, first worked out his teaching, in the selections, organization, and substantial editorial commentary for his co-edited (with Andrew Ziegler) book *Comparative Politics in the Post-Behavioral Era*.

Harold Levy, who knew Lou going back to their graduate school days at Chicago, recalls that, "while still a graduate student, Lou had already demonstrated his special gifts for rhetorical sharpness and verve, in criticizing the then prevailing liberal comparative politics literature, and in praising the older conservative philosophic exponents of what social scientists later called 'corporatism.' For Lou, both the conservatives, and Marx, were worthy critics of the great price that the world was paying for the worst of modernity. But Marx was utterly, destructively impractical; whereas the conservatives foresaw the enduring importance of community, traditional morality, etc. I can hear him as I write this, excitedly explaining the European conservatives!" Augustus Richard Norton of Boston University likewise recalls that "Lou was always skeptical of secular-liberal assumptions about the Middle East. Instead, he could often be heard talking about the relevance of corporatism in the region. He was particularly attracted to the conservatism of thinkers like Karl Mannheim. I think I heard him quote Mannheim a hundred times." Harold Levy further recalls "department meetings (yes, department meetings!) in which he announced with enthusiasm, with his pointed index finger in the air, and with a knowing twinkle in his eye, that religion is 'an independent variable.'" Unsurprisingly, Lou was one of the leaders of the "perestroika" movement in political science.

In addition to the two books already mentioned, Lou published an earlier comparative politics reader, co-edited (with Iliya Harik) the book *Local Politics and Development in the Middle East*, and at the time of his death was completing the book *Statism and the Emergence of the Middle Eastern State*. He also published some 50 articles in scholarly and professional journals based in the U.S., Europe, and the Middle East.

Lou had an extensive professional life beyond UMBC. For many years he was an adjunct professor at the Georgetown University Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, and at various times he held adjunct or visiting positions at the University of Pennsylvania, American University, American University in Cairo, the Graduate School of Islamic and Social Sciences, and elsewhere. Taking great pride in his affiliation with the Marine Corps and admiring the customs and traditions of the military, he at various times also held visiting positions at all three U.S. service academies and, during the last decade of his life, he was an adjunct professor in the Command and Staff College of the Marine Corps University at Quantico, Virginia (where, recalls Richard Norton, "he savored the idea of Sergeant Cantori lecturing to large audiences of bright field grade officers from the Corps"). Though he was often highly critical of U.S. foreign policy and always spoke his mind, he was frequently invited to give lectures at the Foreign Service Institute of the U.S. State Department.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Richard Norton recalls "sitting with Lou and a group of other friends at the 1984 meeting of the Middle East Studies Association in San Francisco. In those days, there was little on the main program of APSA dealing with the Middle East … Those of us chatting—I recall Jerrold Green and Robert Bianchi, and one or two others—were all comparativists trained at Chicago. We were all Middle East hands, with plenty of field-time in the Middle East between us. We decided to launch an affiliated organization, the Conference Group on the Middle East, and for nearly a quarter century the group has met in conjunction with the annual APSA meeting. We were intent to avoid too formal a structure, but Lou emerged as the leader of the Conference Group and he devoted untold hours to organizing the annual program … The annual sessions were organized under a thematic rubric. Papers from the Conference Group were published in a variety of journals, usually under Lou's editorship. The journals included: *PS*, *Middle East Policy*, *Conflict*, and the *Arab Studies Quarterly*. The themes covered included women in Middle East politics, political reform, the domestic determinants of foreign policy, U.S. policy in the Middle East, as well as theoretic approaches to understanding Middle Eastern politics."

In addition to the Conference Group on the Middle East, Lou played an active leadership or advisory role in many scholarly and related groups, including the Middle East Studies Association, the American Council for the Study of Islamic Studies (founding member, vice president, and president), the American Arab Affairs Council (Advisory Committee), the International Institute of Islamic Thought, the Association of Muslim Social Scientists (Board of Directors), the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy, and the Circle of Tradition and Progress (Steering Committee).

Politics in the Middle East is riven by enduring conflicts, and the study of Middle East politics is likewise riven by passionate arguments. Lou did not avoid these (or any other) arguments, to say the least. David Lesch recalls that, "while consistently presenting all sides of an argument, Lou would never shy away from expressing his own opinion on controversial subjects. Because of this, he was, typically in our profession, branded pro-this or anti-that. But one of the many things I learned from Lou was how important it is to listen. I witnessed on numerous occasions Lou listening intently to counter-arguments—and respecting them. He never dismissed opposing viewpoints." In the same vein, Robert O. Freedman of Baltimore Hebrew University (and a UMBC adjunct professor) observes that "while Lou and I differed on several subjects, including the Arab-Israeli conflict and the U.S. interventions in Iraq in 1990–91 and 2003, Lou was never disagreeable when we disagreed. Indeed, Lou sought to make our debates into educational experiences for our students, and after our formal debates he always wanted to discuss the educational experience which the students received from listening to our differing perspectives." And Robert Bianchi of Johns Hopkins and Nanjing Universities recalls that "I had more arguments with Lou Cantori than with anyone I've ever known. Lou loved to argue, particularly with me. He was a gadfly's gadfly. Our arguments were never brief. Most lasted hours, some went on for years. He knew me so well that eventually he sensed when I was really putting up a fight and when I was just teasing him—even if I wasn't sure myself."

But, Bianchi adds: "there were times when we agreed. A few years ago we were invited to speak at the National Defense University where we blasted Bush's Iraq war before the increasingly disgruntled young officers who had to fight it. Afterwards, honorary medals in hand, we strolled down a long corridor toward the exit. Lou was hurting badly and had to stop for a dose of painkillers. As he fumbled with the meds, I noticed that we were standing smack in front of three huge beaming photos of the president, the vice-president, and the defense secretary. 'Hey, Lou,' I said, 'It's your buddies.' Stretching to his full ex-Marine height and shaking the medal in his fist, he looked me straight in the eye and growled, 'They're all war criminals.' Patting his shoulder, I whispered, 'Now you see why I love you?' Arm in arm we continued on our way, Lou's booming laughter echoing through the sacred hallways." As Richard Norton observes: "Anyone who knew Lou will always remember his hearty, endearing, generous laugh. That laugh came from some special place deep inside him; it was his fingerprint."

Charles Butterworth of the University of Maryland College Park first met Lou Cantori when both were beginning their graduate studies at Chicago, and they remained colleagues and friends for the following 45 years. I will let him make the concluding remarks: "Examples of Lou's devotion to abiding principles are abundant, but one is preeminent for me. My younger brother, who spent the summer of 1963 with me and whom Lou had met occasionally at that time, went to Vietnam as a U.S. Marine. In 1967, he was killed in battle. Lou's compassion at that news touched me deeply. Even more, did his dedication of a book to the memory of my brother—a gesture of friendship as much as a tribute to the spirit of the Marine Corps. That, along with so many other similar human gestures, comes to the fore whenever I think of Lou. He was a man as big as life itself in spirit, abundant in laughter, ever ready to question and query, but, above all, devoted to serving the well being of others be they students, friends, or simply fellow human beings. May his big soul rest in peace and continue to inspire us all to reach for the same goals."

Nicholas R. Miller
University of Maryland Baltimore County

JOHN WILLIAM CHAPMAN III

Professor John William Chapman III died on August 7, 2008, in North Bethesda, Maryland. He was born on January 7, 1923, in Providence, Rhode Island; he was awarded a four-year scholarship by Swarthmore College, from which he graduated in 1943. After his World War II Air Force service in Japan, he received a Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1956. Columbia published his dissertation *Rousseau: Authoritarian or Liberal*; this earned him a fellowship to Oxford from the Social Science Research Council. In 1963–64, Chapman taught American Political Thought and Institutions at the University of Bombay; he retained a life-long interest in India and its culture. After 30 years in the political science department at the University of Pittsburgh, he retired in 1992. Chapman also spent 26 years in the U.S. Air Force. He was a navigator in the Fifth Air Force Bomber Command and was awarded the Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster for action against Japan. In his later years, he became an intelligence officer and published on American strategic and political thinking. He retired as lieutenant-colonel.

John W. Chapman was a founding member of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy, and had a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

profound influence on American political theory for almost 30 years through his co-editing of the *NOMOS* yearbook, primarily with J. Roland Pennock. For many years *NOMOS* was the main forum for analytical political philosophy, stressing analytic rigor, conceptual analysis, and the overlapping and complimentary approaches of political scientists, philosophers, and legal theorists. For over a generation all of the very best political theorists published in *NOMOS*.

