

1936. But he could not speak Japanese at this point (he had been working on learning to read it), and his wedding ceremony to Mary (a Nisei who could speak Japanese) was “incomprehensible” to him.

Maki earned a B.A. and an M.A. in English literature from the University of Washington. “For no reason other than idle curiosity,” he chose Japanese (with which he had no familiarity) to fulfill his foreign language requirement. He originally planned to major in journalism, but was warned away from it by the dean of the school of journalism, because “no American newspaper would hire an ethnic Japanese.” (Jack confirmed this as a realistic judgment of attitudes at the time toward Asian and African ethnics.) So he became an English major. Later he was cautioned again at the University: “With my Japanese face, I could never get an appointment to teach English literature.” Fortunately, the University of Washington had a department of oriental studies. He was offered and accepted a teaching fellowship to shift to Japanese literature—a language and literature not then known to him. (In 1932, he joined the staff of the *Japanese-American Courier*, a four-page Seattle English-language weekly, for the first time turning his attention to Japan.) So it was that, thanks to American prejudice, Jack became a scholar of Japanese politics. (He displayed no hint of bitterness at the obstacles he had encountered.) He spent 1936–1938 in Japan on scholarship, then returned to the University of Washington to teach about Japan.

Jack was “evacuated” briefly in 1942 with other Americans of Japanese descent in the area, but, fortunately, was never transported to a “relocation” center. Through an acquaintance, he was offered and accepted a job with the FCC in the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service in Washington, D.C. After about a year there, he was transferred to the Far Eastern Section of the Office of War Information, still dealing with Japanese matters. At this time, though fully employed, he managed to write a book exploring the historic roots of Japanese militarism. Wishing to go to Japan when the war was over, he applied to the Pentagon and found a job in the Government Section of General Headquarters, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, in Tokyo in 1946. He was there for six months, carrying on a study he had proposed dealing with the operation of Japanese government in the midst of devastation. He was among those who monitored the Japanese elections in April 1946.

Having seen Hiroshima after the bombing, he wrote to Mary: “Here was physical devastation wrought by man, which proved that he does not yet have the moral sense that he needs to survive.” Later he wrote of his “lifelong antipathy toward war.” He returned from Japan to Harvard (September, 1946–June, 1948), where he earned a Ph.D. in government, with his book on Japanese militarism serving as his dissertation. He returned to the University of Washington, where he taught for 18 years and participated actively in University governance and served as president of the Phi Beta Kappa and AAUP chapters.

In 1966, John Maki came to the University of Massachusetts, Amherst to chair the Program of Asian Studies and a Four College Committee on Asian and African Studies (established through a Ford Foundation grant to Amherst, Mt. Holyoke, and Smith Colleges and UMass). In 1967, he became vice dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, with special responsibility for personnel matters. After two years, the dean resigned and Jack declined an offer to replace him, thus ending his academic administrative career. Subsequently, he served as presiding officer of the Faculty Senate and an officer of the Phi Beta Kappa and AAUP chapters.

His return to the department faculty was a happy one. Jack was an excellent teacher. His work centered on his special knowledge of Japanese history and politics, but went well beyond this. Especially notable was his creation of an introductory course, *A Study of War*, which successfully challenged well-established American and comparative introductory courses. In 1999, he was awarded the Chancellor’s Medal, a distinct honor at UMass, Amherst, for contributions to the campus.

UMass, Amherst had long enjoyed an association with Hokkaido University, and Jack became involved with exchanges and visitor groups. In 1976, Hokkaido University awarded him an honorary Doctor of Laws degree for furthering American-Japanese understanding, promoting a sister university relationship between the two schools, and publishing a biography of William Smith Clark, an early Massachusetts Agricultural College president who spent 1876–1877 in Japan to establish a similar college there, and became a much-admired figure. In 1985, in recognition of his work to further U.S.-Japan understanding, Jack was awarded the Third Class Order of the Sacred Treasure by the emperor of Japan. A Japanese consular official recently explained to us the dignity of this high honor, which

Jack surely deserved. He helped forge a sister-state agreement between the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Hokkaido in 1987.

Among Maki’s publications is his valuable translation of *Japan’s Commission on the Constitution: The Final Report*, published by the University of Washington Press in 1980. As noted, he published a biography of W.S. Clark, widely respected in Japan for his work in founding Sapporo Agricultural College in Hokkaido. He published *Conflict and Tension in the Far East* in 1961, and was co-author with a former student of a study of Japan’s two constitutions (1889, 1947): *From Imperial Myth to Democracy*. He translated a number of works, including Agawa Hiroyuki’s Hiroshima novel, *The Devil’s Heritage*.

Jack Maki regarded the American occupation of Japan as one of the great achievements of the American foreign policy—a successful case of regime change and democratization, based on a well-defined policy from the beginning. He was deeply pleased with the elimination of the old militaristic and authoritarian state in Japan and the creation of a Japanese version of democracy. (In 2004 he contrasted this sharply with America’s lack of clear, sophisticated policy toward occupied Iraq.)

