alongside the work of Harold F. Gosnell as among the few scholarly studies made between the era of the Muckrakers and modern studies of urban politics which focused on the conditions producing urban political machines and their consequences for urban politics. His later edited work, *Public Men* (1946), assembled a number of studies of the interplay of personalities and institutions at various levels of government. His other books, *The American Politician* (edited, 1938), *The Pattern of Politics: The Folkways of a Democratic People* (1940), and *The People's Choice: Philadelphia's William S. Vare* (1971), were variations on these themes.

As teacher, Salter s strength lay in encouraging young men and women to enter public life, and in illustrating how to begin. Major and minor figures in Wisconsin politics appeared gladly before his classes, after which students wrote essays: "Why did this person enter politics?" "How did he begin?" "As politician, what activities made up his days?" "What part did his personality play?" "What was his role in, and attitude towards, organization?" The professor cared little for grades; but legislators, administrators, and judges have testified through the years to the influence on their careers of Salter's work.

Not all his activity was at the Wisconsin base. He enjoyed stints of teaching at Rockford College and Stanford University. During World War II he was a historian in the War Department and later in the War Assets Administration. After the war there were short terms of service at the University of the Philippines, and as Smith-Mundt Professor at National Chengchi and National Taiwan Universities. Abroad as at home he regarded his principal mission and achievement as the encouragement of ordinary people to understand and to participate fully in their political processes.

Surviving him are his wife, a brother, three daughters and two sons, seventeen grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

Llewellyn Pfankuchen
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Leo Strauss
I.

After years of oppressive illnesses and frailty, Leo Strauss, Scott Buchanan Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence at St. John's College, died gently in his sleep on October 18, 1973, in Annapolis, Maryland. With his writing proceeding at an undiminished pace, and in the midst of eager preparations for two new public lectures, he died as he wished, and as he would have been amused to remark, "with his boots on."

Mr. Strauss was born in Kirchhain, Hessen, Germany, on September 20, 1899. He studied at a number of German universities, but chiefly at Marburg and Hamburg, and from the latter received his doctorate in 1921. He spent much of the Weimar years working as a research assistant at the Academy of Jewish Research in Berlin. In 1932, a Rockefeller Foundation fellowship provided him with a year's study in France and, then, opportunely made possible his safe resettlement with his wife and son in England, where he remained until 1938 when he migrated to the United States. It was only then, with his appointment to the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science of the New School for Social Research, that he began the teaching career that was so central a part of his scholarly achievement.

In 1949, Mr. Strauss accepted an appointment at the University of Chicago and there, during the fine postwar years, contributed powerfully to the many currents in the profession that have flowed vigorously in the Chicago department. In 1959, he became the Robert Maynard Hutchins Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science and retained this chair emeritus until the time of his death. During his Chicago years, Mr. Strauss also was a visiting professor at various universities, among them the University of California at Berkeley and Hebrew University, and was during 1960-61 a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. After his retirement at Chicago in 1968, he taught at Claremont Men's College until 1969, when he moved to St. John's College where he remained until his death. During these last years, his scholarly work was generously supported by a grant from the Earhart Foundation.

It is yielding to a good habit, in writing this remembrance, to follow Mr. Strauss' lead, that is, by taking a leaf from an essay he wrote on the occasion of the death of his colleague Kurt Riezler. He observed that, because Riezler was both a thinker and a man of action, to pay him tribute one would have not only to analyze his thought but also "to describe him in action, and to bring to light the man himself." Now Leo Strauss was not in any ordinary sense a man of action; yet in him the life of thought became a kind of life of action. His philosophic quest so informed the whole man that his life acquired a special and instructive charm that makes it necessary in this case also "to describe him in action, and to bring to light the man himself."

In his tribute, Mr. Strauss claimed to be inadequate to the necessary task. How much more is that the case here. But something may be attempted.

To describe Leo Strauss in action is to describe him in class, in his office, in the corridors, in his home, among students and friends, enjoying good talk on all manner of things, learned and very much otherwise, but always especially conversing on political things, listening attentively, and talking with vigor, grace, humor, plainness, and clarity. He had a robust appetite for the contemplation of politics, followed closely the great political events of his lifetime, and considered closely the great political figures. He enjoyed history and biography, and those books that he found fullest of political life he read over and over. No matter how abstract or abstruse the subject, he would always bring the discussion back to the massive,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900607269 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plain, recognizable stuff of politics and common life. His teaching and speech were a model in action of what he insisted on as a matter of theory: namely, "that social phenomena must be understood primarily in the way in which they come into sight in the perspective of the citizen or statesman." He acted always on his theoretical teaching, that one must "ascend from the phenomena, as primarily given, to their principles." He insisted always on careful attention to the surface of things as "the indispensable condition for progress toward the center." His life was instructed by his conviction that political things are the surface, the known-to-us, solid surface, from which the philosophic study of the whole must begin and to which it must return.

