Samuel Thomas, dean, School of Business and Public Administration, Baruch College, CUNY.

Promotions

Herbert B. Asher, Ohio State University: professor.

Bruce A. Campbell, University of Georgia: associate professor.

Bradley C. Canon, University of Kentucky: professor.

Marn J. Cha, California State University, Fresno: professor.

Anthony Champagne, Rutgers University: associate professor.

George F. Cole, University of Connecticut: professor.

Eric Davis, Rutgers University: assistant professor.

Joel R. Dickinson, Northern Michigan University: associate professor.

Delmer D. Dunn, University of Georgia: professor.

Harris Effross, Rutgers University: research professor.

Max B. Franc, California State University, Fresno: professor.

Trand Gilberg, Pennsylvania State University: professor.

Robert C. Horn, California State University, Northridge: professor.

Ronald W. Johnson, Pennsylvania State University: associate professor.

Marjorie Lansing, Eastern Michigan University: professor.

Robert J. Lieber, University of California, Davis: professor.

William E. Lyons, University of Kentucky: professor.

B. David Meyers, University of North Carolina, Greensboro: associate professor.

Edward J. Miller, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point: associate professor.

Peter Moody, University of Notre Dame: associate professor.

Jack H. Nagel, University of Pennsylvania: associate professor.

Robert E. O'Connor, Pennsylvania State University: associate professor.

Marian Lief Palley, University of Delaware: professor.

Han Shik Park, University of Georgia: associate professor.

Dianne M. Pinderhughes, Dartmouth College: assistant professor.

Paul K. Pollock, Beloit College: professor.

Robert L. Savage, University of Arkansas: associate professor.

Timothy M. Shaw, Dalhousie University: associate professor and director, Centre for African Studies.

Bhola P. Singh, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point: professor.

Roger F. Snider, University of Idaho: assistant professor.

Peter Stillman, Vassar College: associate professor.

Bernadyne Turpen, Rutgers University: assistant professor.

Alden H. Voth, San Jose State University: professor.

A. Peter Walshe, University of Notre Dame: professor.

Herbert F. Weisberg, Ohio State University: professor.

John A. Wettergreen, San Jose State University: professor.

Frederick W. Zuercher, University of South Dakota: professor.

Retirements

Willard F. Barber, Lecturer in International Affairs, University of Maryland, has retired from the University as of July 1, 1977.

William Greer McCall, professor of political science, McNeese State University, has retired as of June 1977.

William Tucker, Texas Tech University, has retired as of August 1977.

Correction

In the Summer 1977 *PS*, Robert B. Highsaw was listed on page 404 of the News and Notes section as promoted to Professor. That entry should have read promoted to "University Professor." *PS* regrets this error.

In Memoriam

Raymond A. Bauer

Raymond A. Bauer was a psychologist whose contributions to social science knew no disciplinary boundaries. He contributed to Soviet studies, the development of social indicators, and to management research. An untimely death from throat cancer in August 1977 stopped his lively and original work.

Ray Bauer's professional career started with Russian studies at the time of World War II. Immediately after the War he joined the Har-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900623913 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vard study of Soviet society that had been organized by Clyde Kluckhohn. Bauer organized the interviewing of displaced persons from the USSR who had been left in Western Europe as a result of the war. These interviews with individuals who had been moved by the Nazis as slave laborers, but who had been ordinary Soviet citizens under Stalin before then, opened up for social science a crack in that extraordinary shell of secrecy in which the pre-war Stalin regime surrounded its society. Ray Bauer's first book on Soviet affairs (his dissertation), "The New Man in Soviet Psychology" (1952), dealt with psychological concepts embedded in the Soviet political ideology, and was largely based on published materials. The next three books of which he was author or co-author depended primarily on the displaced person interviews, and clarified the character of daily life within the Soviet system. His "Nine Soviet Portraits" (1955) portrayed in ideal-type biographies different kinds of individuals and their life experiences in the system. Then in 1956 (with Alex Inkeles and Clyde Kluckhohn) he published "How the Soviet System Works," and in 1958 (with Alex Inkeles) "The Soviet Citizen."