John Chapman did not consider himself a philosophical innovator, but, as he termed it, "a mechanic," whose supreme ambition was to get at the truth about things political, and in particular, the way that political thought melds metaphysical, psychological, moral, and economic ideas. In his work, Chapman demonstrated a remarkable versatility. Graduate students in his weekly seminar discovered that, in his eyes, learning about political theory meant cognizance of the latest work in philosophy, political science, history, economics, sociology, and anthropology. Especially important in Chapman's own work were the psychological and economic dynamics of free societies. His intellectual life was informed by the quest to discover why some political cultures, but not others, were founded on the values of individuality and freedom. This quest by no means ended at his retirement: up until his final illness he continued to consume—at amazing pace—the latest works in philosophy, history, and the social sciences while traveling and studying the world's cultures with his wife of 65 years, Janet Goodrich Chapman, formerly professor of economics at the University of Pittsburgh.

Moral integrity and devotion to the truth informed his life. Among his enduring legacies are the generations of students to whom he has conveyed these values.

John Chapman
Gerald Gaus
University of Arizona

ARTHUR H. MILLER

Arthur Miller was born April 24, 1942, in Little Falls, MN. He died in Iowa City, IA, on August 19, 2008. Arthur received a BA from the University of Minnesota in 1965 and a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan (UM) in 1971.

Arthur Miller took a position as assistant professor at Ohio State University (1971–73). While on leave from Ohio State University (OSU), he served as study director at the Center for Political Studies (CPS) at the UM. After leaving OSU, he continued as study director (1973–76) of the national election series while also serving as a lecturer (1974–76) at UM. He was associate professor of political science and senior study director at CPS and the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan from 1976 to 1984. During this period, he was also a research scholar at the University of Goteborg in Sweden (1980) and as a visiting professor at the University of Chicago (1984–85).

Arthur Miller joined the political science department at the University of Iowa (UI) in 1985. As a full professor at UI, he served as director of the Laboratory for Political Research (renamed to the University of Iowa Social Science Institute) from 1986 to 2001 and director of the University of Iowa International Evaluation Project (2001–07).

Some of Arthur Miller's more influential sole-authored publications in the *American Political Science Review* include "Commentary on Political Issues and Trust in Government" (2006); "Where is the Schema? Critique" (1991); "Rejoinder to 'Comment' by Jack Citrin: Political Discontent or Ritualism" (1974); and "Political Issues and Trust in Government: 1964–1970" (1974).

His co-authored publications in the *American Political Science Review* include "Understanding Political Change in Post-Soviet Societies" (with W. Reisinger and V. Hesli, 1996); "Reassessing Mass Support for Political and Economic Change in the Former USSR" (with Hesli and Reisinger, 1994); "Schematic Assessments of Presidential Candidates" (with M. P. Wattenberg and O. Malanchuk, 1986); "Throwing the Rascals Out: Policy and Performance Evaluations of Presidential Candidates, 1952–1980" (with Wattenberg, 1985); "Type-Set Politics: Impact of Newspapers on Public Confidence" (with L. Erbring and E. Goldenberg; 1979); "Ideology in the 1972 Election: Myth or Reality—A Rejoiner" (with W. E. Miller, 1976); "A Majority Party in Disarray: Policy and Polarization in the 1972 Election" (with Miller, A. Raine, and T. Brown, 1976); and "Mobilization of Liberal Strength in the House, 1955–1970: A Look at the Democratic Study Group" (with A. G. Stevens and T. Mann, 1974).

His co-authored articles in the *Journal of Politics* are "Emerging Party Systems in Post-Soviet Societies: Fact or Fiction?" (with G. Erb, Reisinger and Hesli, 2000); "Public Behavior and Political Change in Post-Soviet States" (with Reisinger and Hesli, 1995); and "A Reference Group Theory of Partisan Coalitions" (with C. Wlezien and A. Hildreth, 1991).

For the *American Journal of Political Science*, Arthur wrote "Normal Vote Analysis: Sensitivity to Change Over Time" (May 1979). His co-authored articles published in the *American Journal of Politics* include "The Development of Party Identification in Post-Soviet Societies" (with T. Klobucar 2000); "Measuring Party Identification: Independent or No Partisan Preference?" (with Wattenberg, 1983); "Group Consciousness and Political Participation" (with P. Gurin, G. Gurin, and Malanchuk, 1981); and "Front-Page News and Real-World Cues: Another Look at Agenda-Setting by the Media" (with L. Erbring and E. Goldenberg, 1980).

Arthur Miller's other co-authored and single-authored articles appeared in numerous other American politics and area studies journals. He co-edited three books: *Presidential Campaigns and American Self Images* (with B. Gronbeck, 1994); *Public Opinion and Regime Change: The New Politics of Post-Soviet Societies* (with Reisinger and Hesli, 1993); and *American Politics in the Heartland* (with D. Madsen and J. Stimson, 1990). He co-authored *American Political Trends: The National Election Studies Data Sourcebook, 1952–1978* (with Miller and E. Schneider, 1980).

Arthur Miller had a special talent for recognizing an area of work just as it was ready to take off. For example, his 1974 *American Political Science Review* article on political trust caught the decline in political trust before other researchers did. During the 1970s, as study director for the American National Election Studies (ANES) presidential election surveys, he took the lead in writing the journal articles on losses of the Democratic Party in 1972 and its ascension to power in 1976. His 1981 *American Journal of Political Science* article on group consciousness and voting, the 1985 *APSR* article on retrospective voting, and the 1986 *APSR* article on schemas for assessing presidential candidates likewise helped set the research agenda on those topics.

Arthur's early work on political trust remains his most cited and most influential work. He demonstrated that the decline in trust resulted from dissatisfaction with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the policy alternatives offered by the parties on major problems facing the nation. Challenged by Jack Citrin (*APSR*, 1974), who argued that trust is related to support for the incumbent administration and would naturally bounce back up with the election of a new administration, Miller correctly recognized that the decline in political trust was a long-term phenomenon that would not be so easily cured. His view was that replacing political leaders without corresponding improvement in government performance only further weakens political trust, a prophecy that unfortunately fits the politics of the subsequent three decades all too well.

His application of political psychology to the study of presidential candidates remains essential to our understanding of the candidate factor in U.S. elections. The *APSR* article with Martin Wattenberg and Oksana Malanchuk carefully analyzed the open-ended survey comments about presidential nominees, finding they were predominately performance-based comments on the candidates' competence, integrity, and reliability. The differences between respondents in their evaluations reflected individual differences in their cognitive schema. These results made him regard voting on the basis of candidate orientation to be fully as rational as voting on the basis of issues, as they indicate how the candidate would conduct governmental affairs.

His *AJPS* article with Patricia and Gerald Gurin and Oksana Malanchuk is a foundational article regarding the impact of social groups on voting. The authors break down the group consciousness concept into four constituent components and demonstrate that these factors have interactive effects rather than linear effects on both voting turnout and non-electoral political participation. Identification with a group is not sufficient to have political effects, without feelings of power deprivation, relative dislike for the outgroup, and/or belief that social barriers explain the group's disadvantaged position.

These pieces represent only a few of his important contributions to the research literature on American political behavior. Noteworthy is that these articles are among the most frequently cited by other scholars in political science. At the time of his death, he was among the 100 most-cited political scientists in the world.

Notable is that his articles on American politics led to equally important contributions to understanding political behavior in countries in Western and Eastern Europe. Although Arthur's early work focused primarily on American politics, over time he became a comparative politics specialist as well. An example of his international influence and involvement is his work in Norway. Arthur first visited the University of Trondheim as a Fulbright Research Scholar in 1983–84, and he returned as a visiting scholar for many summers and shorter periods in the following years. At Trondheim he continued his research on trust in government, comparing survey data from the national election studies in Norway and Sweden with the ANES series from the United States. With Norwegian co-authors he published a number of comparative journal articles and book chapters on trust and on topics such as the gender gap in voting, economic voting, and cross-national variations in support for tax evasion.

As another example of Arthur's work as a comparativist, in the 1990s he began working in the countries of the former Soviet Union. Working with William Reisinger and Vicki Hesli, he generated and analyzed survey data from Russia, Lithuania, and Ukraine. These analyses, published in the *APSR* as well as several other journals, were broadly influential, in particular for the evidence they provided of these publics' attitudes toward the democratization process and identification with emerging political parties. This research was funded repeatedly by the National Science Foundation.