We may observe that it was this joy in political things, this openness to human things, that enabled the quiet scholar nurtured in the high European tradition to come so easily to terms with, to understand and enjoy, American politics and life. He enjoyed the power of American speech, like all ordinary speech, to capture bluntly but exactly the twists and turns of political life. He greatly enjoyed in his lectures making edifying references to Marshal Dillon, Doc, and Kitty, to Perry Mason, and, latterly, to Colombo, all of whose adventures he followed with pleasure. And he had a deep appreciation of the strength and decency of the fundamental American political institutions. This appreciation he expressed with memorable mildness and prudence at a special program arranged for him at the 1964 meetings of the American Political Science Association. Responding to questions that seemed to him excessively melancholy regarding the American polity, he said that he was "sanguine about liberal democracy in this country, more sanguine than are many of my young friends, because so long as it remains true to itself, philosophy remains possible."

Leo Strauss' lifelong devotion to philosophy will be remembered by his students in countless ways. But perhaps what will remain most in the mind's eye will be the picture of him, still young, quietly powerful, holding forth for long hours in his classes at the University of Chicago. During twenty years, in an imposing variety of courses, most devoted to single thinkers, many to a single work, and all proceeding by means of a painstaking explication of the text, Mr. Strauss captivated in successive generations many of the Chicago department's most promising students. No teacher of political science in our time attracted a greater or more devoted personal following. But this was something of a puzzle because no one could have wished less for a following on merely personal grounds, no teaching could have been more disdainful of sycophancy, and no one could have been more lacking in the "charisma" ordinarily cited to explain such attraction. Now much can be attributed to his erudition, the forcefulness of his views, his devotion to teaching and his generosity to students; but all this, being present in others, is insufficient to account for the unique degree of his influence over students of such human variety and quality. What seems necessary to explain the phenomenon is this: In his small and modest person, he made visible to his admiring students and friends the power, purity, and beauty of the philosophic study of politics.

The devotion and fascination of his students was nothing more than his due. Grateful to have known the man, his students and friends grieve that he is no more.

Martin Diamond
Northern Illinois University

II.

Mr. Strauss's scholarly corpus consists at present of some eighty contributions to journals and thirteen books, of which three are collections of articles and two are the elaborations of material delivered on lectureships. Some of his books are available in translation in six European languages. Between 1930 *(Die Religionskritik Spinozas)* and 1958 *(Thoughts on Machiavelli),* most of his books were on the moderns; from 1964 to his death, his books were on the classic ancients. Known as he is for having inclined toward antiquity, it is worth noting that his studies of Spinoza, Hobbes, and Machiavelli, as well as *Natural Right and History,* appeared in roughly the first half of the period during which his books were being published. It was characteristic of his scholarship that he did not criticize, and most certainly did not dismiss, where he had not first given his careful attention. It appears also that he did not merely prefer antiquity but rather rediscovered it through an arduous process that evidently impressed him as an ascent.

Social science, and especially political science, knew Mr. Strauss as a severe and sometimes sharp critic. He came close to suggesting that the social sciences, through the abstraction from moral concern that accompanied the quest for scientific validity, were in danger of becoming irrelevant. In a famous remark in "An Epilogue" to *Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics* (ed. Herbert J. Storing), Mr. Strauss asserted that the new political science was in the position of fiddling while Rome burned. He seems to have provided a forecast that social science has been blaming itself for not producing; he did not foresee how far his criticism would become the confession of the discipline.

Mr. Strauss has long been described as controversial, and in view of his thought could hardly have been described otherwise. To modernity he taught the claims of antiquity. In an era profoundly affected by the successes of science he kept alive deep reservations against the unreflective enlargement of that vast human enterprise. In an age overrun by the belief in history, he reminded of eternity. Where convention or culture was regarded as everything, he spoke of nature. Those who twisted nature into a license heard from him about propriety and convention. Ideologists harboring behind science were rebuked in the name of philosophy.