From 1953 to 1957, Bauer taught in the political science program at M.I.T. and was in the Research Program on International Communications at the Center for International Studies there. In that period of novel and expanding American involvement in the outside world, he studied how American businessmen informed themselves about foreign situations, and made judgments about foreign economic policy. "American Business and Public Policy" was the report on that study, a book that won the APSA's Woodrow Wilson Award for 1963. No-one would doubt that economic interest enters into businessmen's behavior, but that, the book argued, was a shallow explanation. The question to which the book addressed itself was how the structure of information flows, responsibility, and decision making shaped how businessmen perceived their self-interest, and for that matter how such factors shaped the perceptions of their interest by Congressmen and lobbyists too. Questions of that sort have reappeared in Ray Bauer's writings ever since.

During Bauer's period at MIT, he also made an important contribution to the psychological understanding of attitude formation through his work on imaginary audiences. In the course of thinking and deciding, people conduct internal dialogues; the conclusions that they reach depend in part on their anticipations of reactions by these internalized audiences. Bauer's original statement was in an article with Claire Zimmerman in the Public Opinion Quarterly (Spring 1956) on "The Effect of an Audience on What Is Remembered"; a late review of the subject appears in Bauer's chapter in the "Handbook of Communication."

Since 1957, Professor Bauer taught at the Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, where he held tne Joseph C. Wilson chair. There he published on television advertising, and the public's feelings about it, on the processes of policy formation, and on corporate responsibility.

The concept of social indicators entered the mainstream of American social thought through a project of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences that Bauer directed in the mid-1960s. It led to the book "Social Indicators" (1966). It is a long time since people challenged the concept of such economic indicators as "cost of living," or "GNP" on the ground that they involve the adding together of apples and oranges, and that they fail to take account of the infinite complexity of reality. In economics, such logical issues have been fought out and clarified; it has come to be generally recognized that well-defined simplifications can be useful tools, especially for time series comparisons. Consensus on, and understanding of, the value of similar indicators of a non-economic character still remains to be won; logical objections and skepticism greet proposals for social indicators. Yet thanks to Bauer's pioneering work, and persuasive exposition the concept is beginning to gain acceptance.

In 1970, he joined the White House staff for half a year in an attempt to develop a national social indicators program. It was a frustrating experience for him, but while no great breakthrough occurred in that political environment, the idea keeps making progress, on the Hill, in the Executive Branch, and in private foundations. There seems to be little reason to doubt that in the end there will be extensive development of social indicators and acceptance of them.

Those who had the good fortune to work with Ray Bauer would have no difficulty agreeing about a couple of distinctive personal characteristics that ran through his career. One of these was warmth in human relations; another was sensitive awareness of "Second Order Consequences" (the title of one of his 17 books).

Ray Bauer had innumerable devoted friends. He cared about people, and they reciprocated in caring for him. It would be hard to draw a line between his friends, and his students, and his co-workers, for they all became his friends. He had been president of the American Association of Public Opinion Research; he was widely active and accepted in both academic and business circles. People in all walks of life responded to him. He grew up in Chicago, and had worked as a foundry laborer and materials tester; he never lost touch with ordinary people. He followed sports avidly. His ability to relate to people was part of what made him a superb interviewer and field worker. It also entered into his empathy with decision makers. Perhaps it was his sensitivity to people which led to his disinclination to make flat judgments of right and wrong. He could always be counted upon to note unobvious systems consequences of actions and policies. Others might jump to one-sided conclusions, but Ray Bauer, while always concerned for human welfare, would see things as trade-offs. That kind of thoughtfulness leads to moderation; in some people

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900623913 Published online by Cambridge University Press

moderation in turn leads to Hamletian inhibition of action. Not so in the case of Ray Bauer. He was always ready to try the new. That was true in his personal life, in academic methodology, and in social policy. He was thus a rare combination of a scholar and a man of action, an innovator and a moderate.

Ithiel de Sola Pool
M.I.T.

