

truly have been a role model for me.” For her students, their Professor Lansing had been there and done it in the trenches of political life—unlike our armchair philosophers and café intellectuals. She linked these experiences to the world of research, and she projected them with her boundless energy to make scholarship meaningful in ways that students understood and appreciated.

Robert C. Grady
David W. Hortin
Eastern Michigan University

Myres Smith McDougal

Myres Smith McDougal, Sterling Professor Emeritus of Law at Yale University, died on May 7, after a long illness. He was 92 years old.

A renowned authority on international law, Professor McDougal founded, along with political scientist Harold D. Lasswell, the New Haven School of Jurisprudence, a policy-science approach to the study of law that conceives of law not as a body of rules, but as a process of decision.

Professor McDougal called his jurisprudence “configurative” and “policy-oriented.” In his view, the challenge was to develop and apply an approach to the study and practice of law so that law could contribute to the achievement of a public order respectful of human dignity.

Aside from his prominence as a legal scholar, Professor McDougal, known as “Mac” to his students and colleagues, was a respected and popular teacher at the Law School for five decades, and after that, at the New York Law School. He nurtured generations of statesmen, judges, academics, and practicing lawyers.

President Bill Clinton, a 1973 graduate of Yale Law School and a former student of Professor McDougal, expressed sadness in a letter to the McDougal family and friends. Clinton wrote: “Mac was a central part of the Yale Law School community. His conception of the ultimate goal of law as the achievement of human dignity, and his insistence that each legal application be appraised in terms of its contribution to that dignity, inspired many of us

to dedicate our lives to public service and will continue to guide our efforts.”

Yale trustee Judge José A. Cabranes, another of Professor McDougal’s former pupils, noted: “Mac’s scholarship and his advocacy has touched most of the great foreign policy debates of our time: United States participation in the new, post-war order; the principles of law governing the exercise of coercive authority by great powers in that new order; the international protection of human rights (a subject that Mac helped to place on the map, and which he introduced to law school curricula); the use of executive agreements in the conduct of our foreign affairs; the application of international law by United States tribunals; the law of the sea; and the law of outer space (an interest of his that some of us in 1962 regarded, quite incorrectly, as eccentric). . . . Myres McDougal was, without a doubt, the greatest international lawyer of his time.”

Professor McDougal was born in 1906 in Burton, Mississippi. He received a B.A., M.A. and LL.B. degrees from the University of Mississippi and was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, where he received a B.C.L. in 1930. At Oxford, he was a student of the legal historian Sir William Holdsworth, who had a profound influence on his later work. Although invited to teach at Oxford, Mr. McDougal returned to the United States to earn his doctorate in 1931 from the Yale Law School.

After a brief teaching stint at the University of Illinois, he returned to Yale in 1934. Working in the area of property law, he was the first scholar to reconceive this traditional body of law in terms of comprehensive resource planning.

During World War II, Professor McDougal took a leave from Yale to serve his country, first as assistant general counsel of the Lend-Lease Administration (1942); then as general counsel of the State Department’s Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations (1943).

Professor McDougal turned his attention after the war to international law, and it was in this area

that he made his best-known contributions. He produced, in collaboration with his students, six major treatises on international issues, including the law of the sea, the law of outer space, the law of war, and the law of human rights. In 1943, he and Lasswell published their first joint endeavor, “Legal Education and Public Policy,” a fundamental and path-breaking work in its field.

Among his other positions, he served as president of the American Society of International Law in 1958, and was president of the Association of American Law Schools in 1966.

Professor McDougal is survived by his wife of more than 60 years, the former Frances Lee, and a son, John Lee McDougal.

Adapted from the *Yale Bulletin & Calendar*

Mancur Olson

The sudden passing of Mancur Olson on February 19, 1998, at the age of 66, was a blow to his many colleagues, admirers, and friends.

Rarely, if ever, has one individual made such a notable difference to political science. His intellectual audacity was ever a trade mark of his style and always on display, as in the opening of his second volume, *The Logic of Collective Action*:

Since most (though by no means all) of the action taken by or on behalf of groups of individuals is taken through organizations, it will be helpful to consider organizations in a general or theoretical way.

This work, which identified the conflict between individual rational choice and the imperatives of action to support group goals, changed the way the world of political science thought of political behavior, political organizing, and the output of governments. (In 1993, the American Academy of Management awarded it a Best Book Award, for its enduring contributions to our understanding of society.) The contribution stemmed from Mancur’s singular focus on the big questions of social science. He described this predilection nicely in a communication to Avinash Dixit in July 1997:

In economics as in other fields, many researchers have what might be called an instinct for the capillaries and there is some work in the journals that, even when it is right, is hardly worth bothering about. Just as the great fighter is looking for the jugular, so the great scientist is looking for the areas where there can be a breakthrough—for areas where strong claims are in order. Thus I think it is a good research strategy to search for stark and simplifying propositions. In my career I like to think that I have always done that. That is certainly the only thing that I want to do.