In addition to his research and writing, Arthur contributed to the institutional development of the universities where he worked. At the University of Trondheim, Arthur's impact on faculty and students was important in developing the foundation for the political science program. The political behavior specialization and the rigorous teaching program in statistical methods are aspects of the political science program at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU—the University of Trondheim's name as of 1996) that are Arthur Miller's legacy. For his impact on the field of political behavior and comparative politics and his contributions to research cooperation with Norway he was elected in 1999 as the first foreign political scientist to the Royal Norwegian Society of Sciences and Letters.

As director of the Iowa Social Science Institute, Arthur promoted the reputation of the University of Iowa through the organization of the Heartland Polls. Indeed, a common strand that binds the American and the comparative scholarship is the use of public opinion polling. If needed data were not available, he would get it. He had tremendous knowledge of and experience in conducting a high-quality scientific survey: from writing good questions, to selecting the sample, to analyzing the answers. He often accompanied interviewers for in-the-field training to understand what lay behind the answers collected.

Where ever he worked, Arthur made many friends—in the university as well as in the surrounding community. Arthur's large contingent of friends in Trondheim remembers his kindness, generosity, and loyalty. Those who worked with him on research remember his unlimited energy and excitement in doing statistical analysis during long hours on weekdays and weekends. He was always in good spirits and was generous with his advice and time.

His colleagues and his students at the University of Iowa are deeply aware of how tremendously their own careers benefitted from working with him. As a mentor to junior colleagues, he was charitable with both his time and expertise. He was notable for giving graduate and undergraduate students the chance to do professional-level research. He frequently co-authored articles with his students, and many of them went on to become professors of political science themselves.

Exemplary of the high regard and the sincere friendship among Arthur's students are the following comments:

- "Professor Miller was one of my favorite professors at the U of I . . . His enthusiasm and intelligence made him a brilliant professor."
- "I waited three years to enroll in Professor Miller's brilliantly fulfilling and always popular public opinion class. To date, I have the best memories of our class' positive energy, excitement and interest to debate current events with him."
- "I was very thankful to have the opportunity to have Arthur as a professor . . . I will remember his smile and laugh that he brought to the classroom every day."
- "Arthur Miller . . . was very caring and compassionate. He had a smile and laughter that lit up the room, where you couldn't help but laugh along."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- "Arthur was one of my favorite professors. He was a wonderful mentor and good friend. I will always remember his endless energy and contagious laugh."

Arthur H Miller is survived by his wife, Natasha Ivanova of Iowa City; four children, Bret Miller of Michigan, Maija Rowland of Michigan, Marcus Miller of Iowa, and Lucas Miller of Iowa; six siblings, Maryann McDougal, Robert Miller, Jr., and Ronald Miller, all of Minnesota, James Miller of Missouri, Joel Miller of Arizona, and David Miller of North Carolina; and a grandson, Randy Corey.

Vicki Hesli
University of Iowa
William Reisinger
University of Iowa
Ola Listhaug
The Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim
Herbert Weisberg
Ohio State University
Christopher Wlezien
Temple University

JULIUS PAUL

Dr. Julius Paul, emeritus professor of political science at the State University of New York at Fredonia, passed away September 26, 2008. Dr. Paul received his Ph.D. in political science from Ohio State University in 1954. He completed the BA in political science from the University of Minnesota in 1947. Prof. Paul completed additional graduate study at the University of Hawaii, Harvard University, and the University of Denver Russian Institute.

Dr. Paul served on the faculty at SUNY Fredonia from 1970 to 1992, teaching courses in public law and jurisprudence, medical ethics, and science and public policy, as well as American political thought. He held faculty posts at Kenyon College, Southern Illinois University, and Wayne State University before coming to SUNY Fredonia. Prior to joining Fredonia's faculty in 1970, he was a research political scientist at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research where he pursued research in medical ethics.

His early work was devoted to an examination of American legal realism, particularly the work of Jerome Frank and its contribution to contemporary American jurisprudence. His book *The Legal Realism of Jerome N. Frank: A Study of Fact-Skepticism and the Judicial Process* was published in 1959. Prof. Paul was widely known for his seminal research in eugenics, begun in 1959 and completed in the early 1970s. This research provided the most comprehensive data on the subject available, offering insight into the flawed public policies allowing state-sanctioned sterilizations. Eugenics scholars continue to use his data. Some states have only recently publicly apologized for their past policies. In 1972–73, he was the first faculty member at SUNY Fredonia to receive a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, for "Bodily Privacy and Public Policy: Consent and the Problem of Personal Freedom." On this and other ethical matters, Dr. Paul was published in numerous journals including *U.S. Medicine*, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *Law & Society Review*, *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *West Virginia Law Review*, *Dickinson Law Review*, and the *Vanderbilt Law Review*.

He served as a consultant to the Institute of Law, Psychiatry and Criminology, the George Washington University National Law Center; the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; the National Science Foundation, Office of Intergovernmental Science Programs; the Southern Poverty Law Center; U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Institutions and Facilities; the American Civil Liberties Union, Women's Rights Project; and the National Rights Welfare Organization.

Julius's commitment to human rights extended beyond the classroom, publications, and committee work. He was a civil rights activist in the early 1950s working to desegregate diners and bars in Columbus, Ohio. He was a staunch opponent of the Vietnam War and a frequent participant in local peace vigils and teach-ins. Julius was a lifelong advocate for individuals with mental illness. In recognition of this commitment, he was given a gubernatorial appointment to the Board of Visitors of the Gowanda Psychiatric Center in western New York.

He was an active Democrat his entire life, participating in presidential campaigns and locally in the Fredonia-Pomfret Democratic Committee. Julius loved living in Fredonia and embraced its many academic and cultural offerings. He was a 20-year member of the Festival Chorus, sang with the Catch Club, was active in program planning for the Adams Art Gallery, participated in local Holocaust memorial services, and was a member of the Unitarian church.

Julius met his adored wife, Laura Rankin Paul, while they were both attending Ohio State University. A sports fanatic, he proposed to her in the middle of a double header at Yankee Stadium (though his heart labored for the Cleveland Indians). They were married in Columbus, Ohio, in 1952. A lifelong Ohio State Buckeye fan, he was also an avid Buffalo Bills, Sabres, and Mount Union fan. He is survived by his wife Laura; his sons Derrick, Aaron, and Brian; his daughters Sara and Allegra; grandsons Jesse, Noah, Miles, and Jacob; his brother Louis of Beverly Hills, CA; and numerous nieces and nephews.

We remember Julius as a man of great compassion and integrity. A former student said this of him on the occasion of his retirement in 1992: "I revere Julius Paul," she said, "because he is a friend to my mind." Julius was this to all who knew him. He began his teaching career when Sen. Joseph McCarthy was conducting his shameful hearings into alleged Communist infiltration of the American government. McCarthy's assault upon civil liberties and the Constitution deeply influenced his teaching and research throughout his career. Julius was ever mindful of the excesses of government that endanger our civil liberties. For this he earned the deep respect and affection of his many students, colleagues, and friends over the years. Julius was a kind man. His friends will recall his booming voice. Certainly his students will. That voice was never raised in anger at any person, but it surely was over injustice and indifference.

He was a man of ideas, and books. All those books! Stuffed with his books, his office provided room for himself, a telephone (on some books), and one student of modest proportions. Some of us borrowed books and never returned them. To his colleagues, particularly his younger colleagues, he was generous with his time and praise (and his books). He was a friendly critic, never harsh. He shared his mind and his heart freely with all who knew him. He laughed when he should. He loved all the right things.

James R. Hurtgen
Distinguished Teaching Professor, State University of New York at Fredonia

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MARSHA PRIPSTEIN POSUSNEY

On August 22, 2008, our profession lost one of its staunchest advocates for equality when Marsha Pripstein Posusney lost her battle with ovarian cancer. Far beyond the scope of academia, we lost a special friend who never stopped working to improve the lives of others, even as it became clear that she would not live long enough to see the lasting impact of her efforts.