John Maki retired in 1980. In 1995, he made his final visit to Japan. He had a good meeting with Japanese cousins there, but concluded that the McGilvres were his true family, that he could never be really fluent in Japanese or think in Japanese, and that “I have always been culturally American.” In person, as in his autobiography, Jack conveyed an absolute lack of bitterness, a decency, a serenity of spirit, a sense of openness and curiosity that may properly serve as a model for those who knew him. A vigorous mind, a gentle person, a fine colleague, he left a distinctive mark upon this university and his profession.

Lewis C. Mainzer
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Nelson Polsby

Nelson Polsby, Heller Professor of Political Science and former director of the Institute of Governmental Studies at Berkeley, passed away on February 6, 2007, at the age of 72. He was a prominent member of a renowned graduate cohort group that studied under Robert Dahl at Yale in the fifties and included his long-time Berkeley colleagues Raymond Wolfinger and Aaron Wildavsky. After briefly teaching at the University of Wisconsin and Wesleyan University,

Nelson joined the University of California, Berkeley faculty in 1967, where he remained until his death. Nelson received many honors during his illustrious career, including honorary degrees from the University of Liverpool (1992) and the École Normale Supérieure de Cachan (2001), election to the American Academy of Arts and Science (1982), and the Frank Goodnow Award (2003) for Distinguished Service to the Political Science Profession. He was managing editor of the *American Political Science Review* from 1971–1977 and served on the editorial board of 21 other journals. His death was widely reported by the press in the U.S. and Europe, including a lengthy obituary in the *Times* of London.

Nelson was a preeminent scholar and public intellectual, a sage man with a devastating wit, and a beloved mentor to his closest graduate students. Famous but insecure, kind but gruff, an Anglophile who was disdainful of his faux aristocratic prep school classmates, and an iconoclast with a Burkean fear of drastic change, Nelson was endlessly fascinating because of his many contradictory traits and unique talents. Writing at a time when technical specialization was the surest path to success, Nelson's scholarly career and intellectual interests ranged comprehensively over many subfields of political science.

No one obituary could possibly do justice to Nelson Polsby's personality and writings, but fortunately, that is not required. In addition to many excellent profiles in the print media, his *The Forum* co-editor and former graduate student, Ray La Raja, has assembled a wonderful collection of tribute essays for Nelson in *The Forum* (volume 5, issue 1). I will only try to tie some of the pieces together, a task that Nelson often assigned himself when his friends died.

Nelson was interested in the big picture: "I swing for the fences," he used to say to me, "I don't do bunts or singles." So what was the final tally for Nelson, this scholar who swung for the fences?

Nelson did indeed hit a lot of homers: a dissertation on community power that became an instant classic, an article on the institutionalization of Congress that is one of the top 20 most-cited articles in the *American Political Science Review*, a widely adopted book on presidential elections that went into multiple editions over several presidential cycles, a capstone book late in his career that related social and technological transformation to congressional change, and so forth.

Nelson himself was too much the empiricist to claim to have a unifying vision of politics. Still, there was a pluralist coherence to his views, applying the

ideas he acquired in graduate school to many diverse aspects of American politics. Appreciating this resolves some of the seeming intellectual contradictions I alluded to earlier.

Two aspects of pluralism in particular reappear in much of Nelson's writing: First, that democracy was about competition and cooperation between different types of elites, not simple and unattainable egalitarianism, and second, that social structure and change helped to explain the evolution and development of political institutions, especially Congress.

In *Community Power and Political Theory*, Nelson observed that simple stratification theory did not fit the facts of the American experience very well. U.S. democracy has many different elites, some of them competing with one another and others working in fluid coalitions that varied across policy areas. The bases of elitism also vary and include talent, expertise, time, and experience as well as wealth. Since resource inequalities broadly defined are impossible to eliminate, political institutions must accommodate them, not function as if they did not exist. Democratic political structures should not favor any one inequality, but should let all contend freely in the various political arenas of a decentralized government.

Nelson's early pluralist roots are evident in a lifetime of his scholarship and opinions, especially his suspicion of supposedly egalitarian reforms. Party reforms intended to open up the process reduced the role of elected officials and insiders in favor of grassroots activists, thereby weakening the Democrats and leading to their political defeats in the sixties and seventies. The activists' ideological bent needed to be countered in a pluralist mix by the voices of elected officials who understood what it took to win (*The Consequences of Party Reform*). Party reform did not and could not eliminate inequalities in influence and power. It just shifted them, elevating the press corps into an even more critical role in the selection of presidential party nominees (*Media and Momentum: The New Hampshire Primary and Nomination Politics*).

Campaign finance reform, which intended to reduce the influence of group and individual donors, favored those with unequal amounts of time and education. Term limits, perhaps the worst of all reforms to Nelson's mind, undermined legislative experience and the natural processes of institutional development for the sake of political amateurism. Too often, reforms aiming for equality simply favored some groups over others, and removed valuable information, expertise,

and experience from the system. Nelson preferred a thick Madisonian broth full of varied perspectives and interests.