The consequences of this penchant to stay focused on the big picture were the gifts he gave all of us in the discipline, and more broadly in the social sciences.

Born and educated in North Dakota (B.S., 1954, North Dakota State University), he seemed to mix a farmer's sense of nonpretentious work with a pixie's sense of play in the arguments in which he engaged. When an argument ended up at a surprising spot, he was absolutely gleeful.

His contributions to the social sciences are numerous, and certainly none surpassed the impact of the brilliant *Logic of Collective Action* (which was translated into at least nine foreign languages). But there were numerous other contributions of major impact. And as he gained knowledge and theoretical understanding, he was often eager to relate the findings to policy so as to improve society. In this spirit, perhaps most important to policymakers, but most neglected by those of us in the academy, is the U.S. government document "Toward a Social Report" (1969, republished by the University of Michigan Press [1970], and commonly known as the Bell report) which argued for the collection and dissemination of social statistics to supplement the regular reporting of such economic statistics as income, employment, and poverty. The document reflects Mancur's lifelong concern with the issues of economic justice and fairness in the outcomes of social and governmental processes. He brought these con-

cerns to all of his work, including his work as Deputy Assistant Secretary to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1967-1969), where he worked on the problem of social indicators of the welfare of the society.

This concern was reflected in a large number of his other writings, such as his "A Less Ideological Way of Deciding How Much Should be Given to the Poor," (*DAEDALUS*, Fall 1983). There he endorsed Rawls' notion of using "a veil of ignorance" as a mechanism to consider the issues. But he argued that there was, in general, no interest in putting a ceiling on income, but rather only an interest in setting an insurance against poverty: a floor on income. In that piece, he wrestled with the theoretical differences between economic rights (such as the right to a minimum income) and the more traditional rights, such as free speech. The general problem of organizing society so as best to deliver social welfare was only a small step removed from some of these more fundamental questions, and was touched upon in many of his works. One, which is today quite an interesting counterpoint to the anti-socialism propaganda we all hear, is his analysis of what structures allowed highly socialized economies to remain economically competitive and efficient (*How Bright Are the Northern Lights? Some Questions about Sweden*, 1990).

His career took a major turn in 1982 with the publication of another block-buster volume: *The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation, and Social Rigidities* (Yale University Press). (The American Political Science Association awarded it the Gladys M. Kammerer Award for 1983). Building upon the *Logic*, in *Rise and Decline* he argued that the coalescing of narrow interest groups into majoritarian coalitions could endanger continued economic growth of any polity. This volume (also published in at least a dozen languages) led him to explore, ever more broadly, the problems of using markets to spur economic development.

It was this consuming interest

which led him to found the Center for Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS) in 1990. This marked a new phase in his career, which again reflected his concern for policy relevance and innovation. The center's purpose was to give technical assistance and policy advice to once-communist and Third World countries around the world. The insights he gained from this work led to his last series of publications, the intellectual capstone of which was probably his "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development," in the *American Political Science Review* in 1993. Here, he pushed forward the rent-seeking theory of entrepreneurial leaders by arguing that political leaders have incentives to distribute property rights to citizens or subjects so as to get increased profits that stem from the increased productivity from private investment and development. He argued that this same incentive for increasing rents, plus the uncertainties of succession in authoritarian regimes (with the ensuing possibility that the property rights are not secure) lead to a predilection toward democratic development.

But we probably all have read many more of the papers and articles of Mancur Olson than can be mentioned in this short space. He was a strong leader and very honored member of the social science academy, winning at least one other prize from the American Political Science Association—the 1979 Franklin L. Burdette/Pi Sigma Alpha prize for the best paper presented at the previous year's annual meeting for "Pluralism and National Decline". He was not only a founder of organizations such as the Public Choice Society, but he also served as the president and a vice president of a number of more traditionally established organizations such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science (where he was the president of its Social, Economic and Political Section in 1989).

Many of us also had the opportunity to see him in person at meetings, lectures, and other intellectual gatherings. In these settings, Mancur was always, in the words of Herbert

Simon, able “to look at things in a creative and original way.” But he was always also generously giving of his time to those who wished to discuss their own research questions. Although he was frightfully busy, he had time for collegial give and take—both local and more distant. A personal experience comes to mind. When Norman Frohlich and I were graduate students at Princeton, and Mancur had just moved to the University of Maryland, we wrote him about a question regarding the “size principle” in *Logic*. He called me at home, and offered to come to Princeton for a “quick and informal discussion over a breakfast.” We ate in a diner, and filled many a napkin with equations and graphs.

