

often is a discipline in self deception rather than self analysis.<sup>12</sup>

Years later, talking to the graduate political science club at Columbia, he was challenged when he emphasized the intuitive elements in formulating a 'developmental construct' by the question: "Professor Lasswell, is that science?" His reply was iconoclastically brief: "The word 'science' does not make my pulse beat any faster."

Lasswell has been called a tough-minded and worldly man. At times his candor in making explicit certain rarely articulated features of social intercourse could bring this facet of his personality sharply home to the reader:

By the time any of us have learned to survive in politics or business, we have acquired an external facade that can be manipulated for purposes of partial deception. At the same time the successful person has learned that some men are trustworthy—if not absolutely, at least sufficiently for collegial or even friendly purposes. If the individual has not learned *selective trust as well as selective distrust*, he is likely to fail and to belong in the category of the mentally ill.<sup>13</sup>

In the wide circle of his friends, he was the best of companions, witty, erudite, a voluble man full of ideas and stories to tell, yet sensitive to the views and feelings of others. His own comments, once again, add depth to the image:

We spend our lives becoming adept in varying measure in drawing inferences about the moods and images of others, automatically formulating and testing hypotheses that are based on posture, body movement, gesture, speech and overt participation in a great range of social situations.

His associate and friend for 43 years, Myres McDougal of Yale, recalls that Lasswell's very presence created intellectual excitement:

His whole life was a life of the mind directed toward action. He had no time for trivia, but took a deep interest in all whose primary concern was for enlightenment and action in the common interest. . . . Almost by indirection he could assist friends better to understand themselves, others, and the larger configuration of events about them. He also had the ability to teach us both to aspire beyond our grasp and how to extend our grasp.<sup>14</sup>

Lasswell's work featured a persistent microanalytical attention to individuals, to how they think and feel, cope with their lot, share symbol worlds that give form and focus to their social lives, and communicate with each other, near and far. At the same time, over the full

span of his career, Lasswell recurrently traced and tried to anticipate world revolutionary developments, changes in the composition and rhetoric of elites, and growth in the organized power of various skill groups, especially of those whose skills are in the use of violence and in the spreading of enlightenment.

Lasswell spent his lifetime blazing new trails. His contributions made some people nervous; they deeply and lastingly impressed others. In half a dozen subdisciplines, Lasswell was the first to show what features needed to be an integral part of the research agenda, and—once professional interest quickened in the inquiries he had begun—his work was acknowledged to be stimulating and seminal. In his own lifetime, he was fated to see his terse definitions and mapping sentences become common currency, and to witness piecemeal incorporation of his key notions into other, more prosaic frames of reference. Many of his strikingly original formulations are simply taken for granted 50 years after he proposed them. His basic ideas are freely transformed and reformulated by those who use them best. Typically, indeed, those who fully grasped what he meant by contextuality, by versatile methodology, and by problem-solving relevance have fashioned their own tools and techniques for inquiry. The application of his agenda—his schematics—his teachings, so persistently, systematically, and imaginatively elaborated, lies in the future.

Dwaine Marvick  
University of California, Los Angeles

## Peter Christian Ludz

Peter Christian Ludz will be remembered as a pioneer of research on the German Democratic Republic. After studying political science and sociology in Mainz, Munich, Berlin and Paris, he became director of the GDR section of the Otto Suhr Institute of Political Science at the Free University of Berlin. He remained there until 1970 when he assumed the political science chair at the University of Bielefeld. In 1973 he was appointed a professor of political science at the University of Munich as well as research director of the strategic studies institute at Ebenhausen.

Ludz was a frequent visitor to the United States and for several years taught a seminar at Columbia University. Students of German affairs will probably be most familiar with his 1970 three-volume comparative (FRG-GDR) study on *The State of the Nation*, written at the request of Chancellor Willy Brandt. Ludz himself was most proud of his theory of totalitarian societies, published as an introduction to a 1962 edition of the sociological essays of Georg Lukacs.

In recent years what interested Ludz most were his activities as a consultant to practicing politicians. He was present at countless meetings and seminars; an inveterate traveler he became the quintessential political science con-

<sup>12</sup>"Self Analysis and Judicial Thinking," *Ethics*, 40 (April 1930), p. 356.