Another pluralist theme in Nelson's scholarship is the connection between social and political structures. Byron Shafer explores this angle in some depth in his tribute to Nelson in *The Forum*. Pluralist social conditions (i.e., a multiplicity of elites and interests) thrive in political systems with multiple arenas and decentralized decision-making. Congress, especially in its strong committee and pre-Newt phase, was a paradigmatic pluralist institution. Nelson loved Congress, and believed that it played a critical role in American democracy.

In one of his most important essays, "Legislatures," Nelson argued that the American Congress was organized in ways that made it "transformative," meaning that it was capable of making and amending legislation to a degree that most legislatures in the world were not. His seminal article, "The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives," traces the evolution of that institution into a progressively more complex and differentiated structure that allowed 435 individuals to pool their knowledge and expertise in ways that could transform diverse preferences and interests into policy. At the same time, that structure also reflected the political coalitions and norms of the immediate post-war period. Thus, when "air conditioning," among other things, transformed the South and shifted the coalitions of American political parties, it changed the organization of Congress in ways that reflected the cleaner ideological lines and higher polarization of contemporary America. As Eric Schickler writes in his reflection on *How Congress Evolves*, Nelson's final book was a "story of the partial de-institutionalization of the U.S. House" due to "the decline of the seniority system and the reduced role of committees in shaping legislation."

It would be unfair to him to say that Nelson's pluralist roots explained all. Nelson was interested in the history of ideas and biography. Some of this made its way into his scholarship (e.g., *Political Innovation in America: The Politics of Policy Initiation, or What If: Explorations in Social Science Fiction*), but most of it was conveyed to friends and students in conversation at tea time or dinner. He was a keen observer of elections and a serious student of voter behavior. He mastered British politics in a year, and wrote about it with Geoffrey Smith, a distinguished British journalist (*British Government and Its Discontents* [1981]).

Apart from his own scholarship, Nelson was instrumental in shaping and supporting the research of others. As director of the Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS), Nelson sponsored numerous seminars on topics in American and British government. He established an Overseas Americanist program, providing numerous European and Asian scholars with the opportunity to research American politics at the University of California at Berkeley. His door was always open to graduate students, and they congregated at his table to “pull up a toadstool,” listen to him, and just “hang out.” Tea time at the IGS was a chance for colleagues and other students to talk to and learn from Nelson.

Nelson served on innumerable prize and program committee for many organizations, including, of course, the American Political Science Association. He was president of the Yale University Council from 1986–1993, and chair of the Presidential Search Committee for the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1999–2000. He was greatly respected by the press corps and often quoted in the press. More than that, he was a public intellectual, who engaged regularly in serious intellectual discourse beyond the academy.

His health may have slowed him down physically in the final years, but never slowed his mind. Because he had survived previous health crises, his death caught us by surprise and left us greatly saddened.

Bruce E. Cain
University of California, Berkeley

Donald Rothchild

Professor Donald Rothchild, one the foremost of the students of African international relations, passed away on January 30, 2007, at the age of 78 from complications related to lymphoma.

Donald Rothchild was the author or editor of more than two dozen books and over 70 articles over a career spanning almost 50 years. He wrote perceptibly and with unflinchingly exhaustive scholarship on a range of African international relationships, including conflict mediation, international political economy, U.S. foreign policy toward Africa, ethnic politics, international regimes, international security, and Africa's place in contemporary world politics. A scholar of great breadth, he also wrote insightfully in the area of comparative politics as well as important work on Ghana, civil society, Afro-Marxist regimes, state-society relations, and other topics.

Rothchild was much honored for his high quality and path breaking scholarship. A professor of political science at the University of California, Davis from 1965 until his death, he was awarded a University of California system Distinguished Professorship in 2003. He received fellowships and awards from the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the U.S. Institute of Peace. His reputation for quality scholarship won him an international reputation. He taught for a time in four African universities, in Ghana, Zambia, Uganda, and Kenya. He was twice elected to the presidency of an International Political Science Association research committee.

Donald Rothchild's stature as a student of international relations with a particular emphasis on Africa led him to be in

great demand as a consultant. He served on numerous editorial boards, including the advisory board to Lynne Rienner Publishers and the *Western Political Quarterly*. But all this was but the tip of the iceberg. He was constantly in demand for panels at ASA conventions as well as meetings of the International Studies Association, American Political Science Association, and International Studies Association. He was instrumental in the formation of the African Politics Conference Group.

Professor Rothchild was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Kenyon College, receiving his M.A. from the University of California, Berkeley, and his Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University. Before coming to Davis, he taught at Colby College. He met his wife of over 50 years, Edith, during his two years of military service. In addition to Edith, he is survived by two sons, Derek of Hermosa Beach, CA and Maynard of San Marino, CA, and five grandchildren.

Don Rothchild was my great friend, colleague, and collaborator for more than three decades. But he was the great friend, colleague, and collaborator of legions of academics in political science and other fields and in many countries. He exemplified the academic community at its very best. With Don, scholarship and friendship were always seamlessly joined. He was unflinchingly generous and unselfish in encouraging the academic pursuits of countless students, colleagues, and collaborators who today support and build the study of international relations. For all of this he will remain a model and an inspiration.

John W. Harbeson
City University of New York