Marsha often said, chuckling at the irony, that working in an interdisciplinary department at Bryant University made her appreciate the discipline of political science. That led her to active involvement in the "perestroika" movement to reform the American Political Science Association. As a member of the APSA Council from 2002 to 2004, Marsha especially sought to raise awareness of the distinctive challenges facing scholars at teaching-oriented institutions. An award-winning scholar, she knew well from her own experiences that competing demands can make a research agenda difficult to maintain and that most colleagues did not have the opportunities available through her adjunct research professorship at Brown University's Watson Institute. Never satisfied with her own achievements or benefits, she hoped that APSA would continue to take into account this constituency. Her contributions to the council included leadership of a task force examining the situation of faculty in BA- and MA-granting departments. Yet participating within APSA did not alter her fundamental support for competitive elections to the council, and she published her reasons in "Democracy vs Diversity: A False Dichotomy," a chapter in *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science* (Yale, 2005).

After her term on the APSA Council, Marsha served on the APSA Committee for Professional Ethics. Both positions overlapped with her membership on the Middle East Studies Association (MESA) Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF). Not surprisingly, Marsha's concerns for freedom of speech, at home and abroad, influenced her work on the ethics committee. Yet her vision remained broad. For instance, Marsha also raised concerns about equitable treatment of junior scholars, especially in the context of collaborative projects, and remained a steadfast voice for family-friendly policies. Both mentoring and motherhood were abiding themes in her professional activism. In all venues, Marsha sought fair resolutions to difficult issues and, while forthright in her opinions, knew how to choose her battles in a search for common ground.

These professional activities mirrored values of social justice and feminism readily evident in Marsha's scholarship. After receiving the Middle East Studies Association's Albert Hourani award for her first book, *Labor and the State in Egypt* (Columbia, 1997), she organized workshops and conferences that resulted in three edited books: with Michele Angrist, *Authoritarianism in the Middle East* (Lynne Rienner, 2005); with Eleanor Doumato, *Women and Globalization in the Arab Middle East* (Lynne Rienner, 2003); and with Linda Cook, *Privatization and Labor* (Edward Elgar, 2002). Among her articles and book chapters, Marsha remained especially proud of her 1993 *World Politics* article "Irrational Workers: The Moral Economy of Labor Protest in Egypt" and a 2004 special issue of *Comparative Politics* on authoritarianism in the Middle East. Until quite recently, she continued to participate in conferences, leaving many people unaware of her illness. One of her biggest regrets was that the exhausting effects of chemotherapy severely hampered her ability to travel. She took great joy in one last trip to the region between treatments. Her friends received beautiful gifts as a result, and it motivated her to continue writing despite her uncertain future.

With seemingly limitless energy, Marsha also served on innumerable committees in the profession and at her home institution, including editorial boards of the journals *Mediterranean Politics*, *Studies in Comparative and International Development*, and *Middle East Report*, and wrote reports as a consultant. Not surprisingly, given her work as a labor activist before graduate school at the University of Pennsylvania, Marsha was a leader in the Bryant faculty union. Only in the final year of her illness did Marsha concede, to her great frustration, that she felt too tired to maintain all her commitments. Yet she persisted in one particular cause: to see reforms in the faculty contract at Bryant to ensure benefits for colleagues who might face the same daunting medical challenges that she had confronted.

Marsha's professional accomplishments and activities cannot capture the scope of her influence, and especially the warmth of her friendship, which she bestowed so generously. Even when her own prognosis turned bleak, Marsha always found ways to help others. Deprived of the energy for her favorite activities, particularly roller-blading and gardening, she took up beading jewelry to raise hundreds of dollars for Miriam Hospital in Providence, where she received most of her care. As the news of Marsha's decline in health quickly spread, spontaneous e-mails reflected the way that her myriad acts of kindness had, over the years, created a special bond among us. Generous, brave, passionate, and hilarious are among the recurring characterizations that people invoke when remembering Marsha. May she continue to inspire others to live the change they want to see.

Audie Klotz
Syracuse University

LUCIAN W. PYE

Lucian W. Pye, professor of political science at MIT and former president of the APSA, died in Boston on September 5, 2008. Pye was born in 1921 in Fenchow, Shansi Province, China, where his parents were educational missionaries teaching in the Congregational Mission. He went through the fourth grade at the American school in China, then completed primary education at the Oberlin, Ohio, public school. In 1936, he returned to China with his family and, during the Japanese occupation, completed high school at the North China American School in Peking. After graduating from Carleton College in 1943 he joined the U.S. Marine Corps, finding himself at war's end back in Peking as an intelligence officer with the Fifth Marine Regiment.

While accidents of personal biography undoubtedly affect everyone's scholarly commitments, in Pye's case the impact was profound. His dominant intellectual concern was to explore, theoretically and empirically, the cultural differences that help explain why the game of politics differs so greatly from one nation to another. And China itself, unique among nations but also within the class of non-Western modernizing societies, was the subject of about half of his many books. Reviewers often commented on the intuitive quality of Pye's insights into Chinese and other Asian cultures. What he says sounds plausible, they would write, or perhaps far-fetched, but how can he know that? A large part of the answer may lie in a rare sensitivity acquired early in life to the tangible reality and significance of cultural differences.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lucian Pye's scholarly contributions fall into four overlapping realms. First, he was a leader, both intellectually and organizationally, in studying the politics of modernization in the Third World. His writings made theoretical or empirical contributions to our understanding of the development process, and he advanced the work of other scholars by participating in many committees and organizations, including particularly the Committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council. A member of this committee from its origin in 1953, he succeeded Gabriel Almond as its chairman a decade later and served as editor or co-editor of three volumes in the committee's influential series. Second, Pye was one of a handful of scholars who studied Asian politics from a broadly comparative standpoint, having written both an analytical study comparing the cultural dimensions of authority in 10 Asian countries as well as monographs on three particular societies. Third, he belongs on any short list of internationally recognized specialists on contemporary China. Finally, Pye was one of the foremost practitioners of the concept of political culture as a way of penetrating beneath the surface of political life to the deeper layers of attitude, value, and sentiment that motivate political behavior.

The crucial years of Lucian Pye's intellectual formation were as a graduate student and research associate at Yale from 1947 to 1952. An impressive contingent of political scientists from Chicago, where the seeds of the "behavioral revolution" were sown, had by then migrated to New Haven. Among them were Harold Lasswell, Klaus Knorr, Nathan Leites, and Gabriel Almond. Of these, the most influential for Pye were Leites and Almond. Pye's dissertation, which analyzed the attitudes underlying warlord politics in China in the 1920s, was undoubtedly influenced by Leites, and after Pye had received his degree the two teamed up informally in a Yale seminar on comparative political elites. Almond entered the picture as leader of a seminar that analyzed the psychological, sociological, and anthropological literature pertaining to international affairs; he recalled his student Pye as "generally leaving me a little breathless; he had so much energy and enthusiasm." Along with some of the best young scholars from other disciplines, Pye was eager to apply behavioral concepts to the political and social revolution sweeping through the former colonial world.

Political Culture

The concept of political culture was the unifying intellectual thread in Pye's work. He was no evangelist for the approach, recognizing its risks and preferring, in matters methodological, to let a hundred flowers bloom. But psychologically oriented cultural analysis was distinctly his own preferred style of work. One striking trait was a deep-seated instinct not to take things at face value. Pye listened to what people wrote and said about themselves, their motives, and their actions, and he observed what they did. Then he would dive below the surface, examining overt behavior for clues about its deeper sources. Interpretations were not necessarily supported by conventional sorts of evidence. Some readers may have been put off by this way of thinking, especially in contexts where the evidence rested on psychoanalytic interpretation of childhood family relationships. But in the hands of a sensitive, experienced analyst with an intuitive feel for the society in question and unusual qualities of imagination and insight, this approach could help explain the otherwise inexplicable.

Pye's work on Burma, for instance, was skeptical of the capacity of its leaders to create an effective nation-state. He exposed the psychological and cultural sources of their failure to capitalize on its relatively favorable economic prospects. Similarly, his early writing about China distinguished itself by recognizing the potential in Mao, and in Chinese political culture as a whole, for a sharp turn toward an ideologically based politics of radical conflict. The central thrust of a *Foreign Affairs* article written just before the Cultural Revolution was to question the utility of a "prudence model," accepted by many China watchers who assumed that "Chinese behavior was eminently intelligent, ingenious and rational" and thus unlikely to repeat the extreme behavior of the Great Leap period. Pye wryly suggested that this presumption might tell us more about the "rationality and sobriety" of the analysts themselves than about the Chinese, and warned his readers to be prepared for "radical change," "instability," and "tensions and conflicts" among the leadership.