Of course, the measure of a man is not the scale of his professional contribution. Here at the University of Maryland, Mancur was known and loved all over campus. His virtually perennial occupation of a large table in the dining hall during the lunch hour was reflective of his interest in others. Many dozens of his colleagues would spy him, and accede to his invitation to sit down, and commence sharing research ideas, arguments about any topic of the day, or the more personal joys and pains of life. He was an attractive and giving mentor for the best graduate students in political science as well as economics. Indeed, it was his instinctive pursuit of minimizing disciplinary boundaries that led the University to found an interdisciplinary center, the Collective Choice Center, and to bless its sequence of graduate courses.

As Nobel Laureate Robert M. Solow remarked, upon hearing of Mancur’s death, “Most of us are pretty much alike; seen one, you’ve seen them all. Mancur was different, one of a kind. All the more reason that we will miss him.”

Jonathan Wickenfeld
University of Maryland

Richard C. Sinopoli

Richard C. Sinopoli, associate professor of political science at the University of California, Davis, died, tragically and shockingly, in a swim-

ming accident in Kauai, Hawaii, on May 3, 1997. It is relatively easy to appreciate the tragedy. The death of a young person who combined achievement and promise in such extraordinary degrees cannot but give us all pause. The shock of the event is harder to convey. It has been a year since Richard’s death, but the event still haunts those who knew him. Losing, without warning, a person of such passion and sense of life has an indelible impact. Here at UC-Davis, professional and collegial estimates of Richard may be judged by his having been named chair of the political science department just days before he headed off to Hawaii on holiday. A more telling mark of respect for him, however, is the profound hurt of his loss. He touched us in ways that his death brought home.

Born in Yonkers in 1956, Sinopoli attended New York City’s public schools, after which he went on to SUNY-Binghamton for his B.A. Returning to the city, for which he always retained the kind of affection only possible for a person who knows its faults, Sinopoli did his graduate work in political theory at New York University, where he received the Ph.D. in 1986. His dissertation, directed by Mark Roelofs, explores the political thought of the American founding and won the APSA Leo Strauss Award as the best dissertation in political theory for 1985–86. Ultimately, it became *The Foundations of American Citizenship: Liberalism, the Constitution, and Civic Virtue* (Oxford University Press, 1992), which, in 1992, won the award for the best first book published in political theory from the Foundations of Political Theory Section of the APSA. After NYU, Sinopoli had stints teaching at Southern Connecticut University and as a Program Officer at the Twentieth Century Fund before coming to Davis in 1988. Save for a year as acting director of the UC-Davis Washington Center, he remained at Davis until his death. He is survived by his twin sister, Carla, his sister Flavia, and by his two brothers, Joseph and Gregory.

Sinopoli’s scholarship touches on

many areas, but all of it is characterized by sympathy for the traditional liberalism of thinkers like John Locke and John Stuart Mill, independence of thought, fierce resistance to received wisdom, and appreciation of the real-world importance of theoretical concerns. His writing, therefore, typically, and fearlessly, contests current intellectual fashions, whether that means defending Locke against feminist critics (“Feminism and Liberal Theory”), arguing for Mill’s liberty against the contending notions of John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin (“Thick Skinned Liberalism: Redefining Civility”), or extending that debate to the question of the extent of the right of association (“Associational Freedom, Equality, and Rights Against the State”). The best demonstration of Sinopoli’s breadth, rigor, and intellectual probity remains, however, *Foundations of American Citizenship*. There he takes up the question that has dominated scholarship on American thought for most of a half century. Does the Constitution owe more to the republican or liberal end of modern thought? If one takes the republican side, one emphasizes the civic end of American political experience; if one takes the liberal side, one emphasizes the individualist end. Sinopoli refuses to take the easy course of opting for either alternative and argues, instead, that the liberal-leaning institutional framework of the framers is combined with a civic viewpoint without which the whole American edifice dissolves. Thus, he, again typically, foregoes taking a cheap, and attention attracting, shot at American thought by giving in to republicanism’s hierarchies or liberalism’s egalitarianism. Rather, he ends up offering “two cheers” for America’s liberal side and salvaging it from detractors, academic and popular, by accommodating it to virtue. Sinopoli continued this line of argument, but expanded it, into his last work. At the time of his death he was in the beginning stages of extending his argument with the republicans and their intellectual descendants, the communitarians, into contemporary debates over diversity