Martin Diamond

Only an exceptionally strong mind and heart could possibly have sustained the range and diversity of Martin Diamond's interests, associations, and activities. The characteristic tension of his life was created by the many different and sometimes conflicting demands he allowed to be placed upon him. His friends constantly urged that he spend himself less freely (while of course taking plenty for ourselves), but he would not and could not give less than all of his remarkable talents and his good, affectionate nature.

Diamond was a superb speaker. Perhaps that is what he did best of all. On the stump, at the lectern, in academic conferences and confrontations, before public audiences, to statesmen, with friends—he spoke magnificently. He had the actor's sense of and concern for the details and the style of his presentation. He took pleasure in the finely turned, thoughtful phrase. He sought always to speak, of course intelligently and lucidly, but also with some elegance. He was a master story-teller and had a vast reservoir of perfectly remembered, subtle jokes that were always funny and in point. He enjoyed, and admitted that he enjoyed, the applause of his hearers. He once asked jokingly how he could get credit for suppressing a pertinent but not quite first-rate joke. He did not pretend indifference to being on the cover of *Time* as one of the country's ten best teachers. But he knew precisely the value of all the praise he received, and he valued most the applause of a quickened understanding. If his audience, whether in a great hall or in someone's dining room, was restless or inattentive or indifferent he died a little, and he made extraordinary and almost always successful efforts to reach it, to make it respond, understand, join his wonder at human nobility and human folly. These qualities helped to make Diamond the great teacher he is universally acknowledged to have been.

In addition to his own teaching in a wide variety of forums, Diamond was active in thinking and writing and teaching about teaching. He attempted to resist narrow, value-free, sub-political teaching about politics, at the lower as well as the college and graduate levels. He did all he could to arrest the decline in understanding among teachers of politics of the relevance and the nobility of the writings and doings of the American Founding Fathers. In his own teaching, in lectures and writings, in his textbook on American government, and as a member of the American Political Science Association committees on undergraduate education, he sought to reach out as widely as he could with tough-minded support for the nobility of teaching politics and for good teaching about the American tradition and American heroes.

At one time Diamond aspired to be an actor or perhaps a director, and he retained a keen interest in the arts, especially the movies. (He took pleasure in out-"buffing" self-declared, serious movie buffs.) But Diamond could no more have been content as an actor than he could have foresworn being an actor at all. He was determined to speak his own words, his own mind, at the highest level he could reach. The words he uttered as a young socialist agitator in New York City did not seem, finally, to stand up to the tests of experience and critical examination, and this led him on a journey into academia, providing him with the germ of his interpretation of the intellectual failure of American socialism, which became his Ph.D. dissertation. Entering the University of Chicago, without a B.A., for graduate studies in 1950, Diamond enthusiastically shared and contributed to the vitality of Chicago's Department of Political Science in the early 1950s, where a solid social science orthodoxy was under courteous, relentless attack by Leo Strauss, a remarkable professor from the New School for Social Research who proposed to restore, and who did in fact restore, political philosophy to a place in contemporary political science. Some of Diamond's writing and much of his teaching was concerned with elaborating or trying to explain or simply trying to understand Strauss' criticism of social science and the complex and difficult alternative he presented. Of special note here are his attempts to clarify, in ways guided by Aristotle but pertinent to contemporary political science, the notion of "opinion" and the relation of fact and value. A sketch of this ambitious project was presented in a series of lectures at Loyola University in 1970; portions were published in an essay on "The Dependence of Fact Upon 'Value'," in *Interpretation* (1972) and his William Benet Munro Memorial Lecture at Stanford University in 1975 on "Opinion, Passion, and Interest in Political Life."

But while the context of Diamond's intellectual concern was the tradition of political philosophy that Strauss opened, the focus was on the American regime. To understand the basic principles of the American regime, Diamond turned to the intentions of its makers. Establishing for this generation of Americans (including political scientists), the relevance of the Founders to contemporary questions was Diamond's first major object, and it is his major scholarly achievement. The American Constitution and the writings surrounding it, especially the great *Federalist* Papers, were not, Diamond showed, a reactionary turning away from the principles of the Declaration of Independence. In Diamond's view profoundly democratic, these documents were rather a response to the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900623913 Published online by Cambridge University Press