

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

"and friend," there could be no more fitting epitaph.

I first met Joe at a political science gathering in 1953 when he was introduced to me, and some other members of the New York University Government Department (such was consultation in those days) as our new colleague. It was not an auspicious beginning: I can recall a modest dislike for this strangely intense, unwelcome individual who seemingly wanted to talk only about political science in general and about something he called the "group theory of politics" in particular.

The NYU department then numbered perhaps 15 individuals. With one exception, all occupied desks in a single, large open office. Immediately adjacent was another, almost equally sizable room to which, for reasons which slip my memory, I had been assigned. Almost immediately after Joe's arrival, and for reasons which could only do him credit, he was moved from the common departmental office into mine. There we sat together, in semi-solitary splendor.

We were an unlikely pair. Joe had been trained at Cornell and had an incredible knowledge of both the traditional and the then contemporary political science literature. I was a not unusual Chicago product for that period—well read in the social sciences but with what could only charitably be described as a spotty background in political science. Nor could our attitudes toward the discipline have been more dissimilar, diverging as much then as they did 15 years later when we wrote, rather euphemistically, of our "basic differences of outlook." Having so little in common, it was almost inevitable—as Joe would have said—that we became collaborators and then fast friends.

That association and friendship lasted for almost 30 years, never interrupted, despite our professional disagreements, by a quarrel or even angry words; interrupted but never broken by geographic and professional separation. When we joined forces again in 1979, to update our "history," it was as if there had been no intervening hiatus. I marveled, as before, at his grasp of the discipline, both in small detail and in broad perspective. Joe knew all the political science literature, who had written what, when; who was working on what; which were the prom-

ising trends, which least so; where the profession was headed—and where, instead, it should be going. That we did not necessarily agree was quite another matter.

I marveled, too, that, as before, he talked about "intellectual retirement." In the interim, of course, he had continued to publish; read widely in the social sciences; had mastered two highly technical fields outside his own discipline; played a crucial role in launching the doctoral program at Stony Brook; served, *inter alia*, as a member of the American Political Science Association Trust and Development Fund Board, chairman and member of the Committee on Professional Ethics, and Vice President of the Association; and, of late, still threatening "retirement," had launched himself into yet another exotic field, cognitive psychology.

And I marveled, finally, at the curious disparity between what he professed and what he really felt. At least in private, Joe spoke disparagingly of the quest for a scientific political science; behavioralism, to use one of his favorite terms, was simply "wrong-headed." But from his first infatuation with "group theory" he clung stubbornly to the belief that the quest for the Holy Grail would ultimately be successful. In our very last exchange, a lengthy phone conversation two days before his death, he discoursed enthusiastically about the possibilities inherent in sociobiology, rational choice theory, and, of course, cognitive psychology. And, I am proud to say, this time I did not chide nor remind him of past, equally hopeful enthusiasms. After 25 years, I had finally learned.

Albert Somit  
Southern Illinois University  
at Carbondale