

and dynamic lectures, which they recall with vividness, even decades later. Graduate students, in turn, were challenged to think deeply and critically, and to care passionately about teaching. Those who became college professors cannot help but channel his spirit, so his impact ripples into the future.

UW department chairs and colleagues note that when traveling the country to meet with alumni, invariably Booth Fowler comes up in conversation, not only as a favorite teacher, but as someone who made students think, changed their lives, and launched their careers.

Booth challenged his students to lead examined lives, to answer for themselves the timeless question: How shall we live? His legacy is as much about how to be a good human as anything else. He loved students, and many of us remember the numerous kindnesses he extended. As a testament to his impact, former students, colleagues, and acolytes endowed in his honor a chair in the UW Political Science Department, the Robert Booth Fowler Professorship.

In retirement Booth was a model social capitalist (as Robert Putnam would say), giving local talks, participating in numerous card groups and book clubs, keeping up with former students and colleagues, gracing family gatherings, and actively volunteering for his church. A longtime member of St. Paul's Catholic Student Center on the Madison campus, he served as chair of the church board, librarian, and historian. He published *Cath-*

olics on State Street: A History of St. Paul's in Madison (2012). Based on archival research and interviews, the book presents a lively account of the century of the church's history, including the controversies!

Booth's life was also a love story. Together with his soulmate and beloved wife of 35 years, Alice Joy Honeywell, they hiked national parks, enjoyed foreign films, and relished time with friends and family. Booth especially enjoyed cheering on Alice's biking adventures. When she and a friend biked from Oregon to Maine and wrote a book about it, *Across America by Bicycle: Alice and Bobbi's Summer on Wheels* (2010), Booth became its most enthusiastic promoter. Blessedly, just weeks before his illness emerged, Booth was also able to attend the joyous wedding celebration of his beloved son, Ben. For those of us who knew Booth, and loved him, his absence is unfathomable.

Thankfully the UW Political Science Department recorded a 2019 interview with Booth on its podcast, so we can hear again his voice, his laughter, and his incisive wit: https://soundcloud.com/user-311056976-906363553/prof-emeritus-rob-ert-booth-fowler-on-a-life-spent-learning?utm_source=clipboard&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=social_sharing. ■

— Allen D. Hertzke, *University of Oklahoma*;
Laura R. Olson, *Clemson University*;
and Kevin R. den Dulk, *Calvin University*

Johan Galtung

Johan Galtung, an international researcher and public intellectual, passed away on 17 February at 93. He was an innovative scholar, an academic entrepreneur, and a lecturer world-wide.

He was born in Oslo on 24 October 1930. 15 years later, this date would see the founding of the United Nations. There is something symbolic about having the same birthday as the UN. As a researcher, Galtung's orientation was unusually international. An excellent linguist, he was well-travelled and made his home in several countries.

He was a person of exceptional energy. Following a double high-school degree, he completed two MA degrees (in statistics and sociology) and went on to hold professorships in several fields and in many countries. In his younger years, he signed a pledge not to take the old Norwegian doctoral degree, but he came to hold honorary doctorates from a range of universities. After establishing what would become the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in 1959, he founded the *Journal of Peace Research* in 1964. Neither of these would have become what they are today without the impetus that Galtung gave them in their early years. He also played a crucial role in nurturing young aspiring peace researchers in the other Nordic countries. In 1969, he became the first Professor of Conflict and Peace Research at the University of Oslo. While this was not a personal chair, it would never have been established if Galtung's supporters at the University and in political circles had not known that there would be at least one committed and competent applicant. At the time, the establishment of a new Norwegian University chair had to be approved by Parliament. Galtung was not yet 40 when he was appointed, but in a sense, it was already too late. Sabbaticals and leaves of absence abroad became more frequent and lengthier, and in 1978 he resigned—explain-

ing his decision with reference to the spirit of the 1968 student protests: no one should hold a professorship for more than 10 years. Now came teaching positions in many other countries, including political science at the University of Hawaii for over a decade. He also taught methodology in the Sociology department at Columbia University for a few years around 1960, invited by Paul Lazarsfeld, and international relations at Princeton in the mid-1980s, in addition to guest professorships at a large number of universities world-wide.

Galtung's first projects at PRIO resulted in a series of articles in *Journal of Peace Research*. They continue to be his most cited works and concerned topics such as structural violence, concepts of peace, international news dissemination, imperialism, international diplomacy, and the role of summits in international relations. Together with philosopher Arne Næss, he was also a pioneer of efforts to codify Gandhi's ideas about non-violence and conflict management.

After Galtung left PRIO and moved to the University of Oslo and later to his international career, he also reoriented his scholarship in many ways. He became less interested in the pursuit of statistical regularities and developed instead a program for overcoming invariances. His public remarks became more acerbic and polemical, gaining him many critics. He never had problems attracting students and collaborators, but many of us, his students from his years of scholarly entrepreneurship in Scandinavia, found it difficult to follow him in his new orientation. As a scholarly field, peace research became more accepted, and as some would argue, more conventional. Johan could be extremely critical, suggesting, for example, that PRIO should change its name to something like the Norwegian Institute for Security Research. It was with a certain sense of unease that some of us opened his autobiography, *Johan uten land* (John Lackland), which was published on his 70th birthday, and then 10 years later, his *Launching Peace Studies: The First PRIO*

Years. But in both these books he showered compliments on his colleagues from the pioneer years.