The chance of learning something new from Pye's work was enhanced by a related characteristic: a distaste for the obvious. If he did not actually write somewhere that he would rather be wrong than banal, consider it an oversight. It is not surprising that his work could be rated "bold," "provocative," or "stimulating." There is something of a paradox in the way Lucian Pye combined unusual intellectual boldness, and an associated toughness in sticking to his guns under fire, with an otherwise accommodating style and a quite traditional mode of professional life. Although a forceful personality, he was gracious and cooperative in day-to-day collegial dealings and thoroughly respectful of conventions. There was nothing of the prima donna in his makeup, none of the rough edges and quirkiness that can accompany high creativity and originality of mind. He gave sound, practical advice and assistance to students and junior colleagues about how the career game should be played. But when he sat down to write, he disdained what one reviewer called "timorous qualifications" and strode hip-deep into controversial waters with no apparent concern for the "decent opinion" of more conventional scholars.

The early excitement generated by the political culture approach had begun to wane by the late 1960s. The attitudinal and behavioral data required were hard to come by, and sound interpretations frustratingly elusive. Many younger scholars turned toward political economy as a promising source of harder data and, it was hoped, more rigorous interpretations of the development process. There was concern that political culture was becoming a loose catch-all category, a black box to accommodate historical, cultural, and psychological factors that clearly inhibited modernization but were not being analyzed with much precision. More recently the concept has regained a good deal of its luster. Cultural factors are again being cited as important sources of political and economic behavior in the Third World, with respect, for example, to the Confucian societies of East Asia. And conversely, failure to appreciate the salience of cultural factors is felt to have led some Western observers to underestimate the power of Muslim fundamentalism. Political culture seems likely to persist as a vital explanatory concept in the discipline.

The Politics of Modernization

Pye's first field study, in Malaya in 1952–53 under the auspices of Princeton's Center for International Studies, was associated

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the intellectual "revolution" of the cultural approach as well as with two genuine revolutionary developments of the era: the expansion of Communism and the collapse of colonial empires. Based on lengthy interviews of 60 Malayan Chinese, *Guerilla Communism in Malaya* (1956) was the first interpretive study of a non-Western Communist movement based on empirical data. About the time that book appeared in 1956, Pye accepted MIT's invitation to join its recently established Center for International Studies and teach in a new program that soon developed into a full-fledged department of political science.

The center was then the largest university-based interdisciplinary research group in the country working on international affairs. Focusing on issues of political and economic development, Communist societies, and American foreign policy, it was a fine place for a young scholar of Pye's inclinations. In 1958–59 he set off for Burma to do field work that resulted in his second book, *Politics, Personality, and Nation Building* (1971). Pye's distinctive approach to the politics of modernization first fully revealed itself here. The focus was squarely on what he termed "that complex of attitudes and practices which we may call the political culture and which reflects both the historical evolution of the society and the psychological reactions to social change of the society's political actors."

Pye's most important subsequent work could be regarded as an empirical and theoretical elaboration of the concepts imbedded in that sentence. He would remain centrally concerned with the elite political cultures of transitional societies, and he would interpret these cultures as shaped by a blend of universal historical factors, particular national histories, and individual psychological traits as shaped by family socialization patterns. All his studies attempted to perform the difficult feat of working at both macro and micro levels of analysis, with the balance usually favoring the latter.

While acknowledging the seriousness of the objective problems facing transitional societies, Pye consistently distinguished himself from most analysts by his steadfast insistence that anxieties, fears of failure, and other psychological phenomena were every bit as real and inhibiting as other obstacles to development. As he asserted in his Burma book, "The shocking fact has been that in the last decade the new countries of Asia have had more difficulty with the psychological than with the objective economic problems basic to nation building." As this strong statement suggests, he never fell into the easy optimism that overtook some of the development experts of the day, imbued as they were with the faith that rational planning along with sufficient injections of modern technology, skills, and capital would do the trick. In Pye's view, the heart of the development problem lay in such psychological variables as trust and aggression, and in attitudes toward intangibles like time, order, predictability, and power. No one believing in the centrality of personal and group attributes such as these could be sanguine either about the prospects for rapid modernization or about the ability of outside experts to facilitate the process.

Chinese and Comparative Asian Politics

Not long after drawing attention to the ways in which a feeble sense of national identity could impede modernization, as in Burma, Pye returned to his first love, China. Here was a radically different case. Cultural identity was clearly not the problem, in a society so profoundly aware of its historical continuity and the greatness of its civilization. In *The Spirit of Chinese Politics*, the first in a series of books on China, Pye identified the basic problem in China's modernization as an "authority crisis" arising "when the cultural and psychological bases for the legitimacy of political power are radically undermined by the developmental process." He saw legitimacy having evaporated as traditional leaders proved unable to cope with the demands of modernization and as other social structures—above all the family—progressively lost their ability to elicit compliance to society's norms.

This was a high-risk book. Not only was it rather more assertively psycho-cultural than his previous books, and less attentive to historical and institutional factors, but the style was consciously that of an "interpretive and speculative essay." Supporting empirical data were explicitly offered as illustration, not proof, of his approach. An expanded and partially revised edition appeared in 1992.

Pye's subsequent work on China included an introductory text, now in its third edition; a psychobiography of Mao; and a down-to-earth analysis of Chinese commercial negotiating style. His fullest and most important book on China, *The Dynamics of Chinese Politics* (1981), is a rich analytical account of factionalism in Chinese politics from Mao's death in 1976 to the appointment of Hu Yaobang as party chairman in 1981. As was customary in Pye's work, the study was guided by a central hypothesis: "The fundamental dynamic of Chinese politics is a continuous tension between the imperative of consensus and conformity, on the one hand, and the belief, on the other hand, that one can find security only in special, particularistic relationships, which by their very nature tend to threaten the principle of consensus."

Pye argued that factions in Chinese politics are not primarily based, as in the West or the Soviet Union, on policy issues, bureaucratic interests, generational differences, or geographical connections, although all such factors may play a part. Rather, they are rooted in the mutual loyalties of constellations of officials who band together either out of career self-interest or "the highly particularistic sentiments associated with personal ties in Chinese culture, that is the spirit of guanxi." This thesis is systematically explored in a series of chapters developing specific analytical propositions about factional behavior.

In passing, Pye alluded to the "models" developed over the years by Western analysts to explain Chinese politics, drawing attention in particular to the oscillation between "consensus models" and "conflict models" in response to changing political contingencies. We should, he suggested, resist the tendency to discard old models as we develop new ones, and look instead for the enduring truths in old approaches that events may seem to have discredited. In his view, the reality is that the opposites of consensus and of conflict are both deeply rooted in Chinese culture, and our analytical problem is to understand the distinctive dynamic that Chinese politics has acquired through the interplay between these opposites.

Such reconciliations were a hallmark of Pye's work: he often shaped his findings in terms of tensions and paradoxes, presenting forcefully both sides of any pair of opposites and suggesting that interpretations of behavior must take each fully into account. In his interpretations, people do not tend to make a consistent rational choice between one or another apparently incompatible course of action. Rather, they follow first one course, then the other, thereby introducing a permanent dynamic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

element into the political process. The polity retains its coherence despite these oscillations, since each of the qualities making up a pair of opposites itself stems from a widely accepted, more or less permanent cultural norm. Thus both the passionate, ideological politics of Mao and the pragmatic, liberalizing politics of Deng—so nearly polar opposites that they might seem to represent wholly distinct cultures—are seen as reflecting different aspects of a single, quintessentially Chinese political culture.

Pye's work on the modernization process in non-Western societies was most richly reflected in his 1985 book on *Asian Power and Politics*. As Howard Wriggins observed in a review article: "Who but Lucian Pye would be bold enough to undertake this ambitious and controversial study of comparative political cultures in ten Asian polities?" Acknowledging that, on the face of it, the mere idea of treating Asia as a single entity is absurd, Pye nonetheless contended that despite their great historical and religious diversity, Asian societies do in fact share orientations toward authority that differ importantly from those held in other parts of the world. Whereas in the West power is viewed largely in terms of decision making—the ability to set agendas and mobilize resources to achieve specified goals—power in Asian nations tends to be identified with social status and to be oriented toward producing such "outputs" as deference, dignity, pride, and respect. His broader conceptual point, bluntly stated, is that "theories which seek to specify general propositions about power miss the point entirely." What we must do, he suggests, is to concentrate on concepts that bring out "the actual dynamics of politics in particular situations and that also identify changes over time." The central proposition of the book—illustrated in the particular contexts of political attitudes and behavior in China, Japan, Taiwan, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, India, and Pakistan—is that the key determinants of political development are "changes in people's subjective understandings of the nature of power, changes in their expectations about authority, and changes in their interpretations of what constitutes legitimacy."

