

his illness shortened his years and at times confined his activities. It never impaired the excellence of his work nor the quality of his life. His extraordinary professional attainments and personal triumphs commanded the respect and admiration of all who knew him. He was a superb educator who radiated enthusiasm for both the science and practice of politics. More importantly, he was a superior human being whose humanity ran very deep.

He began his teaching career at the high school level, then went on to do graduate work in political science, and received his Ph.D. from Claremont in 1965. During his graduate studies he was awarded an APSA Congressional Fellowship in Washington. In 1963 he joined the Colgate faculty where he soon became a pillar of the university community. As chairman of the Political Science Department, as director of the Colgate Washington Study Group, and as member of various governing boards he rendered distinguished service to the university. His teaching and research were focused on the Congress and American political behavior, but encompassed diverse interests. He taught in the Netherlands for a term as a Fulbright Fellow, and conducted research in Japan under a Ford Foundation grant. He also took an active interest in Hamilton community affairs and was influential in various local civic endeavors.

David was a colleague in the very best sense. He combined devotion to the college with concern for the welfare of individual members of the campus community. He was a generous and compassionate person who cared deeply about people. To students needing help, and to colleagues seeking his counsel he gave of himself unstintingly. Physically frail, he seemed a tower of moral strength; in his limited life span he found time for the most important things.

Above all, David was dedicated to his teaching. For him this was a calling as much as a profession. He had been a teacher before he became a professor, and his career affirmed the primacy of the former. Students and their instruction were his paramount concerns, and he lavished time and care on the design of courses and crafting of lectures. These commitments, together with his superior

classroom talents, were reflected in his excellent courses. And they are remembered gratefully by countless Colgate students.

David's singular personal qualities enriched the lives of those who were close to him. His many friends will recall with distinct pleasure his warm and genuine friendship. His close associates will remember with admiration his exemplary character and courage. All of us will miss him very much.

Edgar Shor
Colgate University

Joseph Tanenhaus

Joseph Tanenhaus, professor and former chairman of the Political Science Department of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, died suddenly on October 9, 1980 at the age of 56.

As chairman from 1969-72, Joe built this department, and remained its intellectual leader thereafter. He liked to tell the story of an acquaintance, a re-knowned scholar, who, upon hearing that Joe was taking the chairmanship at Stony Brook, asked whether his research had turned sour. The question was insidious, of course, but worth a laugh for Joe was indeed ambivalent about administration and, the truth be told, dissatisfied with his research and that of the discipline. The 70s were not good times for universities, especially "developing" ones, and when administration commitments turned to hopes, he agonized, salvaged the department's Laboratory for Behavioral Research, swore off administration, and returned to teaching and scholarship.

He set the standard around here for what a professorship can and should be—not in terms of status, he'd have none of that, but in his intense (dare I say "moral") commitment to teaching and scholarship. His courses on Constitutional Law attracted more than a hundred students a semester. Student evaluations were uniformly positive, but warned of the work load, the need to develop analytical tools, and the difficulty of getting an "A." In 1976 Joe received the SUNY Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching. He deserved it and his example put an end to cynical notions about undergraduate teaching. Good

teaching, it now seemed clear, required preparation, command of the material, and what's more, respect for the subject matter. His teaching performance was all the more remarkable to us because Con-Law was no longer his research interest. He taught those courses because the department needed them. He taught well because that's what professors should do.

Professors should be scholars and scholars should publish. Joe was above all else a scholar. He published 20 chapters and journal articles and a half dozen books, perhaps the most well known being his book with Al Somit on *The Development of American Political Science*. Over the course of his career Joe's research changed in significant ways, mirroring the discipline's "behavioral revolution"; he moved from "traditional" institutional analysis in the 1950s to research on judicial behavior and public support for the Supreme Court in the 1960s.

It took a year, maybe more, for Joe to recover from the chairmanship. He could have followed the well-trodden path of semi-retirement but he didn't; he was too much a professional for that, too much a scholar, too interested in asking researchable questions, and, perhaps most important of all, it would have let us down. He became intrigued with the possibilities for experimental research. Within months of telling us he was too old and set in his ways to make the shift to laboratory research, he was designing experimental studies and running subjects in the department's laboratory. Between 1974 and 1978 he was a principal investigator on NSF grants that pioneered in the application of magnitude scaling to political survey research.

It soon became clear—to him first, the rest of us later—that the problem of how to measure strength of opinion accurately was within reach. What next? Joe wasn't much interested in working at the second decimal place. His son, Michael, was completing his dissertation in cognitive psychology and introduced Joe to contemporary psychological models of human information processing and experimental procedures for determining the meaning of concepts. Joe's recommendation to us was to focus on the stimulus side; to determine the meanings of the words used in questionnaires to refer to political objects and processes. He

was, of course, "too old," "too set in his ways," to do it himself.

That posture didn't last long. He was after all a research scholar, so he immersed himself in the cognitive literature, read everything, and throughout 1976-1979 carried out a series of laboratory studies demonstrating the ambiguity of the words used to refer to political institutions, actors, roles and processes and the effects of multiple meanings on people's interpretation and evaluation of government and politics. Where such variation exists in the meaning of political stimuli, stimulus and response effects are confounded.

This line of research was moving ahead when Joe left for a six-month sabbatical in Australia. We saw Joe, his wife Gussie, and youngest son David when they stopped off here for a few days enroute to the University of Iowa for a semester. He died there among friends. They tell me he was as enthusiastic and involved as ever. A score of projects were left undone. A final paper written in collaboration with Mary Ann Foley on the ambiguity of the concept "Government in Washington" was in penultimate draft and is being readied for publication. His work on political cognition will, I think, be seen as pushing the behavioral persuasion in political science beyond its present boundaries.

Joe left his mark on this place. He will be sorely missed, for he represents the standard of what a professor should be: a fine teacher and productive scholar. What's more, a good friend and a colleague you could rely on. All you had to say was "Joe, I need your help."

A Joseph Tanenhaus Memorial Library is being established in the department to commemorate the man who represents for us what is best about being a professor of political science.

Milton Lodge
Bernard Tursky
SUNY, Stony Brook

Joseph Tanenhaus

Told of Joseph Tanenhaus' recent death, one of his former colleagues fell into a shocked, incredulous silence, then blurted, "Joe was the best political scientist I ever knew." With the insertion of