Galtung was bold in advancing concrete predictions about the world's future. In many ways, this was a strength, especially in comparison with the cautious and wise-with-hindsight remarks to which social scientists are often prone. While he was not always equally adept at admitting error, he had no lack of critics who were happy to point out his errors for him. For a researcher, a measure of obstinacy can be a strength, particularly when things get difficult. Progress in research is often achieved through a dialogue between the bold voices and their critics, between the enthusiast and the sceptic, as Johan himself put it in an essay from 1960.

When PRIO—long after Galtung's time—became the first institution to be designated a Centre of Excellence in the social sciences by the Research Council of Norway, this represented a

recognition of what Galtung had started, even though he himself had pursued other paths.

For those of us who were young in the 1960s and entered the social sciences, and especially peace research, Johan Galtung was an unusually inspiring mentor. He was generous with his time and supplied endless scholarly guidance and encouragement. When something did not go well, he would take the time to explain why. Those of us who could not always follow him on his complex path, are nevertheless eternally grateful for having enjoyed such help and support as we entered the world of research.

A shorter version was first published on *PRIO News* on the death of his passing. ■

— Nils Petter Gleditsch, *PRIO*;
and Raimo Väyrynen, *University of Helsinki*

Charles O. Jones

Dr. Charles O. Jones, Hawkins Professor Emeritus of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison, passed away on January 3, 2024. Prof. Jones was one of the leading scholars of American political institutions of his generation, described by the *Washington Post* as a “dean of American political scientists.” Jones finished his distinguished career at the University of Wisconsin, arriving in 1988 and serving until his retirement in 1997. He previously taught at Wellesley College, the University of Arizona, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Virginia. He also was a non-resident Senior Fellow in the Governmental Studies Program at The Brookings Institution. He is survived by his wife—Vera (Mire) Jones, two sons—Daniel and Joe, two brothers, a sister, and three grandchildren.

Jones wrote or edited 18 books and contributed over 100 articles and book chapters. Jones's scholarship can be divided into three periods: his early work mostly concerned the US Congress, he then shifted to public policy, and his most recent writing focused on the presidency and Congress:

His work on Congress made important contributions to the study of leadership, congressional committees, and the minority party in Congress. One seminal article on leadership made an important distinction between procedural and substantive majorities and examined the limits of leadership with the cases of Joseph Cannon and Howard Smith, leaders who pushed the boundaries of their power (*JOP*, 1968). His case study of the House Agriculture Committee expanded on the standard typology of congressional representation (the roles of trustee, delegate, and politico), to explore how those roles were employed at the committee level, from the perspective of the member of Congress (*APSR*, 1971). His most important contribution from this early work was *The Minority Party in Congress* (1970) which examined the impact of contextual factors such as the size of the majority party and its degree of unity and the role of the president on strategies of accommodation, obstruction, or institutional maintenance (it was a useful reminder that not that long ago, the minority party in the House didn't always obstruct). Much of this work was rooted in an approach that characterized most of his research: 1) understanding the political process and institutions from the perspective of the politicians through personal interviews and archival research, and 2) examining the complex interactions between politicians and institutions in

our system of separated powers. He rejected simple explanations and theories and always searched for more nuanced understandings of our complex system.

His work on public policy, while employing this approach, also developed general frameworks, as in an article outlining a policy making process that logically flows from problem identification and representation through formulation, legitimation, implementation, and evaluation (*AJPS*, 1974). His case study of air pollution at the Clairton coke works produced his most significant work on this topic, *Clean Air: The Policies and Politics of Pollution Control* (1978). This book outlines three kinds of knowledge used in policymaking: information that helps identify the problem, knowledge that informs alternative solutions to the problem; and knowledge about society's capacity to deal with the problem.

His most recent work on the presidency produced *The Trusteeship Presidency: Jimmy Carter and the United States Congress* (1988), *The Reagan Legacy: Promise and Performance* (1988), *The Presidency in a Separated System* (2000, which won the Richard E. Neustadt Prize), *Separate But Equal Branches: Congress and the Presidency* (1995), *Passages to the Presidency: From Campaigning to Governing* (1998); *Clinton and Congress, 1993-1996: Risk, Restoration, and Reelection* (1999); and *Preparing to Be President: The Memos of Richard E. Neustadt* (2000). This work continually reminds his readers that “our is not a presidential system,” but one of separated powers.

Writing in an accessible style, Prof. Jones saw his audience as not only his political science colleagues, but the broader public and, importantly, undergraduate students. He wrote textbooks in each of the three primary areas of his research outlined above: *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy* (1970); *The United States Congress: People, Place, and Policy* (1982); and *The American Presidency: A Very Short Introduction* (2007).

His national prominence was reflected in his service as President of the American Political Science Association (he also served as Treasurer and Vice President of the APSA) and as editor of the discipline's flagship journal, the *American Political Science Review* (from 1975-1981). He also was co-editor of *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, President of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chairman of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Social Science Research Council.

On a more personal note, when the announcement of his