Teaching and Public Policy

In this book Pye gratefully acknowledged his debt to more than 30 former graduate students whose doctoral dissertations had been written under his supervision on one or another Asian society. In fact, he supervised more doctoral dissertations, by a substantial margin, than any other member of his department, most of them based on a year or more of field research. Some pursued topics close to his own research agenda, but the majority did not. One of those whose dissertation research was in substance closely related, on political leadership in China, emphasized his large capacity to stimulate students to think independently, and his corresponding sensitivity about imposing on them his own conceptual or methodological leanings.

Perhaps a quarter of his doctoral students were Asians, for whom he was a particularly important mentor and source of support. He put them at ease with his friendly manner and empathetic understanding of their educational and cultural backgrounds. Some of them may have seen in Professor Pye a culturally comfortable professorial version of paternalistic authority. However that may be, students kept coming to him, whatever their background, because he was accessible, unfailingly supportive, and brimming over with ideas for them to explore—and at the same time a rigorous and effective critic of their work. As one former student commented, "he is never short of enthusiasm for even the most underdeveloped ideas—nor do they stay underdeveloped for long!" His students may also have sensed, quite rightly, that once he took them on, he stayed with them through thick and thin: personal loyalty and commitment were values he prized very highly indeed.

Although Pye's professional life centered on research and teaching, without the timeouts for government service or academic administration that enliven or divert some careers, he by no means lived in an ivory tower. Regular trips to Asia kept him in touch with current developments, he consulted periodically for the RAND Corporation, and he wrote and talked frequently on Asian foreign and domestic policy issues. He appeared in Washington from time to time to testify before a congressional committee, or to advise the State Department or the National Security Council, but he never showed symptoms of Potomac Fever—unless a brief period of involvement in Senator Henry Jackson's presidential campaign could be construed as such. His contributions to policy discussions were reported to be insightful and relevant, neither excessively "academic" nor concerned with tactical or operational details.

In fact, Pye's fascination seemed to be more with the process of policy than with its substance. Passionately interested in deciphering the stratagems and operational codes of decision makers, he seemed temperamentally and intellectually best suited to play the outsider's role of analyst and critic. Indeed, one of the major values of his work, with its focus on the underlying sources of elite attitudes and motivations, lay in the implicit warning that policies proclaimed by statesmen need not be taken as representing their true or full intentions. Policymakers are well aware of this, to be sure, but there is a world of difference between recognizing the pragmatic need for Machiavellian manipulation on the one hand, and probing the cultural and psychological sources of elite behavior on the other.

A major share of Pye's "extra-curricular" energy was invested in a variety of private organizations where scholars, government experts, and lay leaders gather to discuss policy issues and to develop Asia-related research and exchange programs. In the mid-1960s he directed an influential project on China for the Council on Foreign Relations that resulted in several books and helped reawaken American opinion to the possibilities for a more constructive relationship with Communist China. He remained closely connected with the council, serving for years as a director. He was also among the founders of the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, a group that facilitated academic and other exchanges with China. (It was, indeed, the instigator of "ping-pong diplomacy," that early ice-breaking maneuver that helped reestablish constructive relationships between China and the outside world.) Pye served as a trustee of the Asia Foundation and as director of the Advisory Committee of the University Service Centre in Hong Kong, a research center that has served as an outpost for scholars from around the world carrying out research on China. Those who knew him in such contexts have spoken warmly of his enthusiastic and effective personal commitment.

Professor Pye is survived by his wife of 63 years, the former Mary Waddill, who collaborated with him on several of his books; his daughters Lyndy Pye of Northampton, MA, and Virginia Pye, of Richmond, VA;

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his son Chris, of Northampton; and three grandchildren.

Donald L. M. Blackmer
Professor Emeritus, MIT

ROBERTA S. SIGEL

A Life of Political Learning: January 6, 1916–October 25, 2008

Surely no one but Roberta Sigel could get kicked out of hospice for getting much better. Last spring, her family, friends, colleagues, and former students feared we were about to lose her inimitable presence in our lives as her health declined to a point that made hospice care seem necessary. Not long after that sad change, with characteristic briskness, she rallied so strongly that the hospice thought she should leave. She moved into assisted living and started communicating with us all again via her new e-mail address. We succumbed happily to the self-delusion that Roberta would be with us much longer still. But this autumn, her indomitable spirit could no longer sustain her frail body, and she died on October 25.

Roberta Sigel was a private person whose reflective examination of her own life enriched her work in ways that could surprise even those who knew her well. Without ado, and never with the least degree of self-importance, she contributed decade after decade of innovative thinking to the canons of political socialization, political psychology, and gender politics. She helped shape countless scholars in large and small ways. She witnessed—and helped to make—substantial changes in the theory and analysis of political behavior.

She remained intellectually active and deeply engaged with public life until her own life was reaching its end. She had "retired" from Rutgers in 1987, but "retirement" never seemed to change her level of activity. When one of us flew to New Jersey to visit her in the fall of 2007, she complained that it was a terrible time for the visit, since she was so far behind in her work. She relented, and during a very long and wonderful lunch, she proposed a new research project. "Well," she said, "Now you take it the next step. And you had better hurry, since we don't know how long I'll be here."

She would be irritated that she'd been denied one last opportunity to vote in an election the dynamics of which she described with her usual penetrating insight.

Roberta Sigel became very well known when she published *Learning About Politics* in 1970, and she retained a strong interest in the political learning of adolescents and young adults. Her own adolescence was marked by flight from her native Berlin ahead of the growing Nazi menace in the 1930s. She came to New York City, but then, perhaps surprisingly, headed south for college, earning her BA in history at Greensboro College in North Carolina, a small, progressive liberal arts institution founded in 1838. She earned a masters degree at Syracuse University and then attended Clark University in Worcester, MA, where she earned the Ph.D. in history and international relations—and where she met and married Irving E. Sigel, her husband and well-matched life partner for nearly 60 years.

Roberta and Irv were a "dual career professional couple" at a time when they had to shape every facet of their joint professional and personal lives. After Irv finished his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago, Roberta became what we would now call the "trailing spouse," teaching at Wayne State while Irv was at Michigan State, joining him at the State University of New York at Buffalo, and then coming to Douglass College of Rutgers University in 1973, the year that Irv, a developmental and cognitive psychologist, became a distinguished research scientist at the Educational Testing Service in Princeton. The fact that Roberta went to Rutgers as a distinguished professor shows how successfully the "trailing spouse" had combined work and family in a time when she had few female peers, no legal recourse against sex discrimination, and little of the support system available to later generations of female scholars.

By the time Roberta reached Rutgers, she had established herself as one of the foremost thinkers in the field of political socialization, but she had begun to demonstrate the curiosity and imaginative approach to research questions that stimulated her work while she was at Wayne State University. She was percipient in her analysis of race and religion in Detroit-area voters' reactions to President Kennedy, and she published a series of important articles on perceptions of political power in the mid-1960s. Perhaps most characteristic of Roberta's understated but powerfully creative scholarship of that time, however, was her 1968 article "Image of a President—Some Insights into the Political Views of Schoolchildren" (*APSR* 62:216–26). To our knowledge, that paper was one of the very few, perhaps the only one by a political psychologist, that focused on the reactions of pre-adults to President Kennedy's death, and it was conducted in the immediate aftermath of that tragedy. The study was carried out within an astonishing 21 days of the assassination; it consisted of structured and open-ended questions administered to 1,349 children in grades 4–12 in Detroit-area schools.

We seldom have this much detailed response from children giving their perceptions of an event that could have lasting influence on their political orientations. Usually we simply note how old a person was when a given event occurred, and then make some inferences about what kind of reaction the person must have had according to later analysis based on birth cohorts. If there were such a phenomenon as a cohort marked by Kennedy's assassination, then Roberta's study would give us a good idea of the affective and cognitive components going into it—and perhaps to similar events occurring here or elsewhere in the world.

As her interest in the formation of the political self continued, she published *The Political Involvement of Adolescents* with Marilyn Hoskin in 1981, and edited the important *Political Learning in Adulthood* in 1989, once again, as with her study of children's reaction to Kennedy's death, getting out ahead of most scholars by assuming that political learning continues long after earlier theories of socialization had proposed would or could be the case.