<sup>13</sup>*A Pre-View of the Policy Sciences* (1971), p. 80.

<sup>14</sup>*The Interpretations of Agreements and World Public Order* (with others, 1967, p. xvii).

sultant. In early September, after attending the Moscow IPSA meetings, at the age of 48, he took his own life. His insightful writings, combining American and German methodological approaches, will be missed by scholars on both sides of the Atlantic.

Charles R. Foster  
Committee on Atlantic Studies

## Stein Rokkan

On July 22, 1979, Stein Rokkan died in Bergen, Norway. He was 58 years old. Although his health had seriously deteriorated over a period of several years prior to his death, he continued his scholarly work until the end.

Stein Rokkan was born in Holandshamn in northern Norway on July 4, 1921, completed his gymnasium years in 1939, and in 1948 received a *magister artium* in political philosophy from the University of Oslo. His interest soon shifted to empirical work in comparative politics, particularly European political systems, a subject on which he was to become one of the masters of our time. To this task he brought formidable resources. He was at home not only in the Scandinavian languages but in French, English, and German; he also read Spanish and Italian. His knowledge of the modern history of European states and society was extraordinarily broad and deep, and lent an historical perspective to much of his work. While his detailed historical understanding made him acutely sensitive to the unique aspects of each nation's development, his research and writing were animated by a search for patterns, for similarities in the midst of diversity.

He often seemed to his friends to have read everything of significance in modern history, recent political science, and sociology. An untiring worker himself, he also stimulated and encouraged others. He carried on a huge correspondence. He was indefatigable in meetings and conferences, and in addition a superb organizer. His myriad activities and his unending generosity in helping students and fellow scholars did not prevent his own steady production of important new work.

His contributions to international political science were immense. Possibly his most influential writings dealt with the development of European political systems. In the early 1960s he began to formulate the macro-model, as he called it, of Western European political development, with which he sought to account for the individual characteristics of the party systems in Western European countries as the resultant of the interacting effects on a country's development of four major revolutionary changes: the Reformation, the National Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and the International or Russian Revolution. However, because Rokkan was far too aware of and sensitive to historical differences to apply any theory of development in a simplistic or mechanical way, he added a number of other explanatory factors that made

his model quite complex, one understood and appreciated best by scholars who shared some of his vast range of historical knowledge. At the time of his death he held a German Marshall Fund fellowship awarded to provide him the time he felt he needed for further specifying, testing, and evaluating his model.

Although his best known contributions are European and cross-national, Stein Rokkan never lost his scholarly interest in the Norwegian political system, on which he wrote extensively; and because he normally wrote and published in English, he helped extend knowledge of Norwegian politics to American, British and European political scientists and sociologists. In his work on Norway he emphasized the clash between "center" and "periphery," and thereby created interest in that dimension of conflict among political scientists considering other countries. In one of his essays on Norway he also emphasized the conflict between "numerical democracy" on the one hand and, on the other, the increasing *de facto* and *de jure* importance of "corporate pluralism," by which he meant decision making by the nationally organized interests—employers, trade unions, farmers, and consumers. Here again he announced a theme that other scholars took up as the existence of "corporate pluralism" became evident in more and more countries.

While his own research and writing aided many other scholars and directly influenced their research, he also had a major impact on political science through his fostering, encouraging, training, and stimulating others to carry on scholarly research in political science and sociology. With this end in view, he organized a large number of summer schools and workshops. He also was a prime mover in the conceptual and practical work of developing data archives, and in the creation of the European Consortium for Political Research, of which he was chairman from 1970-76. Perhaps no single scholar contributed more to the development of political science in Europe.

In his last years this ideal example of international cooperation was showered with international honors and recognition—sometimes, alas, accompanied by heavy duties. After serving actively in the international associations both of political science and sociology, he was invited to serve as president of each. He accepted the presidency of the International Political Science Association, where he served from 1970-1973. He also was president of the International Social Science Council for four years, three times a fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and visiting professor at Manchester, Stanford, Geneva, the London School of Economics, and the Institut d'Etudes Politiques in Paris. He held a permanent appointment as Visiting Professor at Yale University. He was a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a foreign associate of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States, and a member of the Finnish and Norwegian Academies of Sciences. He received honorary degrees from the University of Uppsala in 1970,