At a time when some are at least envisioning retirement, Roberta crafted yet another research agenda—this time on gender politics—developed new research skills with which to pursue it, and obtained the third large NSF grant of her career to execute the project. Roberta had not, perhaps, started out as a feminist, but she certainly ended her life as one. In midlife she became acutely engaged by the political and social challenges posed by the women's movement, and the result of her reflections, as was typical of her, was both personal and intellectual change. It was truly exceptional for someone of her generation, already well established and well respected in the discipline, to declare herself a feminist and cast her lot with a group of "insurgent" scholars working to develop

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a new area of study. Some would consider the culmination of her gender politics research agenda, *Ambition and Accommodation* (1996), to be her richest work. In that wonderful study, she looked with a cool and yet sympathetic eye on gender relations. She virtually reinvented the use of the focus group as a research method in political science to get underneath closed-response survey items and find out what women and men really thought about sex, gender, and feminist proposals for change.

And, as readers of the book know, what she found was that women were often tired, resigned, and ready to rationalize things away: "I know sex discrimination is out there but I personally am okay"—or what Roberta called either the "not me syndrome" or the "accommodation for a purpose" strategy. She found women ready to agree that a women's movement was necessary but adamantly not ready to take the next step and call themselves feminists. Roberta found that the women to whom she listened were not consciously connecting their awareness of sex discrimination to a desire to politicize it, or to become more politically engaged themselves. The men whose voices she heard casually acknowledged that sexism was out there, but were unconcerned about it—and did not, themselves, initiate discussion of relations between the sexes. Men, Roberta found, developed their own morally justifiable ways of preserving advantage—from "seeing no evil; it's all better now" to blaming the victim or saying "why punish *me*? I don't discriminate against anyone!"

As *Ambition and Accommodation* shows, Roberta exemplified a fine methodological ecumenism. She was no stranger to surveys and quantitative research, but she consistently supplemented this approach with more qualitative methods, including observation and in-depth interviews. What is so consistently striking about her work is that it always addressed important but often neglected issues, that it drew on a combination of psychological, sociological, and political theory as its bases, and that it had important normative implications but was committed to empirical evidence established through a diverse range of methodological approaches. This was a model of research that resonated with many of the colleagues and students who had the good fortune of working with her. For example, as we have noted, Roberta's approach to generational development and change—and her approach to other dynamics of political development, like gender—make clear that to the extent that people are affected by and react to changes in their larger sociopolitical environments, the consequences of these changes for political attitudes and behaviors should be most evident in the young. At the same time, Roberta's approach to political socialization did not limit this process to the young—early experiences may be formative and have effects that reveal themselves collectively as lasting generational differences, but learning and the resulting changes it produces does not end in young adulthood. Roberta is herself perhaps the greatest proof of this contention! Roberta's work reveals the incredible subtlety and complexity of the relationship among the overlapping concepts of age, aging, life cycles, and generations.

Roberta's interest in, and curiosity about, human political behavior never failed, and she could be a touch imperious at times in her assumption that we shared exactly her preoccupation with any given part of that behavior, or that we would willingly accede to her expectation that we would advance some inquiry. We would not want to romanticize this experience—anyone who worked with Roberta knows she could be curmudgeonly and demanding, and she did not suffer fools lightly. Admiring colleagues could feel her stinging impatience, and they knew that getting a phone call from her at any hour of the day or night with a question, suggestion, or request was par for the course. It goes without saying, however, that she was always right.

Roberta loved our shared enterprise. She never ceased to be engaged by the work we do, and she always motivated us to do more. Roberta was the instigator of the New York Area Political Psychology workshop when, while sharing a flight with Bob Shapiro and Leonie Huddy from New York to Chicago for a Midwest Political Science Association meeting, she simply announced that Leonie and Bob should organize a regular area meeting of political psychologists. They knew they had no choice in the matter. The group first convened in spring 1990, and it remains a vibrant, stimulating intellectual forum, attracting scholars from the greater New York area and around the country. Roberta attended the meetings for many years, always contributed insights to the discussions, and will be greatly missed by the entire group.

Roberta had a gift for friendship. She maintained close ties to former students and longtime colleagues everywhere, and she always welcomed new relationships. She was particularly generous to international scholars, doing much not only to facilitate their research programs but to assure that they felt comfortable and welcome when they visited the states. In later years, she was often if not always the eldest person in any group she found herself in, but those of us who were younger than she only marveled at her seamless ability to integrate her long experience with her appraisal of the newest in culture and technology.

Roberta was "between" feminist generations, younger than the suffragettes and older than the mostly Baby Boom second-wave feminists, but her support for the women coming along after her into political science was always strong. She was a vigorous and enthusiastic supporter of the tenure of the first woman executive director of the American Political Science Association. Her commitment to gender politics was reflected not only in her scholarship, but in her contributions to the women and politics program at Rutgers. She threw the full force of her credibility and influence behind the effort to establish women and politics as a Ph.D. field, and her support was absolutely critical to the program's success. Most of the students she mentored and worked with in recent years were the students in that program.

Roberta sustained decades of friendship and scholarly guidance with her friends and collaborators, always contributing to their growth and changing research agendas. She would keep people up until all hours at APSA, Midwest, and ISPP meetings, probing research questions and suggesting new angles. She loved going to dinner with colleagues at the meetings, contributing to evenings we will never forget.

Roberta Sigel had one of the liveliest intellects any of us has known, and none of that burning interest in all things political slowed down over the years. In her mid-70s, she was president of the International Society of Political Psychology. At age 89, she chaired the APSA roundtable "The Future of Political Psychology," lamenting then that she was not as up to date on the new neuropsychological literature as she ought to be. Six months before she died, and just before she went to hospice, she was talking about re-conceptualizing her

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fascinating mother-and-daughter study (a study of two generations of Douglass College alumnae) using Mannheim's generational framework. Perhaps most of all at the end of her life, she showed the grace and beauty of retaining one's engagement with, and activity in, the political world, as scholar, trenchant observer, and progressive citizen.

The International Society of Political Psychology established the Roberta Sigel Junior Scholar Award to honor and encourage the work of young academics. A Junior Scholar Award could not be a more fitting tribute to Roberta's enduring contribution to creating new generations of scholars who would probe people's lifelong learning about politics.

Sue Tolleson-Rinehart
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Susan J. Carroll
Rutgers University
Michael X. Delli Carpini
The University of Pennsylvania
Doris Graber
The University of Illinois at Chicago
Marilyn Hoskin
The University of New Hampshire
M. Kent Jennings
The University of California, Santa Barbara
Catherine E. Rudder
George Mason University

JAMES D. THOMAS

Dr. James D. Thomas, a long-time faculty member of the department of political science at the University of Alabama, died in Tuscaloosa on August 5, 2008.

Professor Thomas was born in Troy, Alabama, on August 27, 1922. Following service in World War II, he received his undergraduate degree from Alabama Polytechnic Institute (Auburn) in 1946. He then went to the University of Alabama where he got his masters degree in 1948. It was at this point in his academic career that he developed his interest in county government, multiple aspects of which would provide the foundation of much of his subsequently published research and many of his service activities as well. His thesis dealt with government in one rural Alabama county. His dissertation, in contrast, encompassed the entire panorama of his home state's counties. The doctoral thesis was written as part of his studies at Ohio State University where he received his Ph.D. in 1958.

Jim Thomas's first professional employment was with the Alabama Legislative Reference at the state capitol in Montgomery beginning in 1959. His services were much in demand by chronically understaffed legislators. The functioning of the state legislature would provide the second of the principal subjects on which he would focus most heavily in his writing and consulting.

Professor Thomas began a distinguished teaching career when he joined the faculty of Alabama College (University of Montevallo) in 1959. As a political scientist interested not only in understanding state government but improving it, he continued in the tradition of excellence of that institution as exemplified in the work of Professor Hallie Farmer, who had previously published the most comprehensive studies of the functioning (or failure to function) of the Alabama legislature.

Desiring to be closer to a larger community of scholars who shared his interest in public administration generally and Alabama specifically, Thomas moved to the University of Alabama in 1966. It was from this base that he would teach, write, and consult until his retirement in 1987.

It was under the auspices of his new department's widely known Bureau of Public Administration that he applied his research and service skills in the interest of improved performance at both the local and state levels of government. He also worked to bring in nationally and internationally known scholars to lecture in the bureau's famous series, which was responsible for a remarkable corpus of public administration literature evolving over more than half a century.

While still with the Legislative Reference Service, Thomas had published an election officers' handbook, a guide that went through multiple editions, with his involvement always a critical factor in its usefulness to its intended readers. Subsequently, to assist other sets of local officials, Thomas, through the bureau or the Alabama Law Institute, authored or co-authored manuals for county commissioners, tax assessors and collectors, and regional planners. He also participated in numerous bureau-sponsored training institutes for these and other categories of state and local officials. Further, he served as a consultant to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, working for greater coordination among colleges and universities, a daunting challenge in an environment in which these institutions were accustomed to considerable autonomy.

Building on his early work as a legislative aide, Thomas was a consistent advocate of and participant in efforts to achieve legislative reform. Despite his and others' labors in behalf of this cause, the Alabama legislature continued to be ranked as one of the least effective in the nation. If sufficient improvements weren't made, it definitely wasn't Jim's fault. In 1969–70 he served as a consultant to a legislative reform study committee. In the latter year he was also the leading academic participant in the first orientation sessions for new Alabama legislators. To make available ongoing assistance for all senators and representatives, Thomas and Robert McCurley of the Alabama Law Institute published two editions of *The Legislative Process: A Handbook for Alabama Legislators* in the 1980s. Previously, with a colleague, L. Franklin Blitz, he had authored *The Alabama Legislature* (1974) to give citizens generally a better understanding of their state assembly. A proponent of the notion that more frequent regular meetings at least had the potential to hasten legislative responses to current problems, Thomas wrote about how this reform was accomplished in *Adoption of Annual Sessions: The Case of Alabama* (1976). The successful strategy could, he posited, be possibly the way to achieve other needed changes.

Jim was also concerned with Alabama state government generally. In 1969 he published *Government in Alabama*, a brief overview of state institutions. Five years later it was updated, again through the Bureau of Public Administration. Most significantly, his original study provided the nucleus for a greatly expanded work, *Alabama Government and Politics*, with William H. Stewart added as a co-author. This book was published in 1988 by the University of Nebraska Press as part of a projected 50-state series, originally edited by the late Daniel J. Elazar. To promote a better understanding of state government among pre-collegiate students, Thomas and Stewart directed a Taft Institute of Government seminar for secondary school teachers.

Jim Thomas was a gifted teacher and instructed multiple generations of students in public law as well as the subjects about which he wrote and consulted most

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prolifically. At the end of his teaching career, these students included military officers who were enrolled in an interdisciplinary DPA program conducted at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery. In an effort to promote more frequent opportunities for interaction among political scientists in his home state, Jim was very active in the Alabama Political Science Association and served as its president in 1977.

Jim was noted for his gentle disposition, a quality that made him a very agreeable colleague and an influential mentor to younger members of the faculty. He is survived by his wife, Miriam, and many other relatives, who, along with a host of former students, fellow political scientists, and friends, deeply mourn his passing.

William H. Stewart
University of Alabama

RAPHAEL ZARISKI

Our colleague Professor Raphael Zariski died June 30, 2008, in Seattle, Washington. Ray taught for nearly 40 years in the political science department at the University of Nebraska Lincoln, before his retirement in 1996. He was beloved by generations of students and colleagues who viewed him not only as an outstanding scholar and wonderful teacher, but as a generous and unselfish friend.

Ray was born in 1925 in Rome, Italy, to Oscar and Yole Cagli Zariski. His father, Oscar Zariski, later to be a member of the National Academy of Sciences in recognition of his path-breaking work developing the field of algebraic geometry, immigrated to Italy in 1920 from Poland. Of Jewish descent, and with leftist sympathies, Oscar found the Fascist regime intolerable and, as a non-citizen, his job opportunities limited. He left Italy in 1928, taking a job at Johns Hopkins, and bringing him with him his wife and three-year-old son, Ray. In 1947, the family moved to Cambridge, where Oscar became a member of the Harvard mathematics faculty.

Ray was educated at Harvard, beginning in 1942, and then, at age 18, he dropped out to serve in the U.S. Army, where he was a rifleman and medical aide. He served with the Fifth Army, 10th Mountain Division, in their 1945 campaign in Northern Italy. Wounded, he was awarded the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star. Following the war, he spent a semester at the University of Illinois, where his father was then teaching, before reentering Harvard, graduating in 1948 with an AB, magna cum laude, in political science. He continued at Harvard to earn his AM and Ph.D. in 1952. During his graduate education, he spent a year on a Fulbright in Rome.

Ray married Birdine Adelstein in 1954. After a series of temporary positions at the University of Vermont, the Center for International Studies at MIT, the United World Federalists, and Bennington College, in 1957 Ray and Birdie moved to Lincoln where Ray joined the department of political science at the University of Nebraska. The world of the University of Nebraska in 1957 was not the diverse modern University of Nebraska world. Ray was a curiosity, a Jewish professor in a still-parochial university where Jewish faculty and administrators were rare. An easterner who had grown up in Baltimore and whose academic life had been at eastern institutions, the university, Lincoln, and the prairie were also new to him. Ray marveled at the on-command parties where the wives of young faculty wore white gloves and were expected to fade into the background.

But Ray and Birdie adjusted to Lincoln and made a successful and happy life there. His career at Nebraska was interrupted only by two further Fulbright years in Italy, and a year as department chair at Virginia Commonwealth University in 1974–75.

At Nebraska, he established himself as a fine teacher of comparative politics and a first-class scholar. Not surprisingly given his background, his primary research focus was on Italian politics. He had special interests in Italian political parties, factions, and interest groups; coalition building; and the politics of Italian regions. Articles in the *Journal of Politics*, *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, and *American Political Science Review*, along with his excellent teaching, earned him tenure and promotion in 1961.

He then turned his attention to his book *Italy: The Politics of Uneven Development*, published in 1972. With the book came promotion to professor. During the rest of his career at Nebraska, Ray was the approachable senior scholar whose own work was highly regarded by fellow comparativists in the discipline and by his colleagues. For years, he was clearly one of the handful of top American scholars of Italian politics. Multilingual, Ray drew on sources throughout Western Europe as he broadened his research focus from Italy to cross-national European concerns. He and Mark Rousseau published the book *Regionalism and Regional Devolution in Comparative Perspective* in 1987, and in that same year, Ray and a Nebraska colleague, Lou Picard, edited the book *Subnational Politics in the 1980s*. After his retirement, Ray continued to publish, co-authoring a multi-edition textbook, *European Politics*.

In a variety of courses from required general-education freshman courses to graduate seminars, Ray excelled in teaching, winning a university-wide teaching award in 1982. He regularly taught the undergraduate courses on Western European government, politics of industrial democracies, and comparative public policy as well as graduate seminars in comparative politics. Students loved Ray, not only because he clearly cared about their well being but because of his sly humor and great timing.

The child of a great man and the grandchild of a family destroyed by the Holocaust, Ray was a caring but cautious and unassuming man. He waited until he had tenure to start his family. In a world where big academic egos are common, Ray was slow to take credit for his own accomplishments and quick to praise others. He was unendingly supportive of young faculty members, and a wonderful mentor to graduate students. All of us, former junior colleagues of Rays, were beneficiaries of Ray's kindness as we developed our careers at Nebraska. Though his critical judgment was superb, he never criticized colleagues, junior or senior, even when he thought their work was misguided.

Ray would often project the persona of an absent-minded professor, and sometimes he was. Some of his graduate students tell the story of going with Ray in his car to a downtown restaurant after a seminar. When he turned a corner and stopped behind a car in front of him to wait for a red light, he turned around to chat with the students. Several minutes, and several good stories later, one of the students ventured, "Professor Zariski, that car in front of us is parked. No one is in it."

But his "absent mindedness" could also be a mask for the keen intelligence working behind the façade of pleasant bumbling. Not only did we see that in his clear

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and intelligent publications, but colleagues have many stories about Ray's request for clarification at the poker table "now does a straight really beat a flush" only to see him consistently have the best hand and rake in the chips.

Ray cared for his wife Birdie during her lingering disabling illness, making sure that she had the care she needed. After her death, and his retirement, he moved to Seattle to be close to his son and grandchildren. But Ray's interests in retirement were broad. He developed a passion for Asian cultures, and did extensive travel there. He returned annually to visit friends and colleagues in Nebraska.

Ray is survived by his son Daniel, his daughter Adrienne, two grandchildren, and his sister Vera DeCola Zariski. They, and we, will miss him greatly.

Susan Welch
Penn State
John C. Comer
University of Nebraska
John Hibbing
University of Nebraska

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090349 Published online by Cambridge University Press